

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 30, 1967  
For actions of Oct. 27, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 174

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7,23	Fishery loans.....10	Meat imports.....26
Agricultural appro- priations.....5	Fishery resources.....11	Per diem.....28
Appropriations.....5,15	Foreign trade.....3,20,26	Poverty.....1,22
Budgeting.....17	Highways.....4	Recreation.....21
Cotton.....6	Import quotas.....3	Redwood park.....12
Economy.....14	Job Corps.....16	Research.....24
Economic development.....9	Job training.....19	Small business.....22
Farms.....18	Lands.....12,29	Taxation.....13,25
Feed grains.....2	Legislative program.....6	Travel.....28
	Manpower development.....8	Waste disposal.....27

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House committee reported poverty bill. Rep. Whitten criticized discrepancies in the figures used by the executive and legislative branches for agricultural appropriations." Senate passed measure for Balanced Economic Development Commission.

### HOUSE

1. **POVERTY.** The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment S. 2388, the poverty bill (H. Rept. 866). p. H14139  
Rep. Bow criticized money spent by OEO "advertising itself." pp. H14133-34
2. **FEED GRAINS.** Rep. Findley criticized the proposed 1968 feed grains program and urged congressional review of the Feed Grain Act. p. H14133
3. **IMPORT QUOTAS.** Rep. Whalen expressed opposition to the proposed import quotas and inserted a telegram from the U. S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc., stating its opposition. p. H14133
4. **HIGHWAYS.** Rep. Cramer urged resumption of joint House-Senate hearings on the proposed highway construction cutback. p. H14135



5. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Whitten criticized "discrepancies in the figures used by the executive and legislative branches for agricultural appropriations" and the "inaccurate" reporting by the press. pp. H14135-6
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Mon. the House will consider the bill to reduce the extra-long staple cotton quota. p. D966
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Oct. 30. p. H14139

SENATE

8. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT. Passed as reported S. 1602, to establish a Northwest Regional Services Corp. to provide a number of training centers and programs. pp. S15417-25
9. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. Passed as reported S. J. Res. 64, to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development. pp. S15462-6
10. FISHERY LOANS. Passed without amendment S. 1798, to authorize the Interior Department to make loans to fishermen's cooperatives. pp. S15425-6
11. FISHERY RESOURCES. Passed as reported S. J. Res. 103, to direct the Interior Department to survey the coastal and fresh-water commercial fishery resources. pp. S15427-8
12. REDWOOD PARK. Sen. Anderson et al submitted an amendment to S. 2515, to establish the Redwood National Park, which would delete the authority to trade redwood lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service for private lands. p. S15429
13. TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire spoke in opposition to the proposed tax increase and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S15429-32
14. ECONOMY. Sen. Stennis stated, "I have been concerned for a long time about increased inflation as it affects the buying power of the consumer as well as the other disturbing influences it has on the economy," and inserted an article, "Family Budget a Distress Signal." p. S15468
15. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10196, the Labor-Hew appropriation bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S15435-4
16. JOB CORPS. Sen. Lausche criticized the Job Corps and stated, "It cost \$11,000 a year to train and take care of a dropout." p. S15442
17. BUDGETING. Sen. Proxmire stated, "Congress must insist that the administration employ alternative discount rates for public works and other spending requests. And Congress must use these analysis techniques to develop for itself some rational system of budgeting priorities." p. S15451
18. FARMS. Sen. Nelson commended a 160 year old farm in Wisc. and inserted an article, "They Like it Down on the Farm." pp. S15452-3
19. JOB TRAINING. Sen. Hartke spoke in favor of his bill S. 2429, the "human investment tax credit" bill which is designed to "spur the efforts of the private sector of industry in training or upgrading skills in on-the-job training." p. S15457



# Union Calendar No. 327

90TH CONGRESS <i>1st Session</i>	}	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	}	REPORT No. 866
-------------------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	-------------------

---

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

---

OCTOBER 27, 1967.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Education and Labor,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 2388]

The Committee on Education and Labor to whom was referred the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass. The first amendment strikes out all of the bill after the enacting clause and inserts in lieu thereof a substitute which appears in the reported bill in italic type. The second amendment is an amendment to the title of the bill.

### INTRODUCTION

The committee has made an extensive investigation and examination of the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and their administration throughout the Nation. Twenty-six days of public hearings were held in Washington, extending from June 12 through August 1. Concurrently, bipartisan staff investigations were made in six cities. Four volumes of testimony concerning the operation of the program throughout the Nation have been compiled. A total of 18 executive sessions of the full committee were held, the last five of which (totaling 19 hours) were open to the public. In addition, special ad hoc subcommittees of the full committee formed to consider in executive session various aspects of the bill accumulated an additional seven sessions.

The committee conscientiously endeavored to hear every witness who could throw light on the programs and their administration in ac-



ceding to the requests of both minority and majority members for witnesses. Particularly, the committee gave attention to the requests of Members who suggested the elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity so that it could thoroughly examine all approaches to the creation of economic opportunities for disadvantaged people. Out of all the witnesses heard and the testimony received the committee found only one witness who advocated the elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity. There appeared to the committee to be unanimous agreement among spokesmen representing business, labor, church groups, education, and other eleemosynary organizations and all levels of government that OEO should be retained as the central guiding mechanism for the war on poverty.

As a result of the extensive investigation and examination of the program the committee has concluded that major changes in the act are necessary to increase its effectiveness, assure appropriate coordination, and enhance the ability of the program to reach persons in need.

### MAJOR CHANGES MADE BY THE BILL

The major changes in the Economic Opportunity Act proposed in the reported bill are as follows:

#### TITLE I-A—JOB CORPS

1. Requires that the direct operating costs be reduced from \$7,500 to \$6,500 per enrollee per year.

2. Strengthens procedures for recruitment and selection of enrollees.

3. Prohibits partisan and nonpartisan political activity or participation in voter registration drives by Job Corps officers, employees, and enrollees.

4. Directs greater emphasis be given to the use of existing vocational education facilities in the Job Corps.

5. Provides for enrollment on a nonresidential basis and limits direct operating costs per nonresidential enrollee to \$2,500 per enrollee-year.

6. Requires an immediate increase in the number of young women in the Job Corps so that enrollment of females represents 25 percent of total enrollment; and further provides that immediate action be taken to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent for young women as soon as is practicable.

7. Requires testing and counseling of each enrollee prior to his termination to effect placement in employment for which the enrollee has received training.

8. Provides for more effective participation of States in Job Corps programs including coordination with State-operated programs.

#### TITLE I-B—WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. Provides a comprehensive manpower approach with stronger provisions to assure better coordination at the local level and to include more private industry involvement.

2. Stresses involvement of senior citizens.



## TITLE II—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

1. Requires community action agencies to be State, city, or county governments or that such government agencies designate a public or private nonprofit agency as the community action agency. A community action agency must have a board composed of one-third public officials, one-third representatives of business, education, labor, and so forth, interests in the community, and one-third representative of the people to be served.

2. Requires funding of programs through community action agencies as constituted above unless such public agency fails to act, or in the case of limited purpose projects the community action agency approves of other funding.

3. Limits size of community action agency boards to a maximum of 51 and institutes notice and quorum requirements to assure decision-making by majority.

4. Tightens political activity restrictions both partisan and nonpartisan and extends prohibitions to voter registration drives and voter transportation.

5. Requires that the non-Federal share of the cost shall be not less than 20 percent of the total cost (the requirement for fiscal 1967 was 10 percent and that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution be in cash).

6. Tightens auditing requirements for community action agencies.

7. Adds four new national emphasis programs:

- (a) A senior opportunities and services program for older Americans;
- (b) Emergency food and medical services program;
- (c) "Day care";
- (d) Family planning.

## TITLE VIII

1. Provides that VISTA volunteers may be given work assignments in their own or nearby communities.

2. Added provisions for older persons membership groups and individual senior citizens participation in program.

## MISCELLANEOUS

1. Prohibits extension of benefits to the "voluntary poor."

2. Places greater emphasis on programs for rural Americans.

3. Requires OEO to establish closer ties with other agencies at all levels of government.

4. Extends authorization to include fiscal year 1969, with the limitation that the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1969 not exceed the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1968.

These changes, as well as others, are more fully discussed in subsequent sections of the report.

## TITLE I-A—JOB CORPS

### A. BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS

The Job Corps was established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 "to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to in-



crease the employability of young men and women aged 16 through 21." The program was designed to serve those youths who are severely disadvantaged because of low educational achievement and little or no occupational skills and who need a change from their home environment. To achieve this purpose the Job Corps established residential centers which would provide intensive education, vocational training, work experience, health services, and other supportive services.

There are three types of centers: conservation centers, urban centers for men and women, and demonstration centers. Eighty-three conservation centers are currently being operated by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, six by various States, and one by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

There are 10 urban centers for men and 18 for women in operation under contract with private industry and nonprofit organizations. Five demonstration centers have been opened.

Since the first enrollee entered the Job Corps on January 6, 1965, 87,954 youth have been enrolled through June 30, 1967, including 42,032 active participants on that date. Their assignment to various types of centers compared to capacity is shown on table 1.

TABLE 1.—JOB CORPS ENROLLMENT AND CAPACITY, JUNE 30, 1967

	Centers	Enrollment	Capacity	Percent of capacity utilized
Total.....	123	42,032	42,614	98
Men.....	103	32,498	32,886	99
Conservation.....	90	16,046	15,736	102
Urban.....	10	16,177	16,600	97
Demonstration.....	3	275	550	50
Women.....	20	9,534	9,728	98
Urban.....	18	9,486	9,578	99
Demonstration.....	2	48	150	32

<sup>1</sup> The Washington D.C., project operates separate facilities for boys and girls but is counted as a single project.

Source: Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity.

The committee has once again given very careful attention and extensive consideration to the Job Corps. A number of studies have been undertaken to evaluate various aspects of the program, and these have been carefully analyzed by the committee. Throughout the committee hearings, considerable attention and discussion was given to the Job Corps program and, in addition, committee members and staff have visited Job Corps centers and camps.

There are several ways in which the Job Corps program might be evaluated. Many specific cases might be cited as examples of the successful rehabilitation of young men and women by the Job Corps. Viewed cumulatively, the Job Corps record of rehabilitation and human renewal is impressive. In order to obtain an overall picture, it is necessary to examine different phases of the program from enrollee recruitment to placement of graduates.

Testimony before the committee indicated that, of the 38,000 youngsters in the Job Corps studied in June 1967, male enrollees had completed an average of 8.8 years of schooling and female enrollees 9.8



years. Even though young men had completed over 8 years of schooling, the average reading level was at grade 4, and for young girls, at grade 6. The math level was at the 4th and 5th grade levels. Sixty-five percent of the males and 50 percent of the females were employed prior to their enrollment in the Job Corps, however, 60 percent were making less than \$1.25 per hour. Pre-Job Corps earnings reported to the Social Security Administration averaged only \$639 per year with 2.5 quarters in employment. Of those eligible for the Armed Forces, 30 percent failed the mental test and 17 percent failed the physical examination. Eighty percent of the enrollees had not seen a doctor or dentist during the previous 10 years. Sixty percent were from broken families. Sixty-three percent came from families where the head of the household was unemployed. Thirty percent could not read or write.

Frequently, the question is asked, "Is the Job Corps reaching those for whom the program is intended? Is the Job Corps serving hard-core youth?" Based on its consideration of the above statistics, its conversations with educators, and its direct observation of Job Corps programs, the committee responds to the question in the affirmative.

To the question, "Is the Job Corps making an effective contribution?" the committee also responds affirmatively. Studies indicate that for every 10 months in public schools, the average pupil gains one grade level, but that the average Corps member gained only 0.6 grade level in reading and mathematics for every 10 months they spent in school. The rate of achievement in the Job Corps is considerably accelerated, as for every 10 months in the Job Corps, the average Corps member gains 1.5 grade levels in reading and 1.8 grade levels in mathematics.

Further insight into whether the Job Corps is making an effective contribution can be gained by asking the question, "What happens to former Job Corps members?" Based upon sample studies conducted for OEO by Lou Harris and Associates, the Job Corps estimates that 70 percent of those who have left the Job Corps are working, in the armed services or enrolled in school. The remaining 30 percent were unemployed, out of the labor force (such as young women who married) or whereabouts unknown. Although adequate control comparisons of Federal manpower programs are not possible, it would appear that the Job Corps' placement rate is somewhat comparable with MDTA institutional training (although the Job Corps reaches more disadvantaged persons) and is higher than the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Considering the types of youths served, 70 percent successful placement is a satisfactory record.

The average hourly wage of former Job Corpsmen is \$1.58. This compares to \$1.19 for those who worked before entering the Job Corps. There is a significant difference in wages, depending on the length of time spent in the Job Corps. The greater the length of time in training, the higher the starting hourly wage. In addition, there are many intangible gains which are beyond measurement—improved motivation, greater self-esteem, more hopeful outlook on life, better personal and social adjustment and a greater commitment to personal efforts to succeed.

In addition to personal achievements, Job Corps enrollees have made significant social contributions through the work they have performed.



Information from the Departments of Interior and Agriculture indicates that the estimated appraised value of the conservation work performed by Job Corps enrollees to May 1, 1967, is \$26,067,234. Among their accomplishments are the following: 73 miles of firebreaks and fire suppression facilities built and maintained; 66 miles of fishing streams developed and maintained; 15,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat improvement; 2,300 miles of roads built and maintained; 7,936 acres of timber stand improved and reforested; 404 acres of watersheds restored; 10,251 units of picnic tables, fireplaces, cabins built; 13,081 acres of trees and shrubs planted.

In this connection, there are numerous examples of corpsmen also providing needed help during emergency situations. These include corpsmen providing assistance (1) in the removal of dead alewives from the beaches of Lake Michigan; (2) during the floods of December 1966, in southern California; (3) in the clean up operations at Albert Lea, Minn., following the April 30, 1967, tornadoes; and (4) in forest fire suppression in the Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico.

Based on the above and additional information, the committee has found that the Job Corps is on balance a substantial success with noticeable improvements in this year's program as compared to that of last year. We are convinced that the Job Corps is making a significant contribution toward the eradication of poverty. Consideration of the achievements by the Job Corps is by itself sufficient reason for the committee to recommend continuation of the program. However, the committee's conclusion that the Job Corps should be continued and be retained as part of the OEO is further substantiated by the almost unanimous testimony in support of the program. The following statements from the committee hearings are illustrative of the views of the great majority of witnesses appearing before the committee. It should be noted that, in addition to personally endorsing the program, many of the witnesses went on to observe that their colleagues and others with whom they spoke voiced strong approval of the Job Corps.

Arthur S. Fleming, president, National Council of the Churches of Christ of the United States:

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the Job Corps is in a position where it is rendering an effective service and where it in the future can render an even more effective service.

I definitely feel that a transfer at this time to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the understanding that it would be made a part of the vocational education program, would be unfortunate.

Andrew J. Biemiller, legislative director, AFL-CIO:

We supported the Job Corps in 1964; we support it in 1967. The idea which President Meany supported has become a reality of which we can all be proud. The Job Corps offers young people who come from the poorest environments and the bleakest backgrounds an opportunity to develop useful work experience, a chance to get a basic education and chance to live in a new and healthy environment.

And perhaps, most important of all, it gives them an opportunity to rechannel their sense of futility and frustra-



tion into a new sense of pride in themselves and in their value as human beings.

Dean O. William Perlmutter, State University, New York:

What it means to me is that the Job Corps represents for the educational community a kind of Mayo Clinic. We have on the one hand here a clinic where we treat people who are in need, and people who are not getting treatment in other places in the educational system.

We do not treat these youngsters in the schools of Harlem adequately. We can't. We don't do it in the restricted suburbs of our affluent cities.

These are youngsters in great need, and on the one hand it is a clinic, but the Mayo Clinic is more than a clinic where you treat the sick. You do research. You study diseases that come before you. You study analytically and in depth the problems that these patients bring to you, and it is perhaps the laboratory aspect to the Job Corps which is so fascinating to me and many of my colleagues which are among some of the most innovative educators in the country, in all fields we are watching the Job Corps.

We want a feedback from the Job Corps. I have faulted the Job Corps in the past very plainly to some of the people there by telling them they had not done enough in relating to the educational community.

I have a specific recommendation that I wish to make on that score, but nonetheless, the Job Corps represents a very profound and new approach in American higher education.

The Honorable John Rockefeller, member of the West Virginia Legislature, Charleston, W. Va.:

What I liked in the Job Corps that I saw, there is something I wish would take place all over West Virginia. They are taking young people with minimum education, high school dropouts, with problems, rural background, urban background. They are giving these people computer training. They are taking, for example, a 17- or 18-year-old girl with these problems and they give her 6, 7, 8 months of training. Within that period, at the end of that period, this girl is qualified to go out and seek work which will pay her \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year.

Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources:

I do want to say one thing, however. Conservation organizations are not noted for general agreement, even among themselves. This is one area, however, that we have probably the fewest complaints about. We have urged our people and our associates and our colleagues all over the country to get out and see these Job Corps camps. They have. In your own State, for example, and I don't think there is a one of the number of camps that we have had reports on that recommended against them. There are 47 Forest Service centers, and 39 Interior camps, and people have visited practically all of them.



Kenneth B. Pomeroy, chief forester, American Forestry Association:

I left the camp with a firm conviction that the Nation is doing something very worthwhile. In fact, several important goals are being achieved. Young men, future heads of families, are acquiring skills that will enable them to make their own way in the world. More importantly, these young men are being imbued with a desire to be self-sufficient. And in this process of "learning by doing" the forest resources of the Nation are being improved significantly.

Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, second vice president, League of Women Voters of the United States:

\* \* \* we have heard only favorable reports on the Job Corps from leagues near Job Corps centers.

We are supporting the continuation of the Job Corps.

Mrs. George B. Martin, national vice president, Church Women, United:

We have come to know at first hand the kind of problems these young women face and some of the situations that have played such a damaging part in their lives. The hope for these girls lies in an opportunity to be removed from the environment which has caused so many of their problems.

We have seen the almost unbelievable transformation that has taken place in girls given the opportunity to hope and to help themselves. We have been in a position to see the "before" and "after" of Job Corps—the girls before they go and the girls when they come back.

The Job Corps has done much more than train in job skills. Important as that is, job training alone is not enough for employability. Many other factors enter into the ability to get and to hold a job. For the girls who need Job Corps, no local training program can provide that most needed element; namely, taking them out of their environment long enough to help them learn new habits of relationships and new ways of thinking of themselves.

As one judge said, "We all know in every community there are lots of young people who can make something of themselves if we can get them away from \* \* \* that stepfather, the gang that pushes her around, the rat-infested slums, the too many younger brothers and sisters to care for, the boyfriend with the criminal record, the brother who is a drug addict. Job Corps is the only chance for many of these."

And, as one girl said, "I don't blame my mother. She didn't know any better. But I want something better for my daughter."

Mrs. John D. Shields, national president, National Council of Catholic Women:

I feel strongly that the Job Corps training will serve as a foundation for future learning for these girls, either formal or informal—probably informal—and plead that nothing be

done to change anything about the Job Corps; that its present concept be supported until there is adequate time for a valid followup on its graduates.

Robert L. Marquardt, vice president, Economic Development Operations, Thiokol Chemical Corp.:

It is our opinion that the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Job Corps in particular, has improved and strengthened its operation to the point where it is making a major contribution to the success of the Job Corps centers throughout the country.

## B. RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee has concluded that the Job Corps should be continued and retained as part of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the enrollment capacity should be limited to 45,000 during 1968 fiscal year. This will require an appropriation of \$295 million out of the \$874 million proposed for carrying out the provisions of title I. Further, the Act should be amended to strengthen and tighten Job Corps operations based upon its 2½ years of experience.

Since the beginning of the Job Corps, the committee has been concerned over the high direct operating cost per enrollee. The 1966 amendments to the act provided that direct operating costs could not exceed \$7,500 per enrollee. The committee is pleased to report that this average cost in fiscal year 1967 was \$6,900 per enrollee in centers in operation 9 months or more, that is, \$600 below the statutory ceiling. Nevertheless, the committee feels that further reduction is essential and that by further tightening its operations, the Job Corps can reduce its direct annual operating costs per residential enrollee to \$6,500 in centers which have been operative more than 9 months. Accordingly, for fiscal year 1968, this cost limitation, to be measured on a 12-month basis, is prescribed in the committee bill.

Related to the matter of high operating costs, and of equal concern to the committee, is the fact that the Job Corps program is reaching only a small percentage of the persons for whom it is intended. There are more than 1 million young men and women who might qualify for the program. Determined that the Job Corps should reach a higher percentage of disadvantaged youth, and convinced that it would be highly desirable to provide for Job Corps training on a nonresidential basis, the committee has modified the program accordingly. In so doing, the committee expects the Director of the Job Corps to give great emphasis and high priority to increasing the involvement of young men and women in the Job Corps programs on a nonresidential basis. This modification is intended to further reduce direct operating costs per enrollee. In this connection, the committee bill provides that the direct operating costs per enrollee for nonresidential students be no greater than \$2,500 per year.

Related to the committee amendments which provide for enrollment on a nonresidential basis, the bill proposes a reduction in the lowest permissible age for enrollment in the Job Corps from 16 to 14. The committee feels that, particularly on a nonresidential basis, it would be desirable to provide Job Corps programs for students at this crucial age. The committee is mindful that State compulsory school



attendance laws and child labor laws will preclude participation of 14- and 15-year-old students in many of the States. The committee, in adopting this provision, in no way intends to supersede or contravene any State law. It intends solely that there be no Federal prohibition against the enrollment of young men and women of that age in the Job Corps.

A third major concern of the committee has been voiced numerous times in the past. In the committee reports accompanying the 1965 and 1966 amendments to the act, great dissatisfaction was expressed over the Office of Economic Opportunity's failure and apparent unwillingness to meet the committee's often-stated requirement and desire that enrollment of young women in the Job Corps be increased. This year the Office reported that the enrollment of young women in the Job Corps amounted to approximately 23 percent of the total enrollment. The committee wishes to commend the present administrators in the Job Corps for their efforts during the last year, but it notes at the same time that 2½ years after the initiation of the program, the Job Corps is still far from attaining the minimum proportion of young women it has been directed from the start to achieve. The committee gave the utmost consideration to a number of amendments to increase the statutory requirement relating to the enrollment of young women. One of these amendments proposed that the requirement be set at 35 percent, another at 30 percent and the amendment finally adopted, at 25 percent of the total enrollment in the Corps. The committee's approval of a 25 percent requirement is in no way to be interpreted as any lessening of the committee's desire that the goal of one-third, which was set in the 1964 committee report, be achieved. Information provided to the committee indicated that mandatory increase at this time from the present 23 percent requirement to 30 percent would, however, necessitate—

(1) A 2,000 decrease in the male population which would require the closing of two men's urban centers;

(2) The closing of an additional men's urban center because of the additional expenses incurred in initiating new women's centers; and

(3) An increase in the enrollee unit cost to \$7,000.

The committee was advised an increase in the percentage requirement to 35 percent would have an even greater impact on program operations and result in still higher enrollee unit costs. It was because of these considerations, and these considerations only, that the committee did not approve the amendments proposing the 30- or 35-percent figure. In addition to setting the requirement at 25 percent, 2 percentage points higher than existing law, the committee bill directs the Office of Economic Opportunity to take immediate steps to increase the enrollment of women to a ratio of 50 percent, consistent with efficiency and economy in operations of the program, sound administrative practice and socioeconomic, education, and training needs of the population to be served. As has been stated repeatedly, the committee cannot overemphasize its concern in this matter. In suggesting that the Director of the Job Corps take immediate steps to increase the enrollment of women to a ratio of 50 percent, the committee means just that and fully expects the Office of Economic Opportunity to be



able to show concrete and specific action taken with respect to this mandate.

Existing law prohibits officers, employees, and enrollees of the Job Corps from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns. The committee's bill adds language to this prohibition making it clear that it applies to such activities whether they are of a partisan or a nonpartisan nature. The bill also prohibits such persons from taking any active part in voter registration drives.

Further, the committee bill sets more specific standards for the screening and selection of applicants than have previously been part of the statute. An important new provision included in the bill requires that the Director prescribe rules which will encourage recruitment through agencies having long-term contact with youth and that they include provision for consultation with individuals and organizations such as courts, probation and parole officers, law enforcement authorities, schools, medical agencies, and advisers. The bill also requires that the screening procedures include an interview with each applicant and careful and systematic inquiry concerning his background.

In its admission policies, the Job Corps must tread a narrow line. On the one hand, its purpose is to serve those who need the opportunity presented by the Job Corps in order to learn to support themselves adequately and to become responsible, productive citizens. These will not be youths with a record of success. On the other hand, the Job Corps must refuse admission to those applicants whose antisocial orientation or medical disability is so great that they are unlikely to benefit from the program, or whose disruptive influence will tend to spoil the Job Corps for others. We recognize that great expertise and judgment are required in making determinations about the potential of a particular youth. Accordingly, the bill requires the Director, before accepting an individual with a record of serious and violent behavioral aberrations, to obtain the opinion of a person who is professionally qualified in the field of human behavior, and who knows the applicant, that participation in the program will help him overcome his problems without unduly disrupting the program for others.

Although not citizens of the United States, residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps. Under the present statute, however, they are required to take a loyalty oath to the United States. Since residents of the trust territory are not citizens, it seems unreasonable to expect them to take the oath of allegiance. Accordingly, the bill exempts them from this requirement.

The committee bill replaces the present provisions of section 104(i) of the act relating to the assignment of enrollees with provisions placing greater emphasis on assuring that enrollees will be assigned to centers which are nearest to their homes. However, it still takes into account the fact that occasional situations will arise in which inflexible adherence to this policy will not serve the best interest of the enrollee or be conducive to effective operation of the program.

More specifically, the amendment requires that after the Director has determined the appropriate type of center to which an enrollee is to be assigned, he shall assign the enrollee to the appropriate type center nearest the enrollee's home. The Director may waive the re-

quirement, in individual cases, when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to more remote centers are to be carefully limited to situations in which this is necessary to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee, or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

The committee bill gives the Director authority to establish and operate Job Corps centers through Federal, State, or local agencies. These centers, which may be nonresidential, as well as residential or a combination of the two, would include the three main types—men's and women's training centers, and conservation centers (which would be designated under the bill as civilian conservation centers). Under the bill, where possible, men's and women's training centers would also make available education, vocational training, and other supportive services to enrollees on a nonresidential basis in work and training programs, under title I-B of the act.

The committee's bill further requires that Job Corps centers be operated so as to provide enrollees with an extensive, well-organized, fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical development, and counseling. A program of at least 60 hours a week is required, one geared to a realistic appreciation of the aptitudes, interests, and career goals of this population. The committee recognizes the need for useful work experience in order to give an enrollee the pride that comes from having worked hard and performed productively. It expects that Corps members, in contributing their services toward the good of their center, will better develop a sense of discipline and self-esteem; and for those reasons, as well as to minimize the cost of running the program, each Corps member should be expected to help in the work of maintaining and operating his respective center.

Further, the committee recognizes that work experience away from the center may be a necessary or desirable concomitant of the Job Corps program. Where this is true, arrangements should be made with community employer-trainers to provide enrollees with work experience or on-the-job training, coordinated, to the extent feasible, with similar programs in the community. The bill retains the requirement in present law that such work programs not displace presently employed workers or interfere with ongoing contracts for services.

The bill generally reenacts the existing act's provisions regarding support, subsistence, and allowances. However, it endorses statutorily the Job Corps practice of encouraging adequate enrollment periods, and thereby promoting greater achievement, by requiring that, except in unusual circumstances, an enrollee not receive a readjustment allowance unless he has remained in the Job Corps program for at least 90 days. Moreover, the Director is authorized to reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during the enrollee's participation in the Job Corps.

The committee understands the frequent necessity for financial support of an enrollee's dependent and does not intend the 90-day enroll-



ment limitation the bill imposes on the payment of the enrollee's readjustment allowances to reduce that portion of the allowance, or the Director's matching contribution, which may be paid under section 109(d) directly to the dependent.

Information developed by the committee during its hearings concerning the Job Corps indicates that more stringent standards of conduct are being enforced in the Job Corps than were applied before the enactment of last year's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. The committee is gratified by this development and its bill incorporates the provisions of one of those amendments under which Job Corps center directors are required to provide and strictly enforce standards of conduct and deportment, and, under regulations prescribed by the Director, to take full and appropriate disciplinary measures subject to a right of appeal in case of dismissal from the Corps.

Placement, and postplacement, support is an important corollary of the Job Corps program. The Director should take care to make optimum placements, and toward that end he should utilize to the maximum extent possible the services of the U.S. Employment Service. He should also take appropriate measures to insure job retention once initial placement is achieved. The committee recognizes that particularly in the period immediately following a corpsman's departure from the program, the Director can be of considerable assistance to him in meeting the serious problems of adjustment which confront such a person as he seeks to accomplish a successful entry into community life.

The committee has provided that the Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of enrollees after termination, and assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling are met. However, it is not the intention of the committee to provide for duplication of the Director's functions with respect to helping Job Corps terminees find a job or obtain further education or training; rather we intend that the Secretary's activity supplement those of the Director, and that the assistance which the Secretary is uniquely capable of providing terminees, such as admission to Manpower Development and Training Act and other programs, be made fully available to them.

In order to insure maximum assistance to the trainee, the committee's bill requires that pertinent records of the enrollee (except for information which would violate the enrollee's right to privacy) be made available to the Department of Labor, as well as to OEO. In order to promote linkage between the trainee and the office providing placement service, the committee has also required, where feasible, that his readjustment allowance be paid to him at the public employment service office in the area to which he is returning; and that that office, or a private organization or agency providing placement support in lieu of the employment office, maintain records and do followup so as to better quantify the results of the Job Corps training, thus serving as an evaluative and refinement tool for the program. Where an enrollee is placed in a job prior to his termination from the center, the Director rather than the public employment office, or other placement agency is required to maintain records providing pertinent

placement and followup information, for later submission to the Secretary of Labor.

The committee has added new provisions requiring the systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program in order to measure the specific benefits and assess the effectiveness of program procedures. Such evaluation must provide for adequate control groups and for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the Job Corps. In particular, evaluative studies should follow up those who leave the Job Corps to determine their residence, employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. In addition, evaluations should also be undertaken to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to non-residential facilities and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including universities and local boards of education.

Finally, the committee bill also provides for experimental projects designed to test new techniques. Among the projects shall be one or more testing the combination of residential and nonresidential facilities. The Director is also authorized to undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have the severest behavioral problems. The Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, is required to enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers in urban areas; the object is to determine whether such schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem and whether such facilities could benefit the whole community.

## **TITLE I-B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS**

In the opinion of the committee, lack of meaningful employment opportunities is still the single most important problem contributing to the continuation of poverty.

The original Economic Opportunity Act included two community level work and training programs. The Neighborhood Youth Corps authorized under title I-B was to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and women to increase their employability or to enable them to resume or continue their education. The work experience program authorized by title V was to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families.

As the significance of employment programs to the antipoverty effort was recognized, other programs were added to these two. This committee last year added a program designed to promote employment of the poor in "new career" jobs that have been developing in many fields. Other additional programs concentrated upon conservation-type employment opportunities and upon "impact" approaches to unemployment and related problems in urban ghettos.

While these Economic Opportunity Act manpower programs have shown good results in many instances, they have not been fully effective. In large part, the committee believes that this failure to achieve



full potential stems from the fact that programs have tended too much to operate separately, with inadequate coordination or linkage with one another and with other activities, including other closely related manpower programs. As a consequence, there have been too many rigidities in the design of local programs, which results too often in a failure to provide services needed to respond to the needs of the very disadvantaged participants which the projects are intended to serve. There are too many cases where participants are denied an opportunity to progress in a logical way from one kind of project or activity to another, as from an NYC project to a new careers program or an MDTA project providing experience or training of a more specific or advanced character. And there are too many cases where no real effort is made to deal comprehensively with the needs of various disadvantaged groups needing jobs, to relate those needs to available job opportunities, to draw in all the resources and programs required to match needs with opportunities, and to measure overall program performance.

If poverty is to be eliminated, the committee believes that a more aggressive effort must be made to reach and to effectively help those who are prepared to help themselves in the best way possible—through useful, meaningful work. The committee believes that a successful effort depends upon a more effective use of existing authorities in support of comprehensive community programs. The bill is designed to provide the mechanism by which communities can and will begin achieving this kind of program structure.

The committee wishes to point out that the bill, in this respect, does not represent a complete or total manpower program, which would involve combining a variety of program elements at many levels, some of which are outside of the Economic Opportunity Act. The committee does believe, however, that a start toward such a program can logically begin with the concentration of programs which are specifically focused upon the poor. As the Economic Opportunity Act manpower programs are drawn increasingly together, it should be possible to begin relating other programs more effectively both to the needs of the poor and, by virtue of the relationships established in this area, to one another as well. The committee expects that every effort will be made to use the authorities provided to this end. With respect to existing work and training activities under the Economic Opportunity Act, the committee notes that administrative actions have been taken this past year to consolidate these programs, by delegation, under the Secretary of Labor with a view to enhancing their mutual effectiveness while also assuring maximum coordination with other parts of the poverty program. The committee expects that this administrative pattern will continue to apply in the case of the new part I-B.

Under the bill, the basic mechanism for providing assistance would be a comprehensive community work and training program under a single local sponsor. Within the comprehensive program framework, it would be possible for a community to use any of the existing program authorities, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, or the "new careers" programs, or "operation mainstream" program, all of which would be specifically recognized and continued with various improvements. In addition, several significant new program authorities are proposed. These include incentives to encourage private employers,

other than nonprofit organizations, to hire and provide intensive training, on the job, to unemployed and severely disadvantaged persons. Also included is a provision patterned upon the so-called concentrated employment programs. The CEP represents a system for pulling together separate manpower programs into a unified approach for dealing with a community's manpower problems. Although in its initial stages, funds drawn from various programs have been identified for additional concentrated effort in a number of communities. It represents a delivery system by means of which existing programs can be integrated and made more mutually supporting and efficient. Thus, this approach can be applied to both urban and rural employment problems, and indeed represents the pattern into which most manpower programs could be fed, in order to meet training and employment needs of poverty communities. These programs are for urban or rural areas with high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons, are designed to assure employer cooperation, and are structured to provide intensive services and followthrough, focused upon those who are most in need of training or work.

Comprehensive programs are not necessarily limited to the specific kinds of projects listed in the bill. A prime objective is, in fact, to encourage flexibility in designing programs that are both comprehensive and which provide an unbroken sequence of services needed to enable participants to secure and hold employment. At the same time, however, the committee wishes to make clear that the comprehensive program approach is not intended to disrupt the many useful and successful projects that may already have been initiated. Building a comprehensive program in full conformity to the purposes of the new part B is likely, in most communities, to be a process that will take some time. The bill has been carefully drawn to take account of the need for such an approach. Thus, while it is contemplated that after July 1, 1968, funding of existing projects should be consolidated wherever feasible through a single sponsor, the bill would encourage the delegation by the sponsor to other agencies to operate projects and would permit independent or direct funding of agencies other than the prime sponsor where this would enhance program effectiveness. This could include direct funding of educational agencies operating in-school NYC projects, under a specific provision of the bill.

#### LOCAL OPERATION

In order to achieve the objectives of the bill, a comprehensive work and training program should be organized and planned for a community area which is adequate to permit the mobilization of substantial resources. In the beginning, of course, program organization on this basis may not be possible in many rural areas where projects that could be included in a comprehensive program are already underway. In these cases, the direct funding authority may be used to assure continuation of projects while a comprehensive program is being developed.

Responsibility for planning, administering, coordinating and evaluating comprehensive programs is to be vested in prime sponsors, and assistance would therefore normally be channeled through them. The prime sponsor may be a public or private nonprofit agency.



No specific type of agency is specified in the bill. The principal requirement would be that the agency have the capability of doing what is required to develop and provide central direction to a program designed to draw upon available resources and provide participants with the services they need in an unbroken sequence. This would include the capacity to work effectively with employers and unions, and members of the groups and residents of the areas served, so as to assure their required participation in program development and implementation, and to secure the cooperation of other public and private organizations that would operate component projects or provide needed support.

While the prime sponsor would be the central planning and administering agency, it is not to be necessarily an operating agency. As a means of involving and utilizing all available resources and elements in the community, the prime sponsor should, where feasible, use other local agencies as delegate or operating agencies. These may be local neighborhood agencies organized specifically to carry out some components of the program, or other public or private agencies with the requisite interest and skill to operate a successful project. However, any agency that acts as a delegate must provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the group served in project planning, conduct, and evaluation. The committee anticipates that the selection of delegate agencies will generally reflect existing patterns of operating responsibility, and that the authority to fund components directly rather than through prime sponsors will also be used with a view to minimizing disruption of existing administrative structures, consistent with achievement of the overall objectives of a comprehensive and coordinated approach.

#### ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

As has been noted, all present Economic Opportunity Act manpower programs have been included as eligible activities and several new ones have been added. However, the list of activities is neither meant to be inclusive, nor to be a requirement that a comprehensive program include each eligible activity. The committee fully realizes that it cannot describe every work-training program that may be viable in some community and expects that communities will take advantage of the ability to tailor programs to meet the needs of local residents. The changes in existing programs and the structure of the added eligible activities are intended to decrease the rigidity of the authority rather than set up inflexible categories.

Thus, the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps type program was modified to enlarge participation to include adults who could benefit from the activities provided by the program, and by emphasizing the need for basic education and institutional or on-the-job training to strengthen the program. The "operation mainstream" program was modified to add lack of employment opportunity as a basis of eligibility. Participants should be placed in competitive employment as soon as possible, but on the other hand they should not be eliminated from the program if, in fact, no competitive employment opportunities exist for them. The need to create new careers with ad-

vancement opportunities was additionally stressed in the "new careers" program.

The committee notes that "new careers" projects have been funded which provide only the most superficial attention to the career ladder concept or to the requirement that permanent jobs be available at the end of training. The committee expects the Labor Department to act decisively in correcting these situations.

The concentrated employment program, given legislative recognition for the first time, may be carried out in urban or rural areas with concentrations or high proportions of unemployed poor, and would focus on the most disadvantaged residents of the area who could reasonably be expected to benefit from the program. Intensive recruitment of the most disadvantaged, individual counseling and coaching of participants to determine, and to refer them to, the part of the program most suited to their needs and provision of education and training activities appropriate to the needs of the participants and related to opportunities available, are major features of this type of program. Follow-up counseling of participants after completing training and while employed should also be stressed. The close cooperation and commitment of private employers and labor unions is essential to this type of program.

Two activities have been included to insure that a program has the means to reach the unemployed, underemployed and low-income person, to involve the private sector in a complete and meaningful manner and to follow through once a person leaves a training program. The bill specifies that employment centers and mobile employment units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services which are located in neighborhoods and areas and are easily accessible to the most disadvantaged, may be included in a program.

The bill also authorizes assistance to programs which may be used as incentives to private profitmaking employers to recruit, train, and employ unemployed and low-income persons. This would include reimbursements to a private employer for unusual training expenses, for recruiting in areas of high concentrations of unemployed or low-income persons, for on-the-job counseling for program participants, for reimbursing participants who reside in such areas for the cost of transportation to the place of work or training, and for other activities which would contribute to the permanent employability of program participants. These types of arrangements should supplement and advance the outreach and counseling functions of the program. The committee believes that the involvement of the private sector in these programs is essential. It is clear that the poor in these programs cannot and should not be supported permanently by government programs. The goal is to aid them to be self-sufficient citizens. As employment with the private sector is necessarily a part of that goal, private employers must be involved and the programs must have access to their capabilities and confidence. Through this incentive program the committee bill would provide the means to gain the involvement of the private sector.

It is not intended that these programs should provide assistance which would be supportive of firms or industries which have high rates of turnover of labor because of low wages, seasonality or other factors,



or which would lead to displacement of their currently employed work force by persons newly trained through these programs. Nor is it intended that the various incentive programs under this act lead to the disruption of an industry's existing patterns of competition or stimulate labor turnover by encouraging replacement of the existing work force by newly trained workers. It would not, therefore, be in keeping with the purposes of the act to make available financial assistance or other incentives for work, training and related programs for industries which are highly mobile, labor intensive, and vigorously competitive on a national basis, which have high labor turnover, and in which the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for employment.

In order to prevent abuse it is expected that appropriate administrative steps shall be taken to assure that unusual training costs or other reimbursements paid to an employer under section 123(a)(8) should cover only such costs as are incurred because the particular worker or workers are not able to perform on the job in the manner the employer previously expected of his new hires for the same or a similar occupation.

In order to assure efficient operation and to minimize confusion, the committee expects that, wherever appropriate, the rules, regulations, guidelines, and orders, including but not limited to standards for reimbursement to employers for training and related activities as well as standards governing the types of training programs which may be approved, established for programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act, shall be applicable to programs developed under this new incentive program, and that maximum use will be made of the facilities, manpower and expertise of existing manpower and community action agencies.

#### TRANSITION

The committee bill would require that by July 1, 1968, programs now receiving assistance under this part must be consolidated into a comprehensive work and training program, and the funds for the program channeled through the prime sponsor. An extension of time for good cause may be granted by the Director, if for example, a rural community has not developed an organization to act as a prime sponsor. The projects under the Title V: Work Experience and Training Program, after July 1, 1968, are also to be linked to the comprehensive work and training program to the maximum extent feasible.

Ongoing program operations should not be interrupted if at all possible during the consolidation process. For the most part agencies operating the programs at the time should continue as delegate agencies. To ease the transition the Director has an option of funding a project independently of the prime sponsor if all differences are not resolved between the delegate and the prime sponsor, but the Director should not exercise this authority in a manner that would permit a recalcitrant delegate agency to obstruct the consolidation process. The Director also has specific authority to provide assistance directly to local or State educational agencies to operate in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs pursuant to an agreement to be reached with the Secretary of Labor.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee has retained the special conditions of existing law which prohibit the employment of participants in projects involving political parties or facilities for use of sectarian or religious worship. Programs must not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts. Rates of pay for time spent working, or other conditions of employment, must be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as the type of work, geographical area and proficiency of the participant.

The participants in a comprehensive work and training program must be unemployed or low-income persons and permanent residents of the United States. A definition of low income will be established for programs under this part by the Director in consultation with the Social Security Administrator. The committee would expect that to the extent feasible the definition would be the same as that reached for programs under title II of the act. The elderly poor face many problems of unemployment and the committee has directed that steps be taken to insure that programs also be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons 55 and over.

Provision for pilot projects have been made in the bill in order to develop new approaches to further the objectives of the program. In keeping with the increased emphasis on the participation of private profitmaking employers, the committee provides specifically for pilot projects to determine new and effective ways for such employers to contribute to the goals of the act.

Technical assistance either directly or through contracts or other appropriate agreements may be extended to assist in the initiation or effective operations of programs under this part. Arrangements for the training of instructors and other needed personnel may also be undertaken. State agencies may be utilized for supplying such technical assistance and training.

Up to 20 percent of the funds authorized for this title may be reserved for the concentrated employment program and allocated in a manner that does not permit more than 12½ percent to go to any one State. The other funds for comprehensive work and training programs must be allocated so as to meet the criteria which apply to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in existing law, that is, to take into account rates of population, unemployment, and family income levels. The maximum Federal share is 90 percent for these basic activities, and a community may pool its matching contributions with those required in title II for the community action program.

The bill requires the development and implementation of a program data system and an evaluation program so that the results of these programs can be carefully measured and compared with other Federal manpower programs. The committee expects OEO and the Labor Department to begin the publication of comparative results within 1 year.

## TITLE II—COMMUNITY ACTION

The Community Action program was authorized by title II, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It has been one of the most complicated, and controversial, aspects of the poverty program.



At present there are more than 1,050 Community Action agencies, and 1.8 billion dollars have been spent for programs authorized under this title since the fall of 1964. In administering the program, these agencies and their delegate agencies employ about 95,000 persons of whom 41,000, or 43 percent, are drawn from the ranks of the poor.

There is no single entity to which one can refer as the model for a Community Action agency. As the term implies, a Community Action agency is the creature of local invention and innovation. Programs are fashioned to cope with the problems of poverty as they exist locally, and objectives vary from community to community. With these variances in mind, however, it is possible to describe some typical activities of Community Action agencies.

Community Action agencies are primarily involved in the provision of services which are designed to aid the poor achieve self-sufficiency. These may include adult education, legal services, health services, a range of special educational programs for both young and old, day care centers, and so on. The great weight of evidence presented to the committee indicated that these services were effectively reaching the poor.

The committee's inquiries have shown that local Community Action agencies have matured substantially in the past year, and are earning new stature and recognition for constructive work in communities in all parts of the country.

Based on their own direct experience, an impressive array of local officials, as well as private groups and individuals, have expressed their view that Community Action and the agencies which administer it locally are effective instrumentalities in the fight to eradicate poverty. The 1,000-plus organizations have created an awareness and a concern for the 30 million Americans who live in poverty, and a commitment to do something about their plight. They are helping to create opportunities for millions of the disadvantaged who are leaving the ranks of tax consumers to become taxpayers.

In spite of this record of success, the committee recognizes that there have been weaknesses and deficiencies in the manner in which the community action program has been administered to date.

There have been instances of administrative laxity.

Some CAA's have indulged in political activities of questionable propriety.

Insufficient attention has been given to the special problems of rural areas, and the same may also be said of the elderly.

Most importantly, though, in initial attempts to protect the legitimate interests of the poor in the conduct of community action programs, an unwholesome situation has arisen in many communities where responsible public officials have not actively participated in the decision-making process with regard to community action programs in their communities. The committee regrets that this has happened, and the most important amendments to title II, we feel, will remedy that situation.

As revised, the title consists of a new statement of purpose and four parts. Part A describes community action programs and prescribes the structure of community action agencies. Part B contains the basic authorization for financial assistance to locally designed



community action programs and related special programs, such as Headstart and Upward Bound. Part C deals with supplementary activities, such as technical assistance and training. Part D sets forth requirements of general applicability, including responsibility with respect to rural areas, and coordination. The principal changes from existing law are as follows:

#### STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

A major respect in which the committee bill differs from existing law is in its provisions specifying the role of public officials in community action programs. Existing law contains no provision with respect to the role of local public officials. The nature of this relationship has varied substantially among communities, with the result that in some instances the influence of public officials upon this important local activity has not been as great as it should be. While it is crucial to preserve the demonstrated advantages of participation by the poor in community action programs, the committee believes that elected local governments must have more responsibility for local antipoverty programs.

There are many sound reasons for this, most of them programmatic. In spite of the fact that about 80 percent of the community action agencies are private nonprofit agencies, the committee finds that there is little or no correlation between an agency's legal form and the success of its program. Effective and ineffective programs can be found under both the public and private nonprofit structures. Secondly, almost every community action agency which is doing a good job of creating new opportunities for the poor has the approval of, and a good working relationship with, the governing structure in its community.

Unless a community's governing structure endorses the community action agency, there is little hope that the agency will be able to realize its vital potential for planning and coordination. This will happen only if the community action agency is viewed as an instrument of the community which it serves and not as the vehicle for implementing federally established objectives.

Section 210 of the revised title therefore requires that a community action agency be a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or political subdivision as the community action agency. Under this provision, elected local governments will be assured the right to determine what agency should administer the anti-poverty program in the community, including the power to determine whether the program should be administered by a public agency or by a private nonprofit agency. A State, a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions may, if it so desires, itself be the grantee for the community action program.

An exception is provided where the State or local government is not willing to designate a community action agency or in cases in which the designated community action agency fails to submit a plan for a community action program which meets the criteria prescribed in the bill. In such cases, the Director may fund another public or private nonprofit agency as the community action agency but the governing



board of such public or private nonprofit agency must meet the requirements of section 211.

Section 211 introduces a requirement that one-third of the members of community action boards be public officials, thereby further strengthening the role of public officials in community action programs. This requirement is also extended to subsidiary boards having responsibility for policy determinations for particular geographic areas within a community. Where the State or political subdivision chooses itself to become the community action agency it shall administer its program through a community action board with the required representation of public officials, private groups, and the poor.

The bill provides that the tribal government of an Indian reservation will be treated as a political subdivision of a State for the purpose of implementing these requirements. This provision will insure that tribal governments have the power to designate community action agencies for the reservations. The requirement that one-third of each community action board be public officials will be satisfied in these cases by membership of officials of the tribe.

To allow time for orderly adjustment to these changed requirements governing the designation and structure of community action agencies, section 301 of the bill provides that they will become effective on June 30, 1968, but that refunding of programs after that date cannot be made without agreement to transfer funds, records, etc., to a successor agency designated pursuant to the new provisions in section 210 and section 211.

The dominant position of the community action agency which has been chosen by the elected local public officials is protected by another committee change which limits the power of the Director to fund other agencies. Under section 221(b) of the revised title, an agency may be funded to run a limited-purpose program in a community only if there is no community action agency serving the community or if the community action agency agrees to such independent funding. It is anticipated, however, that grants for Follow Through programs will continue to be made directly to local boards of education and that grants for Upward Bound programs will be made directly to institutions of higher education.

#### PREVENTING ABUSES

Another major respect in which the committee bill is expected to strengthen community action is by preventing certain kinds of abuses which have been found in a few community action agencies.

Under section 213, each community action agency will be required to establish rules to assure that all programs are conducted effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. These will include rules to assure full staff accountability, to establish specific standards for salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, to assure that employees are hired, retained, and advanced on a merit basis, and to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interest. Further, community action agencies will be required to establish appropriate limitations with respect to employee participation in picketing, protests, and other "direct action."



The committee has also added, in section 246, additional restrictions on political involvement of community action agencies and other OEO grantees. The new provision will require the Director to issue regulations or impose requirements which bar the use of poverty program funds to support candidates in nonpartisan elections as well as in partisan elections. Moreover, the committee's provision will bar the use of the program to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or with similar assistance in connection with any election or registration activity. The committee does not intend that this provision should be construed so as to prevent community action agencies from using elections as the basis for choosing members of community action boards or neighborhood councils. The intention of the provision is to restrict the use of OEO funds with respect to elections which are external to the poverty program. With respect to elections of members of community action boards, it is recognized that some funds may be used to establish electoral machinery and to facilitate participation of the poor. The committee recommends, however, that the Director issue regulations which would prevent community action agencies from using Federal funds in a manner designed to benefit particular candidates for election to community action boards or neighborhood councils.

The committee has also been concerned with the extent to which non-Federal contributions required under title II have been "in-kind." The committee believes that local involvement in programs would be strengthened by a requirement of increased non-Federal financial participation. Section 223(c) of the revised title therefore provides that at least half of the required non-Federal share must be in cash.

#### SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS

Section 222 of the committee's revision explicitly authorizes the continuation of project Headstart, the neighborhood legal services program, the Comprehensive Health Services program and Upward Bound. Almost without exception, witnesses appearing before the committee wholeheartedly endorsed the foregoing programs. No serious objection was raised concerning their administration and effectiveness.

The Legal Services program is governed by national guidelines which were developed by OEO, with the assistance of lawyers on the National Advisory Committee and the legal profession generally, to meet the unique professional problems involved in rendering these services. These problems include: legal ethics, including the preservation of proper lawyer-client relationships, confidentiality of communications between lawyer and client, the exercise of independent judgments by lawyers, complete fidelity to the client's cause, rendering of a full range of adequate legal services, insistence upon the use of properly qualified lawyers and legal personnel and observance of all standards of the legal profession governing such services. Within OEO, primary responsibility for the direction and administration of the Legal Services program has been lodged in the Legal Services Director and the lawyers on his professional staff. This has included primary authority respecting the initiation, supervision, evaluation, funding and refunding of individual local projects. The approval of



the Legal Services Director has been required before any such individual project is funded or refunded. These aspects of the overall program have been largely responsible for its success, for its close adherence to professional guidelines and standards and for the unprecedented vigor with which it has been supported by the legal profession. The committee expects the continuance of these features of the program's administration.

The committee observes that local private attorneys have contributed a substantial amount of voluntary time to local OEO-funded legal services programs during the past 2 years. This contributed time on the part of local attorneys has had much to do with the conspicuous success of the program and should be encouraged. OEO has placed a value of \$12 an hour on such voluntary contributions for the purpose of computing the local share requirements these programs must meet. The committee is convinced from the testimony of representatives of the organized bar and others that this evaluation is significantly below the prevailing rates for attorneys' services in virtually every area of the country.

The committee, therefore, strongly recommends that the OEO reconsider its evaluation of donated-attorney time and adopt a rate more in line with a national average hourly rate for private attorneys' services.

To the aforementioned existing programs the committee has added four new programs which it believes are worthy of special emphasis:

First, the committee bill provides for a program to be known as senior opportunities and services designed to identify and meet the needs of poor persons above the age of 55. This reflects the committee's belief that a greater and more systematic emphasis on the problems of the elderly poor is required.

Second, the committee bill provides for a program to be known as "Emergency Food and Medical Services". This addition provides authority for the Director to arrange with the Departments of Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare to insure the availability of food and medical services, where needed, to overcome conditions of starvation and malnutrition. We urge these agencies to cooperate fully with the Director in dealing with such conditions wherever they may exist. Alternatively, the Director, by other means, may provide for emergency assistance under this special program authority, or he may, if appropriate, resort to the authority for assistance to community action programs or limited purpose projects or programs under section 221 of this bill.

Third, the committee has provided for a special program to provide day care for children, with preference given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under the Economic Opportunity Act and other children whose parents have especially critical need for day care service. It is anticipated that such a program will enable many welfare mothers to train for and accept gainful employment by relieving them of the necessity of staying home to care for their children. The day care programs are to include health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed.

Finally, the committee has added family planning to the roster of special programs. Although OEO has supported local family planning

programs in the past, the committee believes that additional emphasis on this aspect of the poverty program is desirable.

#### INCREASING THE PARTICIPATION OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

From the inception of the antipoverty program, OEO has given financial assistance to State agencies for the purpose of giving technical assistance to communities in the development and implementation of community action programs. These agencies have made significant contributions to the success of community action in their States. A number of them have also received grants for other purposes, particularly for programs to assist migrants under title III of the act.

The committee believes that the role of these technical assistance agencies can profitably be expanded. Section 231 of the committee revision therefore provides that they may be funded not only to give technical assistance to communities, but also to assist in coordinating State antipoverty activities, to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of State agencies, and to advise the Director and other Federal officials about Federal requirements that impede State-level coordination of antipoverty programs.

The role of the State agencies designated to perform these functions would be further strengthened by subsection (b) of section 231, which requires the Director to give preference, in any grants or contracts with State agencies, to programs which are administered or coordinated by the technical assistance agencies or which have been developed with their assistance.

State government participation will also be fostered by section 242(c), which is designed to encourage joint Federal-State funding of certain kinds of projects. For example, a migratory labor program or a model component in the field of migratory labor might involve the use of both Federal funds and State funds. This section would permit the Director, in such a case, to designate the State agency as an agent of the United States to administer the Federal portion of the assistance to local agencies for the kind of project in question. It would thus encourage a coordinated use of Federal and State funds, resulting in a single grant or contract with the local administering agency.

#### RURAL PROGRAMS

The committee is not satisfied that OEO has made sufficient progress in dealing with the problems of the rural poor. Although more than 40 percent of the Nation's poor live in small towns, on farms, and in non-farm rural areas, only 32 percent of the community action program funds were granted to these areas in fiscal 1967. The committee recognizes that one of the major reasons for this discrepancy has been the difficulty encountered in organizing community action agencies in rural areas. Problems of transportation, the lack of any significant number of social service agencies, and trained manpower shortages have made this task particularly arduous.

However, the committee still feels that not enough thought and money have been invested in projects for the rural poor. The committee believes that the rural program should be strengthened and expanded.



To this end, section 240 of the bill requires the Director to appoint an Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas as well as an Assistant Director for Urban Areas. The committee believes that this will strengthen the influence within OEO of those who are concerned primarily with the problems of the rural poor.

The committee believes that an expansion of OEO's rural effort would benefit both urban and rural areas. Persons who have migrated from rural areas constitute a major source of the overwhelming social and economic problems of urban poverty. The committee wishes to discourage any policy which relies on or might tend to reinforce the migratory flow from rural to urban areas, and has made this clear in section 201 of this bill.

### **TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS**

The committee adopted several amendments to part A of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act. This program provides for loans to rural residents to assist in the initiation or expansion of agricultural or nonagricultural enterprises that will enable them to increase their income. The program is administered by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture pursuant to a delegation from the Director. Two changes have been made. One extends eligibility to the elderly. The other change, essentially a technical amendment, relates to the manner of calculating the present \$3,500 limit on the amount of loan funds which can be outstanding to any one borrower at any time. Administrative complication and uncertainties have resulted because, under the present law, continuing allowance must be made for the amount of accrued interest in determining whether the limit has at any time been exceeded. The amendment would allow the limit to be calculated on the basis of the loan principal, excluding interest.

The committee, after careful consideration, decided to make no changes in the provisions governing title III-B, which includes a program for migrant and seasonal agricultural workers and their families. The committee believes that the present law in fact provides considerable flexibility for this program. At the same time, the committee is of the view that the program should remain essentially supplementary and ought not to be expanded so as to become largely duplicatory of other programs, including community action. The committee's action of course is not to be interpreted as indicating an approval of all features of this program that would preclude administrative improvements in its operation. Projects in some cases, at least, could be more sharply focused, and continuing efforts should be made to assure that all project sponsors have, and maintain, the capacity to utilize the funds made available to them in an effective and efficient manner.

### **TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES**

Title IV of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act consists of a program designed to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such enterprises. That program had two parts: Economic

opportunity loans, which were handled by the Small Business Administration, and small business development centers, which were sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

#### SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

The small business development centers (SBDC's) were organized on the local level by community action agencies. Generally located in the poverty areas, the functions of the SBDC's included identifying applicants for training and/or loans; recommending specific loans for SBA approval; and organizing and providing management counseling and training to loan recipients and others. The SBA made final determination on award of loans, and it reviewed loans to insure compliance with statutory and loan provisions.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LOANS

From January 1965 to November 1966, economic opportunity loans were made through the SBDC's. During that period 2,678 loans were made at a total cost of \$26 million. In December 1966 SBA assumed full control of the program and shifted to a nationwide program designed to serve other cities, suburbs, and small communities. From that date through June 1967, 2,222 loans were made, totaling \$25 million.

The committee's bill makes it clear that a major focus of the economic opportunity loan program should be on small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas having high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or (2) owned by low-income individuals. The change is reinforced by requiring that at least 50 percent of the amounts of the loans shall be made in such areas or to such businesses. A different definition of low-income is permitted for this title than for other titles of the Economic Opportunity Act, so that small businessmen in poverty areas who would not technically qualify as low income but who need aid to save or develop a business may be helped. To assure that the loans will be well used, the committee bill requires that special attention be given to the development of management training and counseling programs in which borrowers may be required to participate. In order to facilitate an equitable distribution between rural and urban areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this program, the committee has directed the use of agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the act to the extent necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of the program.

The committee has assigned to the Secretary of Commerce responsibility for providing technical assistance and management training, it being expected that the Economic Development Administration, an agency with considerable experience in this field, will be assigned operating responsibility. The Secretary would be authorized to extend financial assistance to public or private organizations which would provide assistance under this program to existing small businesses or to persons establishing small businesses who qualify under this title. Planning and research, identification, and development of new business opportunities, stimulation of new private capital resources, furnishing of centralized services, establishment and strengthening of busi-



ness service agencies, encouraging placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small concerns located in poverty areas or owned by low-income individuals, and furnishing business counseling, management training, legal, and related services are among the activities for which assistance may be extended. Particular emphasis should be given to the establishment of management training and counseling programs of sufficient content to adequately prepare participants for the rigors of business competition; in the past, management training courses have been too brief and have been limited to rudimentary accounting and business skills which do not prepare an individual to compete on his own. The committee hopes that major new initiatives will be taken in this area. Special emphasis is to be given in this regard to enlisting the talents and personnel of existing businesses, including efforts to develop management training opportunities in existing businesses in an on-the-job format.

The Secretary of Commerce is in no way required to continue the existing SBDC's, although the committee expects that he may wish to continue funding such of those centers he finds to be effective.

Preference should be given to projects which promote ownership by residents of poverty areas and projects planned and carried out with participation of local businessmen. The Secretary of Commerce is required to work with other Federal agencies so that Federal contracts, subcontracts, and deposits are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this program.

## **TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION**

The bill makes several changes in the administration provisions of title VI, many of which are essentially technical or conforming. One substantive amendment would authorize an additional assistant director of the OEO who would be charged specifically with working to improve the range and effectiveness of programs in rural areas.

Another amendment to this part of title VI relates to the provision authorizing the Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, to issue rules and regulations governing certain political activities not covered under the "Hatch Act" provisions of title 5 of the United States Code. The amendment would make such rules or regulations mandatory. It would also make it clear that conduct to be covered includes "nonpartisan" as well as "partisan" activities, thus reaching situations where local governmental structure may be determined in campaigns conducted under "nonpartisan" labels, as well as campaigns relating to school board or other special board or agency elections where partisan labels may not be involved. However, while the committee believes that identification with election campaigns is to be avoided, without regard to labels, it appreciates the importance of encouraging the poor to avail themselves of the political processes available to them along with other citizens. Accordingly, the amendment would authorize the Director to issue appropriate regulations to assure that persons seeking benefits under the act make reasonable efforts to become registered voters in accordance with applicable State laws.

The committee has also taken note of the fact that the definitions of poverty generally applied may include some groups of persons who

are voluntarily poor in that they deliberately reject responsibility for self-support, even though they may be fully capable of availing themselves of opportunities open to them. Accordingly, the bill provides that a person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income stems, not from the handicaps normally associated with poverty, but simply from refusal, without good cause, to accept employment commensurate with his health, education, age, and ability.

The committee has made no changes in the provisions of title VI of the act relating to overall coordination of antipoverty programs. This does not mean that improvements in this phase of the poverty effort may not be needed. However, the coordination provisions now in the law were broadly drawn, and the committee believes that they provide an adequate base for necessary improvements, provided that adequate time and continuing attention is given to the matter by those having the administrative responsibility. To be noted in this latter connection is an amendment to the administration provisions of title VI that would authorize an additional statutory assistant director who would work with the Economic Opportunity Council.

### **TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES**

The committee considered a number of proposed amendments to title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act, which deals with the effect upon public assistance payments of the receipt of benefits under the Economic Opportunity Act. The committee is not persuaded that the benefits to be achieved by any of these proposed revisions of title VII would justify the confusion and administrative burden that would ensue from change in the requirements. The committee's bill, therefore, leaves the existing title VII intact, except that it extends the time within which State plans under the Social Security Act must conform with the requirements of the title.

### **TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS**

The committee is favorably impressed with the accomplishments of the VISTA program. Since its inception, 7,219 persons have served as volunteers, and through their efforts help and hope for the future have been brought to hundreds of depressed communities and to thousands of the Nation's least privileged citizens.

The VISTA program both complements and supplements other major antipoverty efforts. This is evidenced by the fact that 87 percent of VISTA volunteers have been directly involved in OEO-related projects: 3 percent have been assigned to Job Corps centers, 35 percent to community action agencies, and 49 percent to other agencies which are funded in whole or in part under the Economic Opportunity Act.

While the committee is of the opinion that the VISTA program is making a signal contribution to the antipoverty effort, it nevertheless believes that its effectiveness will be improved by the amendments it proposes in section 107 of the bill.

The most significant innovation effected by the committee's bill is embodied in its provisions granting authority for the assignment of volunteers to their own or nearby communities.



The bill also provides for special community service programs which will utilize volunteers working part time, or for periods of less than 2 months' duration, in or near their home communities, in activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. They will be designed to encourage persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act; in programs to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute these skills to the betterment of neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentration of poor; and in programs which assist existing national and local agencies and organizations to obtain services of volunteers more readily. The bill also authorizes the Director to provide specialized training for volunteers participating in such programs.

In this country there are many people who, while unable to volunteer full-time, or for long terms, are willing to contribute their skills and a portion of their time to provide meaningful service. In part, the provision stems from the experience of VISTA volunteers in the field. They have empirically discovered the great desire to serve which exists among all classes of society, and have utilized these resources in their own local programs. For example, two VISTA volunteers in Pittsburgh organized a group of approximately 200 college students to tutor disadvantaged children. Similarly, volunteers working with the VESPR program (Volunteers in Service to Puerto Rico), funded under section 805 of the present law, have encouraged qualified persons from the ranks of the poor to become part-time volunteers in their home communities in Puerto Rico. But much broader efforts to increase volunteer participation are necessary and possible. The new programs authorized by the bill will encourage a broader and better planned use of existing volunteer resources in the overall effort to eliminate poverty.

There are, for example, many business and professional men who have a little time and talents which are greatly needed; there are retired persons seeking creative outlets for their energies; there are people who, given the opportunity, would be prepared to give vacation time to some of the great variety of summer programs now being planned for low-income children and youth. Existing mechanisms for matching these people with the agencies, groups, and organizations who need their services are commonly nonexistent, deficient, or imperfect at best. This is particularly apt to be true of the many smaller agencies and programs which deal with the very poorest of the poor or which operate in the very heart of our slum areas. Moreover, there is often a need for giving volunteers short-term training which these agencies, acting individually, are unprepared to provide. Finally, there are frequently organizations which could make greater use of volunteer assistance—or use it more effectively—given some technical assistance which is not now available, or given the help of one or more qualified individuals, including former VISTA volunteers, who have the experience needed to organize and oversee projects.

These provisions in the bill are designed to assist in overcoming these problems. It is expected that in many cases the projects authorized would operate in direct support of other programs under the act, such as Headstart, and that they could serve in this respect to help meet some of the needs which these programs have for technical and

professional skills. A particular effort would be made, where Community Action agencies exist, to encourage those agencies to develop their own capacities for more effectively organizing volunteer efforts and to incorporate projects for this purpose into those regular programs.

It should be noted that volunteers in community service programs would not receive any stipend, nor, except in unusual or special circumstances affecting their project, could they receive any other support or allowances. The bill also provides that the value of the services of volunteers under this provision, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, may be accepted toward provision of the non-Federal share.

Another significant amendment proposed by the committee is designed to encourage greater involvement of the elderly in VISTA programs and activities. An important need of older persons in this country is the opportunity to provide services which allow them to utilize their energies, skills, and experience in ways meaningful to them. The committee is not unaware that a number of older Americans are already serving in VISTA, often in teaching assignments in Job Corps centers. The committee is of the opinion, however, that much more should be done toward involving the elderly in VISTA's endeavors. Accordingly, the committee's bill includes provisions requiring the Director to take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible participation of such persons in VISTA programs and activities.

The committee's bill continues substantially unchanged the provisions of the present law relating to the establishment of full-time VISTA programs. However, there are certain matters concerning these and other VISTA programs which are dealt with in this proposal and which are worthy of comment. These provisions are as follows:

The bill incorporates in the act for the first time provisions which prescribe the commitment to be required of full-time volunteers. It provides that these persons must obligate themselves to serve full time in combating poverty, living among and at the economic level of the people served. It also provides that, except when on authorized leave, they must remain on call for service at all times without regard to regular working hours. These provisions establish as part of the law longstanding VISTA policy that volunteers be, and remain during their VISTA service, totally immersed in the community they serve and its problems. The committee's bill reflects its endorsement of this policy, it being the committee's view that only such total immersion can give the volunteers the necessary resources to understand and, therefore, be better equipped to combat the problems of the communities in which they serve.

The committee's bill provides that in addition to regular 1-year periods of full-time VISTA service, the Director may conduct, as part of the regular VISTA program, programs of short-term full-time volunteer service heretofore conducted under section 805 of the existing act. These programs allow persons to serve as VISTA associates in special programs for periods of not less than 2 months. Such



programs have been proven effective and necessary adjuncts to the regular ongoing VISTA programs. During the summer of 1967, approximately 1,500 VISTA associates in these programs served in 20 rural and urban poverty communities throughout the country. It has been found that for many problems of poverty, great impact can be had from short-term maximum effort VISTA associate programs. The bill makes it clear that VISTA associates serving in associate programs have earned the right to be considered part of the full-time VISTA program.

When the original VISTA legislation was introduced in 1964, this committee indicated that it believed that the VISTA program would "encourage more young men and women to pursue the helping professions as a career" (88th Cong., second sess., H.R. 1458, p. 35). The committee continues to regard this as a desirable goal, and to encourage its development has authorized educational and vocational counseling for volunteers and recent volunteers for the purpose of encouraging them to utilize the knowledge and skills they obtained in VISTA service in an ongoing manner as members of the helping professions.

Finally, the committee's bill requires the Director to take necessary steps to coordinate all volunteer programs authorized under title VIII with community action programs and other related Federal, State, local, or National programs. The Director is required to consult with other Federal, State, local, or National agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this act in order to encourage greater utilization of volunteer service in programs of service to the poor. It is the purpose of this provision to require that regular full- and part-time programs be coordinated with each other and with ongoing and existing volunteer programs. Additionally, the Director is authorized to encourage former full-time volunteers to continue to participate after their service in part-time programs and part-time volunteers to make further commitments in full-time volunteer programs.

## **TITLE II OF THE BILL—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS**

Title II of the committee's bill provides Federal criminal penalties for certain kinds of misconduct in the administration of Economic Opportunity Act programs. It covers theft and willful misapplication of funds or property by employees of agencies receiving financial assistance under the act, and also the use of duress to secure kickbacks from persons employed in connection with assisted programs.

There have been only a handful of cases of this kind of misconduct in the 3 years of the poverty program, but these cases have revealed a gap in the Federal criminal law. Although the Federal Government plainly has an interest in assuring that assistance funds are used for the purposes for which they were granted, the only basis for Federal prosecution for misuse of funds rests on a statute (18 U.S.C. 1001) prohibiting false statements in matters within the jurisdiction of Federal agencies. It appears to the committee that the willful misuse of assistance funds, whether or not a false statement is made in connection with such misuse, should provide a basis for Federal prosecution, and that the Federal Government should not have to rely on State prosecution to protect its interest in these cases.

## SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

### Section 1. Short Title

This section provides that the act may be cited as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

### Section 2. Authorization of Appropriations

This section authorizes the appropriation of the amounts set forth in the table below for carrying out Economic Opportunity Act programs (other than part C of title I) during the fiscal year 1968:

Title I-----	\$874, 000, 000
Title II-----	1, 022, 000, 000
Title III-----	47, 000, 000
Title V-----	70, 000, 000
Title VI-----	16, 000, 000
Title VIII-----	31, 000, 000
Total -----	2, 060, 000, 000

It also authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, so long as the appropriation does not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

## TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

### Section 101—Job Corps Amendments

Section 101 of the bill entirely rewrites part of title I, Job Corps. As rewritten it will contain the following provisions:

*Section 101. Statement of purpose.*—Restates the purpose of the Job Corps to provide that the program is to assist low-income, disadvantaged youth who need and can benefit from an intensive program operated in a group setting to enable them to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens. Where feasible, Job Corps programs are to be conducted in a way that contributes to the development of National, State, and community resources and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged.

*Section 102. Establishment of the Job Corps.*—Establishes the Job Corps in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

*Section 103. Individuals eligible for the Job Corps.*—This section specifies eligibility requirements for Job Corps enrollees. They must be permanent residents of the United States, between the ages of 14 (previously 16) and 21 at the time of enrollment, must be low-income individuals, or members of low-income families requiring additional education, training, or related assistance in order to secure and hold employment, participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for other training programs, or satisfy military requirements. An enrollee must be currently living in an environment characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions such as to substantially impair his prospects for successful par-



ticipation in any other training or education program. Enrollees must also have the capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and benefit from the program and be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that applicants could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct or pattern of work and training involved in the Job Corps. Enrollees must agree to comply with these and additional rules and regulations the Director of the Job Corps may prescribe.

*Section 104. Screening and selection of applicants—general provisions.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director of the Job Corps to prescribe rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, screening and selection are to be carried on through arrangements with authorities such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. Rules prescribed for screening and selection shall encourage recruitment through agencies having long-term contact with youth and include provisions for consultation with individuals and organizations such as courts, probation and parole officers, law enforcement authorities, schools, and welfare and medical agencies. The section further requires that screening procedures include an interview with each applicant and a careful and systematic inquiry concerning each applicant's background.

Subsection (b) prohibits payment to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the referral of names of candidates for the Job Corps.

Subsection (c) requires that Job Corps enrollment include an appropriate number of youths who reside in rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need for residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

*Section 105. Screening and selection—special limitations.*—Subsection (a) of this section prohibits the selection of an applicant for enrollment in the Job Corps unless there is a reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group activities, is not likely to engage in activities that would prevent others from benefiting from the program or disrupt discipline or the center's relationships with surrounding communities, and manifests a basic understanding of the rules and the consequences of their violation. Also requires that where a potential enrollee has had a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows the individual situation, that there is a reasonable expectation that the potential enrollee shall not be inimical to the interests of the Job Corps and that the Job Corps will help the potential enrollee to overcome his problem.

Subsection (b) permits the enrollment of applicants on probation or parole where the applicant's release from the supervision of probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and to the Director and will not violate applicable laws and regulations.

*Section 106. Enrollment and assignment.*—Subsection (a) of this section limits the Job Corps enrollment to 2 years except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

Subsection (b) provides that Job Corps enrollment shall not relieve any individual of his military obligations.

Subsection (c) provides that each enrollee (other than enrollees from Cuba and the Trust Territory of the Pacific) take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation of allegiance.

Subsection (d) requires that an enrollee be assigned to the appropriate center closest to his home. The Director on an individual basis, when overriding considerations justify such action, may waive this provision in order to insure an equitable distribution of enrollees, prevent delay in assignment, meet educational or other needs of enrollees, or where necessary for the efficient and economical administration of the program.

*Section 107. Job Corps centers.*—Subsection (a) of this section describes the different kinds of Job Corps which may be residential and/or nonresidential. These include Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and provides, in addition to other training and assistance, programs focused on the conservation of natural resources and development of community projects and men's and women's training centers to be located in urban or rural areas and provide programs which include training for youth who can be expected to engage successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semi-skilled employment.

Subsection (b) requires that men's and women's training centers, to the extent feasible, offer education and vocational training opportunities with supportive services on a nonresidential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of title I.

*Section 108. Program activities.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that Job Corps center programs provide enrollees with education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation, and counseling. A program of at least 60 hours a week is required for each enrollee. Enrollees are to participate in center work activities so as to increase their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

Subsection (b) permits enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies or institutions which can provide training at comparable costs and equivalent quality.

Subsection (c) encourages arrangements to provide opportunities for enrollees to obtain a high school equivalency certificate and requires the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to develop certificates of Job Corps achievement reflecting the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

Subsection (d) requires the Director to prescribe regulations to require coordination of Job Corps activities with other work experience programs and to assure that Job Corps activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts.

*Section 109. Allowance and support.*—Subsection (a) of this section, which is identical with existing law permits the Director to provide enrollees with living, travel, and leave allowances, quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, health services, and other expenses necessary or appropriate to their needs.

Subsection (b) requires the Director to prescribe rules governing enrollees' leave and prohibits the Director, except in cases of emergency, from assuming transportation costs connected with an enrollee's



leave where the enrollee has not completed at least 6 months' service in the Job Corps.

Subsection (c) authorizes a readjustment allowance of not to exceed \$50 a month, a provision currently in the act. The section further provides, however, that no enrollee, except in unusual circumstances, is entitled to the readjustment allowance unless he has remained in the program at least 90 days, and for the reduction of the readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during enrollment.

Subsection (d) permits up to \$25 per month of the readjustment allowance, plus an amount equal to that portion of the readjustment allowance so designated to be paid during an enrollee's service directly to his spouse, child, or other dependent relative.

*Section 110. Standards of conduct.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that standards of conduct and deportment be established and strictly enforced in Job Corps centers, with violations punished by the enrollee's dismissal or transfer where it is deemed necessary.

Subsection (b) provides that Job Corps center directors be given authority to take disciplinary measures against enrollees under regulations prescribed by the Director, including dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to appeal procedures to higher authority.

*Section 111. Community participation.*—Requires the Director to encourage and cooperate in activities to establish mutually beneficial relationships with Job Corps centers and surrounding communities, including the establishment of community advisory councils established and coordinated where possible by the local community agency. Youth participation is to be encouraged, as is the establishment, where feasible, of separate youth councils. Further, the Director is required to establish necessary rules and to take necessary action to achieve certain objectives, such as giving community officials advance notice of changes in center rules; affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs; providing center officials with access to community groups and agencies which work with young people; encouraging fullest participation of enrollees in community improvement programs; recreational activities with enrollees and local residents; providing residents the opportunity to work directly with enrollees; developing where feasible job opportunities for the enrollees in the community; and promoting the interchange of information and techniques with agencies and institutions serving youth.

*Section 112. Counseling and job placement.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that the Director provide for testing and counseling of each enrollee at regular intervals.

Subsection (b) requires the testing and counseling of each enrollee prior to termination and that the Director seek to place him in a job in which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed or to assist him in obtaining further training or education. Also this section requires the Director to utilize the U.S. Employment Service to the fullest extent possible in the placement of enrollees in jobs.

Subsection (c) requires the Secretary of Labor to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling are met.

Subsection (d) requires that a terminee's pertinent records, including counseling and testing data, be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Subsection (e) provides for the payment of an enrollee's readjustment allowance at the public employment service office nearest to where he resides after termination of training. The public employment service officers under arrangements with the Secretary of Labor shall maintain records on former enrollees including information as to the number of former enrollees who have declined help in finding a job; the number successfully placed in jobs without further education and training; the number found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and the number of enrollees found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs together with information as to the types of programs for which former enrollees are found unqualified for enrollment. The Director may use the services of other public or private organizations to pay the readjustment allowance and maintain records similar to those required to be kept by public employment service officials and to furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees placed in jobs prior to termination the Director shall maintain records on placement and followup.

*Section 113. Evaluation; experimental and developmental projects.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program directly or through independent contracts. Such evaluation shall include consultation with other agencies to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps and other programs. The evaluation must seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of combination residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments and from the use of different types of program sponsors. The evaluation must include comparisons with control groups of persons not participating in the Job Corps. Job Corps participants' opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program must also be obtained and information must be obtained from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their Job Corps training. Evaluation results must be published in the Director's annual report.

Subsection (b) provides for experimental and research projects to develop ways of better using facilities and of encouraging more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life to permit shorter enrollment in the Job Corps, of lowering transportation and support costs and of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness. Requires one or more projects on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Permits the Director to conduct pilot projects involving youth having a history of antisocial behavior. Actions taken under this section must be reported to the Congress annually.

Subsection (c) requires the Director in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education to enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to establish and operate model community vocational education schools and skill centers to be centrally located in urban areas having high dropout rates, large numbers of unemployed youth, and a need for such school and center. The project must include a job survey of the area, a training program reflecting the needs of the job market as projected by the survey and the establishment of a com-



munity advisory committee, and accounting and evaluation procedures. Arrangements must also be worked out with existing schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours.

*Section 114. Advisory boards and committees.*—This section requires the establishment of advisory committees or boards whenever the Director determines that the availability of outside advice on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in solution of problems, program planning or center development, and strengthening relationships between Job Corps and agencies and groups involved in related activities.

*Section 115. Participation of the States.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director to take action to facilitate State participation in the Job Corps program including consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, and the development of work experience and other activities for enrollees.

Subsection (b) authorizes agreements with States to assist in the operation of State-operated programs to carry out the purpose of the Job Corps including the payment of all or part of operating or administrative costs.

Subsection (c) requires the submission of a plan setting forth the proposed establishment of a Job Corps center to the Governor of the State in which the center is to be located and gives the Governor a veto over such plan.

*Section 116. Application of provisions of Federal law.*—Subsection (a) of this section provides, with certain specified exceptions, that Job Corps enrollees are not to be considered Federal employees or subject to laws relating to Federal employment including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits. Enrollees are to be considered Federal employees for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code, Social Security Act, compensation for work injuries, and tort claims against the United States.

Subsection (b) permits adjustment and settlement of claims for damage to persons or property resulting from Job Corps operations in amount not exceeding \$500 when such a claim is a proper charge against the United States and not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Subsection (c) provides that personnel of the uniformed services assigned to duty for support of the Job Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services.

*Section 117. Special limitations.*—Subsection (a) of this section limits Job Corps enrollment during fiscal year 1968 to 45,000 residential enrollees.

Subsection (b) requires that on or before June 30, 1968, at least 25 percent of the Job Corps enrollees receiving training be women, and that immediate steps be taken to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent consistent with efficient, economic, and sound administrative practice, and socio-economic, educational, and training needs of the population.

Subsection (c) limits the direct operating costs in fiscal year 1968 of Job Corps centers in operation for more than 9 months to a maxi-

num of \$6,500 per residential enrollee and \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee.

Subsection (d) provides that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data relating to Job Corps centers shall become the property of the United States.

*Section 118. Political discrimination and political activity.*—Subsection (a) of this section prohibits inquiries concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee and requires that all disclosures concerning such matters be ignored, except as to membership in political parties or organizations which constitute by law a disqualification for Government employment. Prohibits discrimination by any Government employee against or in favor of any enrollee or applicant because of his political affiliations or beliefs.

Subsection (b) prohibits officers, employees and enrollees of the Job Corps from taking any active part in political management or campaigns—partisan or nonpartisan, and vote registration drives, except as provided by or pursuant to statute. Prohibits such persons from using their official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or effecting the result thereof, although all such persons retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express in their private capacities opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

Subsection (c) provides for notice and opportunity for explanation to an officer, employee, or an enrollee who violates the foregoing provisions and for certification of the facts to the Director with specific instruction by the Civil Service Commission as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective action to be taken.

### Section 102—Work and training programs

Section 102 of the bill entirely rewrites part B of title I, work and training for youth and adults. As rewritten it will contain the following provisions:

*Section 120. Statement of purpose.*—This section states the purpose of part B is to provide useful work and training opportunities with related services and assistance to assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education and to help unemployed or low-income youths and adults to obtain and hold regular competitive employment with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems. Emphasizes a comprehensive approach, including programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in rural and urban areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

*Section 121. Community program areas and comprehensive work and training programs.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director to designate community program areas for the planning and conduct of comprehensive community work and training programs.

Subsection (b) defines a community to be a city, county, multicounty, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. Also requires the Director to consult with other



Federal agency heads regarding related programs to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes.

Subsection (c) states that a comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services to enable them to obtain and hold employment, and provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant components with one another and with other public and private programs.

*Section 122. Prime sponsors and delegate agencies.*—Subsection (a) of this section provides for the designation of a prime sponsor which may be a public or private nonprofit agency to receive comprehensive work and training program funds. The prime sponsor must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

Subsection (b) provides that the prime sponsor must provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of programs.

Subsection (c) encourages the prime sponsor to use public and private agencies as delegate agencies to carry out comprehensive work and training program components including agencies governed with the participation of the poor, educational institutions, the public employment service, health, welfare, training, and other organizations.

Subsection (d) requires that the prime sponsor and delegate agencies provide for resident participation in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Residents must also be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs.

Subsection (e) requires the Director to assure administrative, accounting, personnel, and evaluation standards and procedures.

*Section 123. Eligible activities.*—Subsection (a) of this section authorizes financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs including the following:

(1) Programs providing part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for low-income students in the ninth through 12th grades or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades, and who need earnings to permit them to resume or maintain their attendance in school.

(2) Programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons age 16 and over with useful work and training to assist them to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment.

(3) Special programs to provide work activities for the chronically unemployed with poor employment prospects who are unable because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. Such programs must enable participants to participate in projects involving community betterment or beautification including activities contributing to the management, conservation or development of natural resources, recreational areas, parks, highways, and other lands.

(4) Special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types

of careers in activities designed to provide maximum prospect for advancement of employment without Federal assistance to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community served in such fields as health, education, welfare, redevelopment, and public safety.

(5) Programs concentrating work and training resources in urban and rural areas, which are focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers.

(6) Supportive and followup services including health services, counseling, day care, transportation assistance, and other necessary assistance.

(7) Employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services conveniently located in areas served.

(8) Programs to provide incentives to private employers to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, through payments for unusual training expenses, reimbursements to employers for expenses for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of employer-recruiter costs in areas served and payments for the provision of transportation to and from work. In making reimbursements to employers the Director must assure that wages paid employees are not less than the Federal minimum wage.

(9) Means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

Subsection (b) requires that by July 1, 1968, all work and training programs be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and that financial assistance for such components be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director grants an extension of time or exercises his authority under section 123(c). Also requires that the work and training components of the work experience program (title V of the act), to the maximum extent feasible, be linked to the comprehensive work and training program.

Subsection (c) permits the Director to provide financial assistance to organizations other than a prime sponsor to carry out component programs when, after considering the views of the prime sponsor, if any, the Director determines that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve purposes of title I. Pursuant to agreement between the Director and Secretary of Labor, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies for programs under subsection (a) (1) of the section.

*Section 124. Special conditions.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that no financial assistance shall be provided unless the Director determines that—

(1) no participants will be employed on projects involving political parties or construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility as is used for sectarian instruction or religious worship;

(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;



(3) rates of pay for time spent in work training and education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in light of the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

Subsection (b) requires that, for programs providing work and training related to physical improvements, preference must be given to improvements substantially used by low-income persons or families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in areas served.

Subsection (c) requires that programs must to the maximum feasible extent contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

Subsection (d) provides that projects must provide for the maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

*Section 125. Program participants.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that program participants be unemployed or low-income persons and provides that the Director in consultation with the Social Security Administrator shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences and other relevant factors. A person is deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

Subsection (b) requires that participants be permanent residents of the United States.

Subsection (c) provides that participants shall not be deemed Federal employees or subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment.

*Section 126. Elderly.*—This section provides that programs under part B be designed to deal with incidence of long-term unemployment among the elderly and requires that the Director encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

*Section 127. Pilot projects.*—Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the conduct of pilot projects to develop new approaches to further the objectives of part B. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

Subsection (b) requires that the Director undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers in work and training programs.

Subsection (c) requires that the Director solicit and consider comments on pilot projects from the prime sponsor before approval of the project.

*Section 128. Technical assistance and training.*—This section authorizes the provision of technical assistance for the initiation or effective operation of programs and the making of arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out programs under part B. In carrying out this section the Director must give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

*Section 129. Role of the States.*—This section authorizes financial assistance to State agencies for the provision of technical assistance

and training with emphasis upon such services to rural areas, to assist in coordinating State activities relating to part B, to operate work and training programs in communities where a prime sponsor is not yet established, and to provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies.

*Section 130. Equitable distribution of assistance.*—This section requires that of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for programs authorized under title I that the Director reserve not to exceed 20 percent for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5) (the concentrated employment program). Not more than 12½ percent of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year may be used within any one State. Remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out section 123 may be distributed under criteria established by the Director which are designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. Developing such criteria, the Director must consider such factors as population ratios, unemployment, and family income levels.

*Section 131. Limitations on Federal assistance.*—This section limits Federal financial assistance to programs under part B to 90 percent of the cost of such programs, giving the Director discretion to exceed such percentage where he determines it necessary in furtherance of the purposes of part B. Non-Federal contributions may be cash or in kind. If a community's non-Federal contribution under title I exceeds its 10-percent matching requirement, the excess may be used to meet its matching requirements under title II, authorizing community action programs.

*Section. 132. Program data and evaluation.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director to develop and implement a program data system with other similar Federal data systems.

Subsection (b) requires that the Director provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under part B including program effectiveness, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services. The Director must arrange for the obtaining of the opinions of program participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The evaluation shall include comparisons with control groups composed of persons who have not participated in comprehensive work and training programs and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of such programs and related programs under other acts. The Director may contract for independent evaluations and the results of evaluations must be included in the Director's annual report.

Subsection (c) requires that the Director develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness and that such standards be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, 129.

### Section 103—Community action amendments

This section provides a complete substitute for the present title II which provides for community action programs. It provides as follows:

*Section 201. Statement of purpose.*—States the basic purpose of community action agencies to stimulate a better focusing of all available resources upon the goal of enabling low-income individuals and



families to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed to become self-sufficient. Specific purposes are (1) strengthening the capabilities of communities to plan and coordinate assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that such assistance can be made more responsible to the local needs and conditions; (2) improving the organization, efficiency, and effectiveness of services related to helping the poor to overcome particular problems in a way which considers and supports their progress in overcoming related problems; (3) increasing use of new types of services and innovative approaches to develop increasingly effective methods to attack the causes of poverty; (4) developing the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served so as to obtain the full potential for self-advancement and to assure the full meaning and wide utilization of such projects; and (5) securing a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups to provide among other things increased employment opportunities as well as to secure the participation of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations and individual citizens. Further states the purpose of the title and policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to enable rural poor to avoid migration to urban areas through providing them with basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities.

*Section 210. Designation of community action agencies; community action programs.*—Subsection (a) of this section designates a community action agency as a State or political subdivision of a State or a combination of such subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision or combination of subdivisions. Each community action agency must have the power to contract with both public and private nonprofit agencies and be designated as such an agency by the Director. Designates a community action program as one which is community based and operated and includes or is designated to include projects which provide a range of services having measurable and potential impact on the causes of poverty and which have been developed and organized to carry out the purposes of this title and which conform to other criteria that the Director may prescribe.

Subsection (b) of this section provides that components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency where consistent with efficient management or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be designed either to meet local needs or pursuant to eligibility standards of Federal or State programs providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

Subsection (c) of this section defines "community" for which a community action agency is designated to carry on a community action program as a city, county, multicounty, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or neighborhood or other area, regardless of political boundaries, which provides an organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program.

Subsection (d) of this section provides that where a community action agency has failed to submit satisfactory plans for a program

and neither the State nor any political subdivision is willing to be designated as a community action agency or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency for the Director to designate as the community action agency for the community, the Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency (as a community action agency) other than one designated in subsection (a).

Subsection (e) of this section provides that no political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a State or of any political subdivision, or combinations thereof, if its governing officials do not wish such inclusion. The political subdivision and any public or private nonprofit agency it designates shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions or their designees.

Subsection (f) of this section provides that for the purpose of this title, tribal governments of an Indian reservation are to be deemed political subdivisions of a State.

*Section 211. Community action agencies and boards*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that each community action agency which is a State or political subdivision of a State shall administer its program through a "community action board" meeting the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision or combination of subdivisions or is an agency designated under 210(d) must have a "community action governing board" meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

Subsection (b) of this section requires that a community action board, limited to not more than 51 members, be composed of (1) one-third public officials, including the chief elected official or officials or their representatives, unless the number of officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third; (2) at least one-third persons democratically chosen to represent the poor of the area served; and (3) the remainder representatives of other major groups or interests in the community. Also limits the time of service on the board of persons other than public officials or their representatives to not more than 3 years at one stretch or more than 6 years total on the board.

Subsection (c) of this section provides that where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations and administration of programs carried on in a particular area of the community, or places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making policy determinations, the board of that agency must meet the requirements of subsection (b).

Subsection (d) of this section requires that the Director promulgate rules relating to notice of meetings, quorums (which must be 50 percent of the members) and other procedures to assure boards to which subsection (b) applies provide continuing and effective means for securing broad community involvement, such as assuring that all elements on such boards are afforded opportunities to participate in decisions. Also permits the boards to appoint executive committees to transact business.

Subsection (e) of this section specifies that "community action governing boards" must have the power to select persons for senior staff positions, determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, ap-



proves overall programs, establish priorities and assure compliance with conditions of this title. Does not specify the powers to be delegated to "community action boards" when the State or political subdivision itself has been designated as the community action agency.

*Section 212. Specific powers and functions of community action agencies*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that a community action agency have funds contributed from private or local public sources and from any Federal or State assistance programs under which the agency could act as a grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects properly included in a community action program. Also requires that a community action agency be able to transfer funds and delegate powers, including, where it would further program objectives, transfers, or delegations to component projects.

Subsection (b) of this section requires that a community action agency have the functions of (1) planning and evaluating the program to determine the causes of poverty, determining the effectiveness of services being provided and establishing priorities among services as needed for the most efficient use of resources; (2) encouraging related poverty agencies to plan, secure, and administer assistance on a common or cooperative basis by providing planning or technical assistance to such related agencies and generally cooperating with community action agencies and officials to improve existing efforts; (3) starting projects responsive to needs which are not otherwise being met, with emphasis on central or common services that a variety of programs can draw on and developing new services and approaches that can be incorporated into other programs and filling gaps pending their revision; (4) establishing procedures whereby poor and other area residents can influence the character of and participate in the implementation of programs affecting their interests, providing support to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to obtain assistance from public and private sources; and (5) joining and encouraging labor, business and other private groups and organizations to undertake activities supporting community action programs resulting in the additional use of private resources, as for example in developing employment opportunities.

*Section 213. Administrative standards*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that as far as reasonably possible standards of organization, management, and administration will assure that program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purpose of this title and provide assistance free of any taint or partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Requires each community action agency to allow reasonable public access to information. Requires agencies to regulate employee salaries and benefits to insure that only competent persons are hired and that advancement is by impartial procedure, to guard against financial conflicts of interests, and to prohibit any employee in performance of his duty from participating in any direct action which is against the law.

Subsection (b) of this section requires the Director to issue regulations to implement subsection (a), including regulations pertaining to partisan or nonpartisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this act. Authorizes the Director to establish simplified requirements for smaller or rural agencies, providing that such

regulations do not affect the applicability of regulations relating to conflict of interest, partisan political activities or participation in direct action. Also requires the Director to consult with the heads of other Government agencies to insure consistency in the regulations he may prescribe.

*Section 214. Evaluation of community action agencies and programs*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director in considering which programs to fund, to consider the extent of poverty in a community and the probable capacity of an agency to undertake an effective program in accordance with the purpose of this title. In considering renewing or supplementing financial assistance the Director is required to consider the progress of the agency with allowance for the special needs of rural or smaller communities and the efficiency of such agency. Further requires the Director to prescribe standards for evaluation including such criteria as population and income of the area to be served, extent to which persons aided have in fact attained the goals of this title, extent to which committee resources exceed those required for non-Federal share under this title, extent to which resources are obtained other than from this title, extent to which groups have participated in the running of the program, provisions for follow-through arrangements between components and related agencies, and extent to which components in this program have been incorporated into ongoing community programs.

Subsection (b) provides that the Director may provide for or require the community action agency to provide for independent evaluations, including the establishment by such agencies of independent groups or committees.

*Section 220. Development of community action programs*—This section authorizes the Director to provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs. The Director may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

*Section 221. Development of community action programs*—Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the Director to fund programs which are in accordance with the provisions of this title. Such assistance can be used by agencies in coordinating, planning, evaluating, and overall administering their programs; and also used for the development of necessary component programs such as projects helping persons and families to become employed, making better use of available income in connection with self-advancement efforts, teaching the basic skills needed for employment, self-help, or successful participation in school, securing and maintaining suitable housing, undertaking family planning consistent with family goals and religious and moral convictions, and making better use of available programs. Provides that such components may be aimed at needs of specific low-income groups, providing that such programs where feasible encourage family participation and progress.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Director to directly fund through public or private nonprofit agencies limited purpose programs where



there is no community action agency designated or where the designated community action agency approves such direct funding.

Subsection (c) requires the Director to assure that reasonable efforts are made by applicants to obtain the views of local officials and agencies in the community and to resolve issues of cooperation and duplication prior to the submission of such application.

*Section 222. Special programs and assistance.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires the Director to develop and carry on special programs to stimulate or deal with critical needs or problems of the poor. Such authority is to be used where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221. Such authority is to be used in respect to programs which involve activities which can be incorporated into or coordinated with community action programs, involve new combinations of resources or new or innovative approaches, and are structured in a way that will promote the purpose of this title. The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on such special programs in such a manner that will encourage wherever feasible the inclusion of such projects in community action programs so as to minimize duplication and promote efficiency and otherwise secure the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include—

(1) A program known as Headstart focused on pre-school-age children which provides for comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and for the direct participation of the parents in the overall program on the local level.

(2) A program known as Follow Through focused on kindergarten or elementary school children previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide the comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children.

(3) A Legal Services program to provide legal services to persons unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information in furtherance of the cause of justice among poor persons. Such projects shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of the lawyer-client relationship. Further, the Director shall assure that the principal local bar associations in the area are given an opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

(4) A Comprehensive Health Service program to aid in developing and carrying out health service projects focused on the needs of the poor and a marked inadequacy of health services. Requires that these projects be designed to (a) make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provisions of comprehensive health services, (b) assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas and are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and their participation, and wherever possible, combined with other

forms of assistance to the individuals or families served. The Director may fund the full cost of such projects, but only after consulting with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and taking such steps as may be required to assure the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies are given all assistance needed to enable them to participate in the program and for the continuation of those related services.

(5) A program known as Upward Bound designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary preparation. Projects must assure the cooperation of one or more institutions of higher learning and one or more secondary schools. The curriculum must be designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary-education success, necessary health services, recreational, cultural and group activities as the Director deems appropriate.

(6) A program known as Emergency Food and Medical Services designed to provide on a temporary basis basic foodstuffs and medical services through a community action agency where feasible or by other means. Each community action agency is required to encourage the development of projects as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.

(7) A Day Care program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to obtain the objectives of this title. Such projects shall provide health, education, social, and other such supportive and related services and facilities. Preference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under this act and to children whose parents have critical needs for such centers. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are required to coordinate day care programs under this jurisdiction with a view as to establishing common standards, regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

(8) A Family Planning program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the area of family planning including information, medical assistance, and supplies. This program shall be coordinated with similar programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assure a full exchange of information—in order to maximize the availability of services and best meet the varying needs of different communities. For the purpose of the program, the services of the Public Health Service officers shall be available to the Director.

(9) A program known as Senior Opportunities and Services designed to identify and meet the needs of persons over the age of 55 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services, effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, recreational, and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy



gaps and deficiencies in presently existing procedures, eligibility requirements, and programs structures to facilitate the greatest use of and participation in public services by the older poor; development of all season recreation and services centers controlled by older persons; and such other activities as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate. In administering this program, the Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, utilize the services of the Administration of Aging.

Subsection (b) requires the Director, in developing programs under subsection (a), to give priority to programs whose effectiveness has been tested in community action or related programs. Also requires the Director to cooperate with Federal and State agencies to develop programs which will improve and supplement programs for which those agencies are responsible. Further authorizes the Director to delegate where appropriate authorities granted under subsection (a) to other Federal or State agencies.

Subsection (c) provides that programs under subsection (a) may include training, research, and technical assistance related to program development and implementation and funds allocated for such purpose may be used in the manner otherwise provided under this title for similar activities.

Subsection (d) requires the Director to provide for the continued evaluation of effectiveness of all programs under this section. Authorizes him to consult with other Federal or State agencies to provide where feasible jointly sponsored evaluation studies. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies shall be public records and reflected in the annual report of the Director.

*Section 223. Allotment of funds; limitations on assistance.*—This section is the general provision governing allotment of community action funds among the several States. It provides that of the sums allocated for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 percent among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs and shall also reserve not more than 20 percent of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as may be prescribed. The Director shall allot the remainder among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared with all States. The Director may reallocate that part of a State's allotment which he determines will not be needed, at such dates as he may fix, in proportion to the original allotments with appropriate adjustments to assure that an amount so made available to a State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated. Authorizes the Director to provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program under section 222(a). Such an allotment may be made in accordance with the

criteria in subsection (a) or may be made in accordance with other criteria which will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, with the exception that not more than 12½ percent of the funds for any program may be used in any one State. Unless otherwise provided in this part, this section would require that financial assistance extended to any agency under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) shall not exceed 80 percent of the cost of the assisted program or activity. However, the Director may approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines that such action is required to further the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, including but not limited to plant equipment, or services, but at least one-half of the required non-Federal contribution must be in cash. No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the services provided will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and the funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor in the community will not be diminished in order to provide for the non-Federal contribution required for receiving such assistance. These requirements may be waived in situations where they would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

*Section 230. Technical Assistance and Training.*—This section permits the Director to provide directly or through grants or other arrangements, technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs and training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purpose of the title. The section also permits the Director, upon request of any agency receiving financial aid, to assign personnel to that agency, for periods not to exceed 2 years, to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity.

*Section 231. State agency assistance.*—This section permits the Director to provide financial assistance to designated State agencies, to enable those agencies to provide technical assistance to communities in developing and carrying out community action programs; to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title; to advise and assist the Director in providing the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council, and the heads of other Federal agencies in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that impede coordination of the programs related to this title at State level and in developing methods for overcoming those problems. In extending assistance to State agencies the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated, or which have been developed with the assistance of agencies designated pursuant to this section.

*Section 232. Research and pilot programs.*—Subsection (a) of this section permits the Director to contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special prob-



lems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. The Director may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

Under subsection (b), the Director is required to establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot and demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan must set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan the Director must consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication or determining if results of activities under this section may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. A description of the activities under this section must be submitted in the annual report required by section 608 or in a separate report.

Subsection (c) provides that no more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated to this title in any fiscal year shall be used for pilot or demonstration projects or research projects authorized by this section.

*Section 240. Assistant Directors for Community Action.*—This section would require the Director to appoint two Assistant Directors, one responsible for rural area programs, the other for urban area programs, to assist him in administering the provisions of this title.

*Section 241. Rural Areas.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that the Director take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas such as the development of special programs responsive to particular needs of rural areas, the development of pilot and demonstration activities focused upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow the migration from rural bases because of lack of economic opportunity, the provision of technical assistance so as to provide a priority to rural communities and to aid in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to rural areas, and the development of special or simple procedures, forms guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

Subsection (b) of this section requires the Director to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance between urban and rural areas within States taking into consideration the relative numbers in States of low-income families, particularly with children, unemployed persons receiving public or private welfare, school dropouts, adults with less than an eighth-grade education, and persons rejected for military service.

Subsection (c) of this section permits the Director to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized if it is not feasible within a reasonable period of time to establish a community action agency.

Subsection (d) of this section requires the Director to encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities

with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

*Section 242. Coordination—Federal agencies; use of State funds.*—Subsection (a) of this section requires that the heads of all Federal agencies cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title, and to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers in a manner that encourages the implementation of the purposes of the title with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may initiate cooperative undertakings with other agencies, such as the joint evaluation of local programs and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements.

Subsection (b) of this section would permit, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, one Federal agency to be designated to administer all funds and would permit one local share requirement to be established according to the proportions advanced by each agency, when funds are advanced to a community action agency or other agency, assisted under this title by more than one Federal agency.

Under subsection (c), for purposes of coordination, the Director is permitted to enter into agreements with State or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

*Section 243. Submission of plans to Governors.*—This section provides that no assistance may be extended under this title to any agency or organization to carry out any program project or other activity within a State unless a plan for such assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State and has not been disapproved by the Governor within 30 days of the submission, or if so disapproved has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This requirement does not apply to assistance extended to institutions of higher education.

*Section 244. Fiscal responsibility and audit.*—Subsection (a) of this section prohibits the release of funds to any agency receiving financial assistance under title II until it has submitted a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency, and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements. The required statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer.

Subsection (b) requires the Director to make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established pursuant to subsection (a).



The Director shall determine promptly after completion of the survey whether the findings and conclusions show whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet the standards and, if not, whether to suspend the assistance. If assistance is suspended, the assisted agency will be given not more than 6 months within which to establish a satisfactory system, and if it fails to do so within 6 months, the Director shall terminate the assistance.

Subsection (c) provides that the Director must make or have made at least once annually an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after completion, he shall determine whether any costs of expenditures incurred will be disallowed. The Director may seek recovery of any sums disallowed by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within 12 months after the date of disallowance.

Subsection (d) requires the Director to take the actions necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program, and to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of community action programs receiving financial assistance under this title.

*Section 245. Special limitations.*—This section prescribes special limitations to apply to programs under this title. They are as follows:

(1) Financial assistance extended may include funds for a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council, or committee to assure the maximum feasible participation of members of the groups and residents of the area served, and to provide reimbursements of actual expenses connected with those meetings. However, allowance may not be paid to any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment to any person for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

(2) No employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities may be compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum. Any amount paid to such an employee in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be included in determining whether the non-Federal share requirements have been complied with. However, the Director may provide for exceptions in cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of this restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

(3) The section prohibits any officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity from serving as a member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title. However, this prohibition does not extend to a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

(4) In projects or activities in the field of family planning, services must be made available to all low-income individuals who are eligible for such assistance under criteria established by the grantee and who desire such information, assistance, and supplies. However, no individual may be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical or religious beliefs, and no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies. In no case shall the use of family planning services assisted under this part be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this act.

(5) No financial assistance may be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. This limitation, however, does not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make a maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

*Section 246. Limitations on political activity.*—Requires the Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, to issue regulations necessary to insure that programs assisted under this title are not carried out in a way using program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of any such programs with any partisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate or faction in any election for public or party office, or in any activity providing voters, or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any election or voter registration activity. Such rules or regulations shall have enforcement procedures, which include summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary.

*Section 247. Duration of program.*—States that the Director shall carry out programs in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

#### Section 104—Amendments to Title III—Rural Areas Programs

Subsection (a) of this section changes the heading of part A to read "Part A—Rural Loan Program" and inserts a new heading, "Loans to Families," before section 302.

Subsection (b) of this section amends section 301 of the act to restate the purpose of the rural loan programs that it is to be to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards.

Subsection (c) of this section amends section 302(a) of the act to extend eligibility to the elderly and to permit the calculation of the \$3,500 loan limit on the basis of the loan principal excluding interest.

Subsection (d) of this section transfers section 606 of the act (relat-



ing to the establishment of a revolving fund) to title III as section 306.

### Section 105—Amendments to Title IV—Employment and Investment Incentives

Section 105(a) of the bill amends section 401 of the act to require that special attention be given in carrying on programs under this section to emphasize that (1) small business concerns located in rural or urban areas with a high proportion of unemployed and low-income individuals or (2) owned by low-income individuals.

Section 105(b) of the bill amends section 402(a) of the act to require that in providing loan assistance, particular emphasis will be placed upon the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income persons or owned by low-income individuals. The subsection also requires that management training programs be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency.

Section 105(c) of the bill deletes the first section 402(b) of the act which is replaced by a new section 406 of the act. It also amends the second section 402(b) of the act to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to utilize authorities developed in title III of the act to insure equitable distribution of loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000, between urban and rural areas.

Section 105(d) of the bill rennumbers section 405 of the act to read "407" and includes the Secretary of Commerce as authorized to carry out programs under the title through fiscal year 1970. This section of the bill also strikes out section 404 and inserts new sections 404, 405, and 406 of the act which provide as follows:

New section 404 requires that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration assure that in any fiscal year at least 50 percent of the loans are granted small business concerns are located in urban areas having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to such concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Director and the SBA are to jointly define the meaning of "low income" as it applies to owners of small business concerns. Such definition need not correspond with the definition of "low income" as used elsewhere in the act.

New section 405 prohibits financial assistance which would be used in relocating business establishments from one area to another where such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

Subsection (a) of new section 406 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects to provide technical and management assistance to individuals and enterprises eligible for assistance, with special attention to small businesses located in urban areas of high-poverty concentration and small businesses owned by low-income individuals.

Subsection (b) of new section 406 authorizes financial assistance for projects including planning, research, feasibility studies and market

research, identification and development of new business opportunities, and stimulation of new private capital resources, the furnishing of centralized services, the establishment and strengthening of business services agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives, encouragement of placement subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in high-poverty concentration urban areas, including the furnishing of incentives and assistance to train and upgrade potential subcontractors and the furnishing of business counseling, management training, legal and other related services with special emphasis upon management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses.

Subsection (c) of new section 406 requires that the Secretary of Commerce give preference to projects promoting the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas with high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects planned and carried out with a participation of local businessmen.

Subsection (d) of new section 406 requires that, to the extent feasible, services be provided in a location easily accessible to the individuals and small businesses served.

Subsection (e) of new section 406 requires that the Secretary of Commerce take steps to assure that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of title IV.

Subsection (f) of new section 406 requires that the Secretary of Commerce provide continuing program evaluation and that the results of such evaluation be published in the annual report of the Director.

#### Section 106—Amendments to Title VI—Administration and Coordination

Section 106(a) of the bill amends section 601(a) of the act to provide for six Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity instead of four as is presently authorized.

Section 106(b) of the bill amends section 603(b) of the act by directing the Director to issue regulations or impose requirements to insure that programs under this act are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, services, or unemployment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such program with any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any political candidate for public office. Also provides that the Director may issue regulations to insure that persons seeking benefits under this act make a reasonable effort to become registered voters.

Section 106(c) amends section 609 of the act to clarify certain definitions.

Section 106(d) amends section 610 of the act relating to programs for the elderly poor to direct the Director to work in cooperation with the Director of the Administration on Aging in the development of programs for the elderly poor.

Section 106(e) makes a technical amendment.



Section 196(f) adds a new provision to the title requiring the Director to take such action as is necessary to assure that no one will be deemed to meet the poverty criteria for the purpose of the act "if his lack of income results from his refusal without good cause to seek or accept employment commensurate with his age, health, education and ability."

### Section 107—Amendment to Title VII

This section amends section 701(b) of the act to extend the time within which State plans under the Social Security Act must conform with the requirements of title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act. The deadline is extended to July 1, 1968, or the first day of the fourth month after the State legislature next adjourns following the effective date of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, whichever is later.

### Section 108—Amendments to Title VIII—Domestic Volunteer Service Programs

This section entirely rewrites the provisions of law relating to the VISTA program. As rewritten it would provide the following:

*Section 801.*—Restates the purpose of VISTA to provide full- and part-time volunteer programs to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons to perform meaningful and constructive service as part- or full-time volunteers in urban communities, rural areas, Indian reservations, Job Corps centers, and in other agencies and institutions.

*Section 810(a).*—Authorizes the Director to establish full-time volunteer programs. Upon request of Federal, State, local, or private non-profit agencies, volunteers may be assigned to work in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs; care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or retarded; or in connection with any programs or activities authorized or supported or of a character eligible for assistance under this act.

*Section 810(b).*—Authorizes the Director to assign volunteers under such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities appropriate to the volunteer's status as such) as he may determine, provided that no volunteer be assigned to any State without the consent of the Governor.

*Section 811(a).*—Requires a full-time personal commitment of volunteers under this part including a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people being served.

*Section 811(b).*—Provides that enrollments shall be for 1-year periods unless the Director determines that persons who are not able to enroll for this period can promote the purposes of VISTA by enrollments of not less than 2 months.

*Section 811(c).*—Provides for an oath or affirmation for volunteers.

*Section 812(a).*—Provides for volunteer stipends at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month, or in the case of volunteer leaders who have served for at least 1 year and shown special skills and experience, \$75 per month. The Director may also provide living, travel, leave and support allowances as he may deem necessary or appropriate.

*Section 812(b).*—Provides that stipends shall be payable only upon completion of term of service, but in extraordinary circumstances, the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipends to or on behalf of volunteers. If a volunteer dies during VISTA service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5582.

*Section 812(c).*—Allows the Director to provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to utilize their VISTA experience in combating poverty after their formal connection with the program has ended.

*Section 820(a).*—Authorizes the Director to encourage, develop, and assist in new programs designed to increase and expand volunteer participation, utilizing volunteers working part time, or for periods of less than 2 months' duration, in or near their home communities. Such programs are to be designed to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute these skills to the betterment of communities having large concentrations of poor; and to assist agencies and organizations to obtain services of volunteers more readily or to provide specialized training.

*Section 820(b).*—Provides that volunteers under this section do not receive any stipend, nor, except in unusual or special circumstances affecting their project, could they receive any other support or allowances.

*Section 820(c).*—Provides that the value of the services of volunteers under this section, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal act, may be accepted toward provision of the non-Federal share.

*Section 821.*—Authorizes the Director to design special programs to improve methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation. Not more than 10 percent of sums appropriated for VISTA may be allocated for programs under this section.

*Section 831.*—Requires the Director to coordinate volunteer programs with community action programs and other appropriate Federal, State, local, and national programs. Also requires the Director to consult with other agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this act in order to encourage more effective use of volunteer services in those programs. Also requires the coordination of part- and full-time programs, and to encourage former full-time volunteers to participate in part-time programs and part-time volunteers to participate in full-time programs.

*Section 832.*—Requires the Director to take necessary steps including the development of special projects where necessary, to encourage the fullest feasible participation of older persons or older persons membership groups in VISTA programs and activities and to encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to the elderly.

*Section 833(a).*—Provides that, subject to the exceptions in subsection (b), VISTA volunteers are not to be deemed Federal employees, and are not subject to the laws relating to Federal employment.

*Section 833(b).*—Provides that volunteers who receive a living allowance or stipend under part A shall be deemed Federal employees



for purposes of chapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code and deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3), except with respect to manner of computing disability benefits.

*Section 834(a).*—Requires the Director to issue regulations to assure that activities under this title will not displace existing workers nor impair existing contracts for services.

*Section 834(b).*—Requires that all support, including transportation, be provided at the lowest possible cost.

*Section 834(c).*—Prohibits any agency utilizing volunteers to be compensated for services performed by volunteers.

*Section 835.*—Authorizes the carrying out of programs under this title through the fiscal year 1970.

## **TITLE II OF THE BILL**

### **Section 201—Criminal Provisions**

Subsection (a) of this section provides criminal penalties for embezzlement, willful misapplication, theft, or fraud of assistance funds provided under the Economic Opportunity Act by way of grant or contract. The penalty is not to exceed a fine of \$10,000, imprisonment for 2 years, or both; if the amount involved is \$100 or less, the penalty is not to exceed a fine of \$1,000, or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

Subsection (b) provides criminal penalties for the use of duress to secure kickbacks from persons employed with funds provided under any such grant or contract. The penalty is not to exceed a fine of \$1,000, or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

## **TITLE III OF THE BILL**

### **Section 301—Effective Date**

Section 301 provides that the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act proposed herein are to be effective upon enactment, except that in the case of existing funded community action agencies, there is provided a reasonable transition period (June 30, 1968).

## CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

AN ACT To mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

#### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. Although the economic well-being and prosperity of the United States have progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in world history, and although these benefits are widely shared throughout the Nation, poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy.

It is the sense of the Congress that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all such efforts to further the policy of this Act.

### TITLE I—WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

#### [PART A—JOB CORPS

#### [STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

[SEC. 101. The purpose of this part is to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and young women aged sixteen through twenty-one by providing them in rural and urban residential centers with education, vocational training, useful work experience, including work directed toward the conservation of natural resources, and other appropriate activities.



## 【ESTABLISHMENT OF JOB CORPS

【SEC. 102. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"), established by title VI, a Job Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").

## 【JOB CORPS PROGRAM

【SEC. 103. The Director of the Office shall prescribe regulations to prevent programs under this part from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services. The Director of the Office (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") is authorized to—

【(a) enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation, in rural and urban areas, of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed to carry out the purposes of this part, including but not limited to agreements with agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility, and including agreements for a botanical survey program involving surveys and maps of existing vegetation and investigations of the plants, soils, and environments of natural and disturbed plant communities: *Provided*, That such agreements shall provide that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation camp or training center shall become the property of the United States;

【(b) arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollees in the Corps: *Provided*, That, where practicable, such programs may be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training at comparable costs: *Provided*, That such arrangements for education and training of enrollees in the Corps shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain education or training necessary to qualify them for the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;

【(c) provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience and other appropriate activities for enrollees;

【(d) establish standards of safety and health for enrollees, and furnish or arrange for the furnishing of health services; and

【(e) prescribe such rules and regulations and make such arrangements as he deems necessary to provide for the selection of enrollees and to govern their conduct after enrollment, including appropriate regulation as to the circumstances under

which enrollment may be terminated: *Provided, however,* That the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Corps.

#### COMPOSITION OF THE CORPS

【SEC. 104. (a) The Corps shall be composed of young men and young women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment, and who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director. Participation in the Corps shall not relieve any enrollee of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.). For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.

【(b) In order to enroll as a member of the Corps, an individual must agree to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Director for the government of the Corps.

【(c) The total enrollment of any individual in the Corps shall not exceed two years except as the Director may determine in special cases.

【(d) Each enrollee (other than an enrollee who is a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 104(a) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required under this subsection.

【(e) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that, on or before July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence and receiving training, at Job Corps conservation camps and training centers is not less than 23 per centum of the total number of enrollees in the Job Corps.

【(f) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, in such a manner as to increase the capacity of conservation camps and training centers of the Job Corps above the capacity of 45,000 enrollees in such camps and centers.

【(g) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps camps and centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$7,500 per enrollee in such camps and centers.

【(h) Job Corps officials shall, whenever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps camps and centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life.

【(i) Whenever there is a vacancy in a Job Corps camp or center in the region in which an enrollee resides which is an appropriate camp or center to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the



Director, such enrollee shall be assigned to such camp or center. If no such vacancy exists, the enrollee shall be assigned to the Job Corps camp or center offering programs and activities appropriate to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, which is nearest to the residence of such enrollee.

[(j) The Director shall to the maximum extent feasible assure that each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Corps furnishes to him six months and eighteen months after such completed enrollment the following information:

[(1) The place of residence of such enrollee;

[(2) The employment status of such enrollee;

[(3) The compensation received by such enrollee in his current job and the compensation received by him in the job, if any, immediately preceding his current job; and

[(4) Such other relevant information determined by the Director to be necessary for an effective followup.

#### [ALLOWANCE AND MAINTENANCE

[SEC. 105. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

[(b) Upon termination of his or her enrollment in the Corps, each enrollee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Director: *Provided, however,* That under such circumstances as the Director may determine a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a member of his or her family (as defined in section 609(c)) and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director. In the event of the enrollee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

#### [APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

[SEC. 106. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, an enrollee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

[(b) Enrollees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401

et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

[(c)(1) Enrollees under this part shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

[(2) For purposes of this subsection:

[(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Corps.

[(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d)(1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756(d)(1)) shall apply to enrollees.

[(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the enrollment of the injured enrollee is terminated.

[(d) An enrollee shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

[(e) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

#### [POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

[SEC. 107. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

[(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and



to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

[(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.

#### [STATE-OPERATED YOUTH CAMPS

[SEC. 108. The Director is authorized to enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs, which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to such regulations as he may adopt, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

#### [REQUIREMENT FOR STATE APPROVAL OF CONSERVATION CAMPS AND TRAINING CENTERS

[SEC. 109. In carrying out the provisions of part A of this title no conservation camp, training center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purposes of this Act, shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission.

#### [YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

[SEC. 110. Within the Job Corps there is authorized a Youth Conservation Corps in which at any one time no less than 40 per centum of the male enrollees under this part shall be assigned to camps where their work activity is directed primarily toward conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation, and developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas. Such work activity shall be performed under the direction of members of agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas.

#### [STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

[SEC. 111. (a) Within Job Corps camps and centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps camp or center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

[(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps conservation camps and training centers, the individual directors of Job Corps camps and centers shall be given

full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulation set by the Director.

[(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.

#### [EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS]

[SEC. 111-1. The Director shall arrange, through grants or contracts, for the carrying out of experimental and demonstration projects (of which not to exceed four may involve the construction of new camps or centers) providing youth employment and training on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Such projects may involve the use of resources or authority under both this part and part B of this title, pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor where funds under part B of this title are so used, and the Director is authorized to waive any provision of such parts which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of such projects essential to a determination and demonstration of their feasibility and usefulness. The Director shall report to the Congress a full description of actions taken and progress made under this section no later than March 1, 1968.]

### PART A—JOB CORPS

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.*

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

*SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a "Job Corps".*



## INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

*SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—*

*(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age fourteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;*

*(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs, or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;*

*(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;*

*(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and*

*(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.*

## SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

*SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including court, probation, parole, law enforcement, education, welfare, and medical authorities and advisers. They shall also provide for—*

*(1) an interview with each applicant for the purpose of—*

*(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;*

*(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and*

*(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.*

(2) *the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.*

(b) *The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.*

(c) *The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.*

#### SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

*SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.*

*(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.*

#### ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

*SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.*

*(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).*

*(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent resident of the Trust Territory*



of the Pacific Islands) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

(d) After the Director has determined whether an enrollee is to be assigned to a men's training center, a conservation center, or a women's training center, the center to which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the appropriate type which is closest to the enrollee's home, except that the Director, on an individual basis, may waive this requirement when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the enrollee's home shall be carefully limited to situations in which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

#### JOB CORPS CENTERS

SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character and shall be designed and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling, and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's and women's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment.

(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's training centers shall offer education and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresidential basis to participants in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

#### PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each

enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours a week. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

#### ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

SEC. 109. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.

(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.



(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

#### STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

#### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Whenever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center

or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and cooperative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

#### COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

*SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.*

*(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.*

*(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.*

*(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.*

*(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 611(d) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to—*

*(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;*

*(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;*

*(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and*

*(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.*

*If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the*



*Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.*

#### **EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS**

*SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of higher learning, boards of education, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.*

*(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as described in part B of this title, in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any*

provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of existing educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

- (1) a job survey be made of the area;
- (2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;
- (3) an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;
- (4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and
- (5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

#### ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

#### PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters



*pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.*

*(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.*

*(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.*

#### APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

*SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:*

*(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.*

*(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:*

*(A) The term "performance of duty" shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;*

*(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and*

*(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.*

*(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.*

*(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.*

*(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director, for the*

support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

#### SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five thousand enrollees.

(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women enrollees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,500 per residential enrollee, or \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee.

(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

#### POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, excepts as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, either partisan or nonpartisan, or in voter registration drives, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving



*due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.*

## **[PART B—WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS**

### **[NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS**

**[SEC. 112. (a)** The Director shall formulate and carry out—

**[(1)** programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school, and

**[(2)** programs to provide unemployed individuals useful work experience and on-the-job training, combined where needed with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training designed to assist the individuals to develop their maximum occupational potential. Enrollment shall be limited to individuals aged sixteen through twenty-one years.

**[(b)** In determining for purposes of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) whether a student is from a low-income family, the Director shall consider a student to be from such a family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

### **[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

**[SEC. 113. (a)** The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a program submitted under section 112 if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

**[(1)** enrollees will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private organizations;

**[(2)** no enrollees will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

**[(3)** the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services; and

**[(4)** the rates of pay for time spent in work, training or education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

**[(b)** In approving on-the-job training projects with other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the Director is authorized to enter into agreements to pay reasonable training costs but not wages paid to enrollees for services performed.

**[(c)** In approving projects under this part, the Director shall give priority to projects with high training potential and high potential for contributing to the upward mobility of the trainee.

**[ENROLLEES IN PROGRAM]**

**[SEC. 114. (a)** Enrollment in programs under this part shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this part. For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.

**[(b)** Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

**[(c)** Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private organizations.

**[LIMITATIONS OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE]**

**[SEC. 115.** Federal assistance to any program pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

**[EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE]**

**[SEC. 116.** The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this part shall be used within any one State.]

\* \* \* \* \*

**[PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS]****[ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS]**

**[SEC. 131. (a)** The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas of the Nation having, in the judgment of the Director, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic



unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3) where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies in order to coordinate effectively all relevant programs of social development.

[(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit organizations, or to enter into contracts with other private organizations, for the payment of all or part of the cost of programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e) of this Act. The Director shall assure that the work training and employment opportunities created under these special programs are filled by the residents of the communities or neighborhoods served, and that the activities pursued are carried out in the communities and neighborhoods described in subsection (a). For the purposes of this section, the Director may include youths aged sixteen to twenty-one who are unemployed, underemployed, or below the poverty level as established for the programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e).

[(c) The Director shall establish such criteria, and impose such conditions, as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that no program assistance under this part will result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services and to assure that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

[(d) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall establish such procedures or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to assure maximum coordination with community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this Act.

#### [FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

[SEC. 132. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.]

### PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to*

obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

#### COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicounty, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to community action, manpower services, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and comprehensive work and training programs assisted under this title.

(c) A comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant component programs authorized by this Act with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs and activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

#### PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123 (c)). This agency must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

(b) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

(c) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make use of public and private organizations as delegate agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work and training program, including without limitation agencies governed with the participation of the poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational institutions, the public employment service, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training institutions, and other capable public and private organizations.

(d) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served in the plan-



ning, conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement.

(e) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

#### ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES -

SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:

(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school;

(2) programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over) with useful work and training (which must include sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training) designed to assist those persons to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment;

(3) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas,

*which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers:*

(6) *supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;*

(7) *employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;*

(8) *programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive service, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: Provided, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and*

(9) *means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.*

(b) *Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.*

(c) *The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this title. In the case of programs under subsection (a)(1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies*



*pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts.*

#### SPECIAL CONDITIONS

*SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—*

*(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;*

*(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;*

*(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;*

*(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.*

*(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.*

*(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.*

*(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.*

#### PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

*SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments*

*(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.*

*(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.*

#### ELDERLY

*SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment*

among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

#### PILOT PROJECTS

SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

#### ROLE OF THE STATES

SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: Provided, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

#### EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5); but not more than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.



## LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

*SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 223(c).*

## PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

*SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.*

*(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.*

*(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129.*

## PART E—DURATION OF PROGRAM

*SEC. 141. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.*

## [TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

## [PART A—GENERAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

## [STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*[SEC. 201. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs.*

**[COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

**[SEC. 202. (a)** The term "community action program" means a program—

**[(1)** which mobilizes and utilizes in an attack on poverty resources, public or private, of any urban or rural, or combined urban and rural, geographical area (referred to in this part as a "community"), including but not limited to a State, metropolitan area, county, city, town, multicity unit, or multicounty unit or any neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which is sufficiently homogeneous in character to be an appropriate area for an attack on poverty under this part;

**[(2)** which provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;

**[(3)** which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served;

**[(4)** which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency (other than a political party), or a combination thereof; and

**[(5)** which includes provision for reasonable access of the public to information including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or agencies engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with procedures approved by the Director.

**[(b)** The Director is authorized to prescribe such additional criteria for programs carried on under this part as he shall deem appropriate. Such criteria shall include requirements to assure (1) that each agency responsible for a community action program is qualified to administer such program and the funds granted to it efficiently, effectively, and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part, having due regard for the size and complexity of such program and the number of persons and size of the area served; (2) that each such agency is subject to evaluation of program progress and regular or periodic audits and that the results or findings of such evaluations and audits are considered by the agency as well as by the Director in connection with proposals or applications for the renewal, expansion, or modification of any such program; (3) that each such agency maintains records and internal controls needed to achieve and document compliance with all legal requirements and that all records bearing exclusively on grants made under this part are available to the General Accounting Office; (4) that each such program is carried on in accordance with standards and policies, including rules governing the conduct of officers and employees, to preclude the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in an identification of such



program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; and (5) that the personnel of each such agency are selected, employed, promoted, and compensated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, or personnel plans approved by him, as promoting efficiency and the effective use of funds.

[(c)(1) The Director shall not approve or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.

[(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership.

[(3) The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor.

[(4) In communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

[(d) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which representative groups of the poor including but not limited to minority groups, the elderly, and the rural population, which feel themselves inadequately represented on their community action agency policy board, may petition for adequate representation on such board.

#### [ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

[SEC. 203. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for carrying out sections 204 and 205. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. Twenty per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted among the States as the Director shall determine. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

[(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

[(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of public assistance recipients in such States (as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data) bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States (as so determined);

[(2) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the

annual average number of persons unemployed in such State (as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data) bears to the annual average number of persons unemployed in all the States (as so determined); and

[(3) the remaining one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in all the States.

[(c) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

[(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

#### **[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

[SEC. 240. The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs.

#### **[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

[SEC. 205. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including, but not limited to, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit



of low-income individuals and families. The Director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; and any amount paid such an employee in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether section 208(a) has been complied with.

[(b) No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system.

[(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors in the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; of the extent persistent unemployment and underemployment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidences of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

[(d) The Director is authorized to make grants under this section for special programs (1) which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, (2) which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, and (3) which are conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

[(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance,

and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed, with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training. Such program shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

[(f) In extending assistance under this section the Director shall give special consideration to programs which give promise of effecting a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities to deal with their problems without further assistance and to programs which make the maximum utilization of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

[(g) The Director shall carry out this part in such a manner as to insure that funds available for carrying out this part (other than those available for carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2, and 211-3) at least 5 per centum will be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs (other than programs described in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2, and 211-3) which are carried on in communities in which there is being carried on concurrently a community action program for which an overall community action agency assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and provides for the involvement and participation of public and private nonprofit agencies. In addition the Director may use an additional 5 per centum of such funds for carrying out such programs. For purposes of this subsection, a program will be deemed to be independently funded if the grantee is one that develops, and is funded to operate only, programs which are of limited scope and which does not have broad comprehensive community representation on its policymaking board, whether or not the grantee sponsors one or several component programs.

[(h) The Director shall make grants to, or contracts with, independently funded public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations in predominantly rural areas in accordance with sections 210 and 617, where the Director determines it is not feasible, within a reasonable period of time, to establish community action agencies.

[(i) If projects are of a regional nature and can be more efficiently operated on this basis, the Director may make grants to, or contract with, independently funded, public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the conduct and administration of such projects.

[(j) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be an executive officer or a member of the board of directors of any organization (other than a religious organization) with which the Director has entered into a contract under this section to carry out a community action program or a component program thereof.

[(k) No funds shall be released to any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section unless the grantee organization has submitted to the Director either—

[(1) a statement from the appropriate public financial officer of the community or of the public agency which will maintain the



accounts of the grantee, stating that such officer accepts responsibility for providing financial services adequate to insure the establishment and maintenance of an accounting system by such agency and its delegate agencies, with internal controls adequate to safeguard the assets of such agencies, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency and encourage adherence to prescribed management policies; or

[(2) an opinion from a certified public accountant or a duly licensed public accountant stating that the grantee has established such an accounting system.

[(1)(1) The Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey within three months after the effective date of a grant or contract with any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section to review and evaluate the adequacy of the grantee organization's and its delegate agencies' accounting systems and internal controls.

[(2) Within thirty days of the completion of such survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of the findings and conclusions resulting from such survey whether the accounting systems of the grantee organization and its delegate agencies meet the standards set forth in subsections (k)(1) and (k)(2). If he shall determine that the standards have not been met, he shall immediately notify the grantee organization of his determination and he shall consider whether suspension of further payment of Federal funds under the subject grant is warranted.

[(3) In the event of suspension of any grant funds pursuant to subsection (1)(2), the affected agency shall be given not more than six months from the date of notice of suspension in which to establish, with the advice of Office of Economic Opportunity auditors, the procedures prescribed in subsection (k). A new audit shall be performed within this period and if, by the end of this period, the Director is still unable to determine that the accounting system meets the required standards he shall terminate the contract or grant.

[(m) The Director shall establish such rules and regulations as may be required to insure that public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, maintain the standards of accounting set forth in sections 205(k) (1) and (2) during the period of any grant or contract under this section.

[(n) In extending assistance under this section the Director is authorized to make grants for the payment of a reasonable allowance per meeting for attendance at community action agency board meetings or neighborhood community action council or committee meetings and for the reimbursement of other necessary expenses of attendance at such meetings to members of such boards, councils, or committees who are residents of the areas and members of the groups served in order to insure and encourage their maximum feasible participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs: *Provided, however,* That no such payments shall be made for attendance at more than two meetings in a month, or to any person who is an employee of the United States Government, of a community action agency, or of a State or local governmental agency.

[(o) (1) In making grants for programs in the field of family planning the Director shall assure that family planning services,

including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the community action agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

[(2) No such grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

[(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

[(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

[(3) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

#### [TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EMERGENCY LOANS

[SEC. 206. (a) The Director is authorized to provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance in connection with such programs or otherwise pertaining to the purposes of this part. The Director may, upon request of a grantee under this section, or sections 204, 205, or 209(b), make special assignments of personnel to the grantee to assist and advise in the performance of functions related to the purposes of this part, except that in no event shall more than one hundred persons be employed for, or at any one time regularly engaged in, such assignments, nor shall any such special assignment be for a period of more than two years in the case of any grantee.

[(n) The Director shall also formulate and carry out a program for making small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. The total outstanding balance of loans made to an individual under this subsection may not at any time exceed \$300. Loans under this subsection shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe.

#### [RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

[SEC. 207. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research, and demonstrations pertaining to the purposes of this part. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed 5 percentum of the sums appropriated or allocated for such year to carry out the purposes of this part. No grant or contract



for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section after January 1, 1967, except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of the annual report required by section 608, or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, or indicating the time or period, and to the extent possible the manner, in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities will or are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed simultaneously in the appropriate regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and shall require such offices to review and make recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing.

#### **[LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

**[SEC. 208. (a)** Assistance pursuant to sections 204 and 205 paid for the period ending June 30, 1967 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

**[ (b)** The Director is authorized to prescribe regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which assistance may be reduced below 90 per centum for such community action programs or components as have received assistance under section 205 for a period prescribed in such regulations.

**[ (c)** The expenditures or contributions made from non-Federal sources for a community action program or component thereof shall be in addition to the aggregate expenditures or contributions from non-Federal sources which were being made for similar purposes prior to the extension of Federal assistance. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

**[PARTICIPATION OF STATE AGENCIES**

**[SEC. 209. (a)** The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of such programs.

**[(b)** The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

**[(c)** In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I and title II of this Act, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

**[(d)** When the Director receives an application from a private non-profit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs, he shall, within five days, give notice to such community action agency and the Governor of the State in which the community is located of the receipt of such application. When the Director determines that a separate contract or grant is desirable and practical and that good cause has been shown, he is authorized to make a grant directly to, or to contract directly with, such agency.

**[(e)** No private institution or organization shall be eligible for participation under this part unless it (1) is itself an institution or organization which has, prior to its consideration for such participation, had a concern with problems of poverty, or (2) is sponsored by one or more such institutions or organizations or by a public agency, or (3) is an institution of higher education (as defined by section 401(f) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963).

**[EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE**

**[SEC. 210.** The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5)



adults with less than an eighth-grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service; and (7) persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places as determined by the Bureau of the Census for the 1960 census.

#### **[PREFERENCE FOR COMPONENTS OF APPROVED PROGRAMS**

**[SEC. 211.** In determining whether to extend assistance under this Act, the Director shall, to the extent feasible, give preference to programs and projects which are components of a community action program approved pursuant to this part.

#### **[HEADSTART AND LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS**

**[SEC. 211-1.** (a) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections which assist young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which include (1) the furnishing of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, educational, and mental health services as the Director finds will aid such children to attain their greatest potential, (2) the provision of appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and the effective use of their services, and (3) such other training, technical assistance, evaluation, and follow-through activities as may be necessary or appropriate.

**[**(b) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections, which provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty: *Provided*, That the Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed program of legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to review the proposed program and to submit comments and recommendations thereon before such program is approved or funded.

#### **[COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAMS**

**[SEC. 211-2.** (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies in order to provide assistance necessary for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs focused upon the needs of persons residing in urban or rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services. Such programs shall be designed—

**[**(1) to make possible, with maximum feasible utilization of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with facilities and rehabilitation necessary in connection therewith; and

[(2) to assure that such services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation, and wherever possible are combined with, or included within arrangements for providing, employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Before approving any program under this section, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps, or impose such conditions, as may be required to make certain that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing services related to this section are furnished with all assistance necessary or appropriate in order to permit them to plan for participation in such program and for the necessary continuation of such services.

[(b) In carrying out this section, the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Such programs shall include provisions for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts.

[(c) The Director, either separately or as part of the annual report required under section 608, shall submit at least annually to the Congress a comprehensive statement describing the actions taken and progress made under this section and all other provisions of this Act in meeting the needs of the poor for expanded and improved health services. The Director shall also provide for studies of the nature and characteristics of health problems particularly significant to low-income persons.

[(d) The Director is authorized, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to secure (by grant or contract) objective studies of the overall operation of the programs authorized under this section, including their relationship to and impact on the adequacy and availability of all relevant programs and services for meeting total health needs. Reports of such studies, together with such comments and recommendations as the Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may care to offer, shall be submitted to the President and the Congress.

#### [SPECIAL PROJECTS ON ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

[SEC. 211-3. The Director is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies and to other public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of special projects in the field of adult basic education for low-income individuals over eighteen years of age whose lack of basic educational skills constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability. Such projects shall—

[(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which the Director determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title,

[(2) involve activities in adult basic education which the Director determines are so coupled with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs, as to have unusual promise in



promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income individuals with basic educational deficiencies, or

[(3) show promise of enabling persons receiving welfare payments or other forms of public assistance to obtain employment which will permit discontinuance of such assistance.

## PART B—ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS

(Note: Part B was repealed by Public Law 89-750.)

## [PART C—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

### [STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

[SEC. 219-1. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

### [AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH INFORMATION CENTER

[SEC. 220. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children.

[(b) It is the intent of the Congress that the section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children.

## [PART D—DURATION OF PROGRAM

[SEC. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.]

## TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*SEC. 201. This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed*

for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

## PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

### DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES;

#### COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—



(1) has power to enter into contracts with public and private non-profit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

(2) is designated as a community action agency by the Director

A community action program is a community based and operated program—

(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

(c) The community for which a community action agency is designated to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision); but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

(d) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency other than a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the Community action program of a State, or of any political subdivision or combination thereof, if the elected or duly appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.

## COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

*SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(b), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).*

*(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.*

*(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations with respect to the character, extent, and administration of programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making such policy determinations affecting particular areas, such subsidiary board, council, or similar agency shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).*

*(d) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.*

*(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.*



## SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public

*officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.*

#### ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

*SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.*

*(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regulations governing matters relating to partisan or nonpartisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum con-*



*sistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.*

#### EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

*SEC. 214. (a) In determining whether, in what amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assistance to a new community action program, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity to the purposes of this title. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on such a program, consistent with needs and with due allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific functions and duties to this end. The Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering: the number and incomes of persons or families served and seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the extent to which those persons and families have been aided in establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those goals; the extent to which resources have been committed which are over and above the contributions required by this title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor and area representatives, have actively participated in the formulation and implementation of the program in question; the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements among agencies operating different components and related agencies in the community; and the extent to which activities or approaches initiated as part of the program have been incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.*

*(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by him or by community action agencies, the Director may provide for, or require community action agencies to provide for, independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.*

#### PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

##### DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

*SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.*

## GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

*SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of community action programs, the Director may provide general financial assistance to those programs in accordance with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be used, as approved by the Director, by community action agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning, coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsibilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be used for the development and operation of approved program components which are necessary for a fully effective program and for which assistance is not available, as needed, from other sources. These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment; to make better use of available income in connection with efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills needed for employment, family self-help, or successful participation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain housing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake family planning consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent and effective use of programs available to help in overcoming specific problems. Components providing these or other services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly, the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance, but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family participation and progress.*

*(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community, and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private non-profit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.*

*(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.*

## 'SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

*'SEC. 122. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by*



him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

(1) A program to be known as "Project Headstart" focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

(2) A program to be known as "Follow Through" focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential.

(3) A "Legal Services" program to provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information, as appropriate, to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

(4) A "Comprehensive Health Services" program to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health

*services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and*

*(B) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.*

*Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.*

*(5) A program to be known as "Upward Bound" designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary education success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate.*

*(6) A program to be known as "Emergency Food and Medical Services" designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange with other Federal and State agencies or officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.*

*(7) A "Day Care" program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise attain objectives related to the purposes of this Act. Projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed, together with necessary related facilities and services. Preference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate*



*in programs under this Act and to other children whose parents have especially critical needs of day care service which could not be secured under any other program. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.*

*(8) A "Family Planning" program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.*

*(9) A program to be known as "Senior Opportunities and Services" designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 55 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.*

*(b) In developing programs under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private. The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under subsection (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to delegations of authority or suitable agreements.*

*(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include essential training, research, and technical assistance directly related to program development and implementation, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.*

(d) *The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this section, including their impact in terms of the needs or problems at which they are directed, and their relationship to and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director.*

#### ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

*SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to sections 220 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallotted at such dates, during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallotted among the other States.*

*(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.*

*(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services, except that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution shall be in cash.*



(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise to qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

## PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

### STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 604 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

### RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies

which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

#### PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

##### ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

##### RURAL AREAS

SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing



assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components and model programs for use in rural areas.

(b) In order to further implement the policy described in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

#### COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE FUNDS

SEC. 242. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice, information, or assistance, including the establishment of working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific problems of coordination arising under programs authorized in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range plans where justified by prior progress.

(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar

requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

#### SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

SEC. 243. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency, or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

SEC. 244. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards, and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.



(c) *At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.*

(d) *The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.*

#### SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

*SEC. 245. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title:*

(1) *Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expense connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.*

(2) *The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 223 have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.*

(3) *No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a*

program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

#### LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

SEC. 246. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue such regulations, or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate, to insure that programs assisted under this title are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs (1) with any partisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or any voter registration activity. Rules or regulations under this section shall provide for enforcement procedures, which shall include provision for summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis.

#### DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 247. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.



## TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

### PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

#### 【STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

【SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this title to meet some of the special problems of rural poverty and thereby to raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families and migrant agricultural employees and their families.】

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards.*

#### 【PART A—AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS】

##### LOANS TO FAMILIES

SEC. 302. (a) The Director is authorized to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not resulting in an aggregate *principal* indebtedness of more than \$3,500 at any one time to any low-income rural family where, in the judgment of the Director, such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families, *and, in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions* by assisting or permitting them to—

(A) acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon,

(B) operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized, including but not limited to the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and equipment, or

(C) participate in cooperative associations; and/or to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

(b) Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

##### COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 303. The Director is authorized to make loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

##### LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

SEC. 304. No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Director determines that—

(a) the providing of such assistance will materially further the purposes of this part, and

(b) in the case of assistance provided pursuant to section 303, the applicant is fulfilling or will fulfill a need for services, facilities, or activities which is not otherwise being met.

## LOAN TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 305. Loans pursuant to sections 302 and 303 shall have such terms and conditions as the Director shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

- (a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;
- (b) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;
- (c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Director may determine to be consistent with its purposes;

(e) with respect to loans made pursuant to section 303, the loan is repayable within not more than thirty years; and

(f) no financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part to or in connection with any corporation or cooperative organization for the production of agricultural commodities or for manufacturing purposes: *Provided*, That (1) packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance; and (2) a cooperative organization formed by and consisting of members of an Indian tribe (including any tribe with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) engaged in the production of agricultural commodities, or in manufacturing products, on an Indian reservation (or former reservation in the case of tribes with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) shall not be regarded as a cooperative organization within the purview of this cause.

## REVOLVING FUND

SEC. [606] 306. (a) To carry out the lending and guaranty functions authorized under [titles III of this Act] *this part*, there is authorized to be established a revolving fund. The capital of the fund shall consist of such amounts as may be advanced to it by the Director from funds appropriated pursuant to section 321 and shall remain available until expended.

(b) The Director shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the capital of the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity during the last month of the preceding fiscal year. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest.

(c) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Director to be in excess of current needs, such capital shall be credited to the



appropriation from which advanced, where it shall be held for future advances.

(d) Receipts from any lending and guaranty operations under this Act (except operations under title IV carried on by the Small Business Administration) shall be credited to the fund. The fund shall be available for the payment of all expenditures of the Director for loans, participations, and guaranties authorized under [titles III of this Act] *this part*.

#### PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES

SEC. 311. The Director is authorized to develop and implement a program of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which will meet, or substantially and primarily contribute to meeting, the special needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children.

#### PART C—DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 321. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

#### PART D—INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

SEC. 331. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make indemnity payments, at a fair market value, to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use. Such indemnity payments shall continue to each dairy farmer until he has been reinstated and is again allowed to dispose of his milk on commercial markets.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The authority granted under this section shall expire on June 30, 1967.

### TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such [enterprises;] *enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals; and to mobilize for these objectives private as well as public managerial skills and resources.*

## LOANS, PARTICIPATIONS, AND GUARANTIES

SEC. 402. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years, to any small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and regulations issued thereunder), or to any qualified person seeking to establish such a concern, when he determines that such loans will assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, with particular emphasis on **[employment of the long-term unemployed]** *the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals: Provided, however, That no such loans shall be made, participated in, or guaranteed if the total of such Federal assistance to a single borrower outstanding at any one time would exceed \$25,000. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may defer payments on the principal of such loans for a grace period and use such other methods as he deems necessary and appropriate to assure the successful establishment and operation of such concern. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may, in his discretion, as a condition of such financial assistance, require that the borrower take steps to improve his management skills by participating in a management training program approved by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration: Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall encourage, as far as possible, the participation of the private business community in the program of assistance to such concerns.*

**[(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay all or part of the costs necessary to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance, or similar assistance with respect to persons or small business concerns which receive or may be eligible for assistance under subsection (a). Financial assistance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 208 of this Act.]**

(b) To the extent necessary or appropriate to carry out the programs provided for in this title the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall have the same powers as are conferred upon the Director by section 602 of this Act. *To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary.*

## LOAN TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 403. Loans made pursuant to section 402 (including immediate participation in and guaranties of such loans) shall have such terms and conditions as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall determine, subject to the following limitations—



- (a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;
- (b) the financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;
- (c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;
- (d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may determine to be consistent with its purposes: *Provided, however,* That the rate of interest charged on loans made in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) shall not exceed the rate currently applicable to new loans made under section 6 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2505); and
- (e) fees not in excess of amounts necessary to cover administrative expenses and probable losses may be required on loan guaranties.

#### **[LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

**[SEC. 404.** No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another or in financing subcontractors to enable them to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.]

#### **DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

*SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.*

#### **LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

*SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.*

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

SEC. 406. (a) *The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.*

(b) *Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—*

(1) *planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;*

(2) *the identification and development of new business opportunities, and the stimulation of new private capital resources through the use of guarantees, pooling arrangements, or otherwise;*

(3) *the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;*

(4) *the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;*

(5) *the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and*

(6) *the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.*

(c) *The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.*

(d) *To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.*

(e) *The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.*

(f) *The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608.*



## DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. [405] 407. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration *and the Secretary of Commerce* shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years.

\* \* \* \* \*

## TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

## PART A—ADMINISTRATION

## OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 601. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and [four] *six* Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director and the Assistant Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5(b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z-3(b)), at any time after one year from the date of enactment hereof the President may, by complying with the procedures established by that Act, provide for the transfer of the Office from the Executive Office of the President and for its establishment elsewhere in the executive branch as he deems appropriate.

(c) The compensation of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(e) The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

## AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 602. In addition to the authority conferred upon him by other sections of this Act, the Director is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this Act, to—

(a) appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions, and, except as otherwise provided herein, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et. seq.);

(b) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(c) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act; and members of such committees (including the National Advisory Council established in section 605), other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Director, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in subsection (b) with respect to experts and consultants;

(d) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this Act and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this Act and authorize the redelegation thereof subject to provisions to assure the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and such other agencies at all operating levels, which shall include the furnishing of complete operational information by such other agencies to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the furnishing of such information by such Office to such other agencies;

(e) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(f) accept in the name of the Office, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, or of any title thereof, any money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(g) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(h) allocate and expend, or transfer to other Federal agencies for expenditure, funds made available under this Act as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions hereof, including (without regard to the provisions of section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code) expenditure for construction, repairs, and capital improvements;

(i) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 4154 of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;



(j) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(k) notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guaranties made by him pursuant to titles III and IV of this Act;

(1) collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(m) expend funds made available for purposes of this Act—

(1) for printing and binding, in accordance with applicable law and regulation; and

(2) without regard to any other law or regulation, for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this subparagraph (2)—

(A) except when necessary to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this Act, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and

(B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and

(n) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such functions and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 603. (a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5 of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs and receives assistance under this Act shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of such title any agency receiving assistance under this Act (other than part C of title I) shall be deemed to be a State or local agency.

(b) The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission is **[authorized]** *directed* to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or otherwise to insure that programs assisted under this Act are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in the identification of such program with, any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office: *Provided, That the Director may issue such regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort to become a registered voter according to the laws of the State of his residence*

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

SEC. 604. (a) There is hereby established an Economic Opportunity Council, which shall consult with and advise the Director in carrying out his functions, including the coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government.

(b) The Council shall include the Director, who shall be Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of Selective Service, and such other agency heads as the President may designate, or delegates thereof.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 605. (a) There is hereby established in the Office a National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the Advisory Council), to be composed of twenty-one members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such members shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Director shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Council.

(b) The Advisory Council shall—

(1) advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act; and

(2) review the effectiveness and the operation of programs under this Act and make recommendations concerning (A) the improvement of such programs, (B) the elimination of duplication of effort, and (C) the coordination of such programs with other Federal programs designed to assist low income individuals and families.

Such recommendations shall include such proposals for changes in this Act as the Advisory Council deems appropriate.

(c) The Advisory Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31



of each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1967. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

### **Sec. 606. (Redesignated as section 306)**

#### **LABOR STANDARDS**

SEC. 607. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating of projects; buildings and works which are federally assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

#### **REPORTS**

SEC. 608. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities of the Office during such year.

#### **[DEFINITIONS**

**[SEC. 609. As used in this Act:**

**[(a)** The term “State” means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and the term “United States”, when used in a geographical sense, includes the foregoing and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

**[(b)** The term “agency”, unless the context requires otherwise, means department, agency, or other component of a Federal, State, or local governmental entity.

**[(c)** The term “family,” in the case of a Job Corps enrollee, means—

**[(1)** the spouse or child of an enrollee, and

**[(2)** any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee.]

#### **DEFINITIONS**

*SEC. 609. As used in this Act—*

*(1) the term “State” means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of “State” shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223 of this Act this*

*term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;*

*(2) the term "financial assistance" when used in titles I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services; and*

*(3) the term "permanent resident of the United States" when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

#### PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The Director shall [carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary] *work in cooperation with the Director of the Administration on Aging* (1) to develop programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, and education for the elderly poor under the provisions of this Act, and (2) to determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority.

#### COMPARABILITY OF WAGES

SEC. 610-1. (a) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that persons employed in carrying out programs financed under part A of title I or [part A of] title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall not receive compensation at a rate which is (1) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid in the area where the program is carried out to persons providing substantially comparable services, or in excess of the average rate of compensation paid to persons providing substantially comparable services in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment, whichever is higher or (2) less than the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

(b) Not later than sixty days after the close of the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for submission to the Congress a list of the names of all officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitations set forth in subsection (a) of this section and who were receiving at the end of such fiscal year a salary of \$10,000 or more per year, together with the amount of compensation paid to each such person and the amount of such compensation paid from funds advanced or granted pursuant to this Act. No grant, contract or agreement shall be



made under any of the provisions of this Act referred to in subsection (a) of this section which does not contain adequate provisions to assure the furnishing of information required by the preceding sentence.

(c) No person whose compensation exceeds \$6,000 per annum and is paid pursuant to any grant, contract, or agreement authorized under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 per centum the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the Director may grant exceptions for specific cases. In determining salary in preceding employment for one regularly employed for a period of less than twelve months per year, the salary shall be adjusted to an annual basis.

#### LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE VOLUNTARILY POOR

*SEC. 610-2. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligibility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty, such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his health, age, education, and ability.*

### PART B—COORDINATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

#### COORDINATION

SEC. 611. (a) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are carried out in a coordinated manner—

(1) the Director is authorized to call upon other Federal agencies to supply such statistical data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to discharge his responsibilities under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies;

(2) Federal agencies which are engaged in administering programs related to the purposes of this Act, or which otherwise perform functions relating thereto, shall—

(A) cooperate with the Director in carrying out his duties and responsibilities under this Act; and

(B) carry out their programs and exercise their functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable law, assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(3) the President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (2) shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

(b) In order to insure that all existing Federal agencies are utilized to the maximum extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

(c) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

(d) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (c); and

(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

#### PREFERENCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

SEC. 612. To the extent feasible and consistent with the provisions of law governing any Federal program and with the purposes of this Act, the head of each Federal agency administering any Federal program is directed to give preference to any application for assistance or benefits which is made pursuant to or in connection with a community action program approved pursuant to title II of this Act.

#### INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 613. (a) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum extent possible, and to insure that information concerning such programs and other relevant information is readily available in one place to public officials and other interested persons, the Director is authorized as he deems appropriate to collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute such information, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset to such cost), and make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation.

(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. The Director is further authorized to make grants from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

(c) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum possible extent, and in order to insure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of such programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure



prompt distribution to States and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations and guidelines, required by such agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.

#### PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL CONTROL

SEC. 614. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system..

#### DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 615. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

#### TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations under any title of this Act, or any Act authorizing appropriations for any such title (other than part C of title I), not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out programs or activities under any such title may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out programs or activities under any other such title; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available under any title by more than 10 per centum.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS

SEC. 617. The Director shall adopt appropriate administrative measures to assure that benefits of this Act will be distributed equitably between residents of rural and urban areas.

#### LIMITATIONS ON ADDITIONAL SUPER GRADES

SEC. 618. No additional positions above those authorized on the date of enactment of this section shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, in the Classification categories of GS 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code in the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices.

#### LIMITATION ON FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 619. The total administrative expenses, including the compensation of Federal employees, incurred by Federal agencies under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for that year: *Provided, however,* That grants, subsidies, and contributions, and payments to individuals, other than Federal employees shall not be counted as an administrative expense.

## PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION

SEC. 620. The Director and the heads of any other Federal departments or agencies to which the conduct of programs described in this Act have been delegated shall take such steps as may be desirable and appropriate to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in the programs described in this Act. The Director and such other agency heads shall submit at least annually to the Congress a joint or combined report describing the actions taken and the progress made under this section.

## TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

## PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 701. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

(1) the first \$85 plus one-half of the excess over \$85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under title I or II of this Act or any program assisted under such title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan;

(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under such title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual; and

(3) no grant made to any family under title III of this Act shall be regarded as income or resources of such family in determining the need of any member thereof under such approved State plan.

(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before July 1, [1965] 1968, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a); *nor shall funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the State from complying with the requirements of such subsection, until the first day of the fourth month after the State legislature next adjourns following the effective date of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.*

## [TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

## [STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

[SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to enable and encourage volunteers to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty,



by living and working among deprived people of all ages in urban areas, rural communities, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, and Job Corps camps and centers; to stimulate, develop, and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service; and, through such programs, to encourage individuals from all walks of life to make a commitment to combating poverty in their home communities, both as volunteers and as members of the helping professions.

#### **[AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH VISTA PROGRAM**

**[SEC. 802. (a)** The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

**[(1)** upon request of State or local agencies or private non-profit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

**[(2)** in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

**[(b)** The referral or assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers shall not be so referred or assigned so duties or work in any State, nor shall programs under section 805 be conducted in any State without the consent of the Governor.

#### **[VOLUNTEER SUPPORT**

**[SEC. 803.** The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and to volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed \$50 per month (or, in the case of volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, not to exceed \$75 per month), such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

#### **[APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW**

**[SEC. 804. (a)** Each volunteer under section 802 shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United

States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

[(b) All volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

[(c) For the purposes of subchapter III, chapter 73 of title V of the United States Code, a volunteer under this title shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

#### [SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

[SEC. 805. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with appropriate public or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, special programs in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Such programs shall be designed to encourage more effective or better coordinated use of volunteer services, including services of low-income persons, or to make opportunities for volunteer experience available, under proper supervision and for appropriate periods, to qualified persons who are unable to make long-term commitments or who are engaged in or preparing to enter work where such experience may be of special value and in the public interest. Individuals who serve or receive training in such programs shall not, by virtue of such service or training, be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those related to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits; except that such individuals who receive their principal support or compensation with respect to such service or training directly from the Director or his agent for payment shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) of this Act. Not to exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

#### [DURATION OF PROGRAM

[SEC. 806. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.]



## TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

### VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 801. *This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.*

#### PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

SEC. 810. (a) *The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—*

(1) *in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;*

(2) *in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities; and*

(3) *in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.*

(b) *The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.*

#### TERMS OF SERVICE

SEC. 811. (a) *Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours,*

at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

#### SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 5582).

(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

### PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

#### COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon



programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

#### SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

### PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

## PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

*SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons and older persons membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies in the various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.*

## APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

*SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.*

*(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a)(2)(B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.*

## SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

*SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.*

*(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.*

*(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.*

## DURATION OF PROGRAM

*SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.*



## MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned, oppose enactment of S. 2388 (Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967) in the form reported by the committee. We favor a fundamental redirection of the war on poverty to meet the needs of our fellow citizens who are trapped in poverty.

America today desperately needs and effective program to help the poor in a meaningful way. Our proposals would provide for proper administration of major segments of the existing antipoverty programs while redirecting the remainder strongly toward overcoming unemployment and dependency. It would use Federal funds in large part as seed money to help enlist the enormous resources of our free enterprise economy and to increase the scope of State participation.

Our opportunity crusade proposals, for example, would authorize an annual Federal expenditure of less than \$1.4 billion, but would generate a total investment of public and private funds well over \$3 billion. The resultant revitalization of the program is impossible to calculate in dollars.

### COMMITTEE BILL IS WINDOW DRESSING

The Democratic majority rejected out of hand all major proposals for progressive changes in the present program. The majority tinkered with various window-dressing changes that would cure none of the basic problems with these programs. Then they came to the section on community action, and responded to the most regressive demands of members of their party who apparently have little sympathy for the concept of involvement of the poor. They carved the very heart out of community action in an attempt to pick up enough votes to pass this bill.

We have long proposed that State and local governments be involved in community action in a truly meaningful way. The majority, having utterly ignored such suggestions for 3 years, overreacted, and now propose to turn the whole program over to city hall.

Other than this, and an unfortunate dilution of the residential character of the Job Corps by the addition of a nonresidential component, the committee bill would not substantially change the faltering "War on Poverty."

### OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE CHARTS A NEW COURSE

The proposals rejected by the majority would chart a new course for the "War on Poverty" and give new hope that the problems of poverty in America can indeed be solved without bitter and interminable dissension and without squandering tax moneys in a time of fiscal crisis.

We would make the following basic changes:

1. Community action programs would be continued but would be reoriented in a major degree toward helping the poor obtain

decent jobs; agencies would continue to be independent with a strong representation of the poor, but there would be an effective mechanism for the participation of State governments and an assured role for local governments.

2. The taint of politics and of political manipulation—which characterizes the program at all levels of administration and which would be institutionalized by the committee bill—would be removed.

3. New initiatives—such as the establishment of an Industry Youth Corps and the automation of job opportunity data—would be taken to strengthen employment opportunities and to involve the enormous capabilities of the private economy in providing training and jobs.

4. Education programs (such as Headstart, Job Corps, Upward Bound, and In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps) would be transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; programs having a basic manpower orientation, such as the out-of-school NYC, would be transferred to the Secretary of Labor to be conducted in conjunction with manpower development and training;

5. The Job Corps would be phased into the State vocational education system to provide residential vocational education for young people who need it, and to strengthen our national efforts in vocational education.

6. The States would be given a key role in Headstart while retaining parental and nonpublic agency participation, and “Follow-Through” would be expanded into an early years program to include elementary children who have not had the advantage of Headstart experience, but who need extra educational, social, health and nutritional services in the early elementary grades.

#### COMMITTEE BILL LEADS TO A DEAD END

The committee bill continues the dead end approach of doing everything with Federal dollars; even in a time of fiscal crisis it ignores the many possibilities to generate private investment in meeting the problems of the poor. This approach leads to a dead end, because unless private industry is involved in these programs employment will continue to be of the make-work variety.

The committee bill leads to a dead end in other respects, as well. It is perfectly apparent that the Office of Economic Opportunity has neither the competence nor the structure to administer educational and job training programs, yet the committee bill leaves it with this power. We believe that there is at least a role for the OEO in administering a community action program with greater State participation, and in serving as a coordinating agency. We would leave it with these functions in the hope that once unburdened of tasks it is not equipped to perform—the agency might do an effective job.

Even most of the majority members have acknowledged that the functions we propose to transfer should be “spun off” to other agencies charged with responsibility in these fields, but “at a later date.” We



think that the time is now to start putting together an effective war on poverty.

When this bill reaches the floor of the House, we shall attempt to offer a legislative package which will carry out the objectives outlined in these views.

#### POVERTY PROGRAM IN DEEP TROUBLE

The war on poverty is in deep trouble, a situation which has very little connection with the stringencies of the present crisis of the budget. It is in trouble because of its failure to meet the real needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor for decent jobs; because all over the country it has been mired in partisan politics and factionalism; because a very large part of the funds appropriated to help the poor has been spent for grossly inflated administrative expenses and high salaries; because its management has been incredibly inept; because programs such as the Job Corps have produced dismal results at enormous costs when administered by a Federal agency having no competence in education; and because it has failed to involve the resources of either private industry or the States in any meaningful way. Fundamentally, American taxpayers are no longer willing to tolerate such a shoddy performance.

#### DISCUSSION OF MAJOR ISSUES

The foregoing comments point up the deep divisions within the committee on the fundamental issues that will, in turn, be decided on the floor of the House of Representatives. These issues tend to fall into three major categories: The future role and structure of the community action program; the administration at the Federal level of programs which are primarily educational or training for employment; and the extent of the involvement of private and other non-Federal resources in meeting the needs of the poor.

We hope that the following discussion will be helpful to both Members of Congress and the general public in putting these issues in perspective and understanding the crucial differences between our proposal and the committee bill.

#### THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

Despite all of the justified and well-documented criticisms of the community action program, it does—in our judgment—hold a great, though largely unrealized, potential for helping to break the cycle of poverty at critical points. There are, however, some absolutely essential conditions for the success of this program:

- (1) It must represent the felt needs of the poor through a genuine and effective representation in the decisionmaking process;
- (2) It must operate through independent agencies in which local public officials have a strong voice and with which the State can participate in a stronger role in the program.
- (3) It must be disengaged so thoroughly from local political struggles, both partisan and nonpartisan, that it can become neither the instrument nor the target of political factionalism; and
- (4) It must be redirected toward given the highest priority to overcoming the unemployment, underemployment, and hopeless

dependence upon welfare which lies at the heart of the condition of poverty.

The committee bill fails so miserably as a measure to do any of these things that it offends both those who have been the strongest defenders and those who have been the most vigorous opponents of CAP. The bill fails most of all in its abandonment of the concept of an independent CAP in which the the poor themselves can have an effective voice.

The committee bill provides that "Community action agencies shall be a State or a political subdivision of a State \* \* \*" and all else that follows about participation of the poor is thereby rendered largely meaningless. In attempting to remedy the administrative vagaries and operating excesses of the program, the committee has reversed itself 180 degrees and turned the entire program over to city hall politicians—not as a partner with the poor and with business, labor, and social organizations but as the dominant and controlling power.

The consequences of this action are all too obvious. Where city hall is unsympathetic to the needs of the poor or to this program, the CAP is dead without the decency of a burial; where city hall seizes upon CAP as an instrument for political power, it will become just that and nothing more; where city hall is sympathetic to the needs of the poor and too scrupulous to use the program for political advantage, it will nevertheless dominate it to such an extent that effective participation of the poor (particularly when it becomes abrasive) cannot be realized. In short, CAP would be the creature of the dominant political organization.

If this is the price paid to "save" the community action program in the House of Representatives, the program seems hardly worth the effort.

The true intent of the majority with respect to CAP was further illuminated by their action on an amendment (proposed by Mr. Gardner) to absolutely forbid the use of the program for political purposes. In place of a positive requirement of law, they substituted a much weaker provision leaving it up to the Director of OEO to issue regulations and impose requirements. Considering the history of the OEO operation—which is notorious as a highly paid refuge for Democratic politicians and political managers between political engagements—this is like leaving the cat at home to watch the bird.

Having turned the CAP program over to city hall and having empowered the OEO Director to define and enforce restrictions against political activity in the program, the majority has created a bonanza for political patronage.

There are effective and constructive ways to assure a voice for State and local government in the operation of community action programs and to involve the positive contribution of State and local resources. Our proposals—which were casually dismissed in toto by the majority—provided for State involvement through a State bonus community action program which would give financial assistance to the States to involve State government in assisting community action and other antipoverty programs and in coordinating State, local, and Federal programs. At the local level, we provided for the representation of local public officials on community action boards.



But our proposals—unlike the committee bill—would preserve the CAP agencies as independent entities. Without this crucial factor, the program loses its very reason for existence.

Finally, despite all the evidence that CAP has failed to reach the poor in a meaningful way, the committee bill proposes no basic redirection of the elements of the program, as opposed to its administrative structure. Our contention is that the basic thrust of community action programs should be toward eliminating the fundamental conditions of poverty—hard core unemployment and underemployment.

We have proposed that the major concern of community action should be the elimination of unemployment (including sporadic employment in low-wage jobs requiring no training). With unemployment running up to 40 percent of the work force in the inner city ghettos (and just as high in areas of Appalachia) jobs should be the first order of business for any antipoverty effort.

There are many, many constructive tasks in this field that could best be carried out by an independent, alert community action agency. Merely locating the unemployed and informing them of training opportunities is a major task not fulfilled by any governmental agency, and it is one best undertaken by those who have the confidence of or at least some contact with, the poor. The positive involvement of employers and labor unions in training and other employment programs should be a part of every community action program. When these things are done the further possibilities for effective action are limited only by the imagination and ingenuity of people working together within a community. Transportation problems could be attacked; day care centers should be established for the children of employed mothers; health and vocational rehabilitation services could be made available to those who are unaware of their existence; and a wide variety of special training programs could be established.

The committee bill fails to give this emphasis to the fundamental cause of poverty. It thereby perpetuates the past failures of the community action programs.

In originally offering the Opportunity Crusade, we sought a more effective kind of community action. During 7 weeks of committee hearings and 3 weeks of markup, we have been refining and sharpening our proposals to concentrate even more on creating employment opportunities in a free enterprise economy, and we have sought the advice of a wide spectrum of organizations and individuals for this purpose.

Accordingly, we are prepared to offer a far more effective community action program than the one contained in S. 2388 as amended by the committee majority.

#### TRANSFER OF HEADSTART

If the community action program is the most controversial part of the "War on Poverty," the Headstart component (accounting for nearly one-half of the CAP funds for fiscal 1967) is easily the most accepted part. Yet so little was preschool education considered by the planners of the Economic Opportunity Act that Republican members of this committee had to call the only expert witness on child

problems heard during the 1964 hearings. This was consistent with the view—advanced by minority members long before 1964—that preschool programs are a key to interrupting the cycle of educational failure, unemployment, and poverty.

We support the Headstart program and, moreover, believe that it contains important features not generally found in regular school programs, such as the involvement of parents, provisions for dealing with health, nutrition, and family problems, and the utilization of the resources of private agencies and organizations. We propose to retain these features in a continuation of the program.

Headstart, despite its comparative success, has suffered unnecessarily from the administrative weaknesses of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its operations. Approval and funding of projects has been subject to long delays and in many areas to interminable disputes between the CAP and the public schools, or between contending private groups. There has also been inadequate coordination between Headstart and similar preschool programs funded under title I of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act. Weaknesses have developed further in the failure to followup on Headstart children when they reach the regular schools, a problem that is unlikely to be cured by the initiation of a "Follow-Through" program delegated to a Federal agency other than the one administering Headstart. Our proposed early years program—which is expanded to include both Headstart children and needy children who have not had the advantage of Headstart—would be administered as an extension of Headstart and designed to serve both public and private school children.

There also exists in all too many instances a lack of professional qualifications in the personnel selected to conduct the Headstart program, and a tendency to treat the program as one being designed primarily to employ the poor rather than to prepare children for learning. As a result of all these factors, even Headstart has lagged far behind its potential. Accordingly, we propose that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare administer both Headstart and the early years program in close coordination with other educational programs (and provided with a stronger component of health, nutritional, and social services, as well).

We have proposed a method for accomplishing this transfer that would not result in losing the benefits of parental involvement or participation of community action agencies and private organizations. On the contrary, our proposal would continue this valuable non-public-school involvement while assuring far closer statewide coordination with preschool programs conducted under the complete management of the schools.

We propose to establish State commissions broadly representative of community action agencies, public and private education, and other health and social welfare agencies and organizations (analogous to the State commissions which smoothly administer the Higher Education Facilities Act and related programs), which would plan and administer Headstart and early years programs in the States and approve projects to be funded by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Local projects might be conducted by the public schools with the approval of local CAP agencies, or by private schools, or by



special Headstart agencies. In any event, they would be coordinated with other preschool programs, keyed to the overall needs of the State, and assured a high degree of professionalism in their conduct.

There have been many suggestions that the early years program be placed completely under the U.S. Office of Education and run through the public school system. This is the intent of an amendment adopted in the Senate. While we are sympathetic to a change in administration at the Federal level we see great benefit in tying these projects closely to Headstart and retaining a high degree of community and private agency participation. Moreover, the early years projects should also contain as a major element health, nutritional, and social services which could best be assured through administration at the departmental level, bringing to the programs the combined expertise of education, public health, and Children's Bureau programs.

Our proposal has taken into consideration the possibility that some States might be slow to establish a suitable commission, or that State plans might not be operative for a period of time, or that they might not comply with the requirements of the act, and we have provided a "bypass" (similar to that in school lunch and title II of ESEA) to enable the Secretary to fund programs directly in any of these circumstances.

### "UPWARD BOUND"

The "Upward Bound" program of OEO is designed to assist able, but needy and educationally deprived high school students to prepare for college. It, therefore, fits precisely the objective of the educational opportunity grant program authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, and should be administered as a part of that program so as to complement and augment it.

### PHASING JOB CORPS INTO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Job Corps has been as tragic a failure as anything attempted under the Economic Opportunity Act. It has fundamental weaknesses in concept which have been painfully magnified by weak and often unqualified administration. The real tragedy is that, properly handled, a program of residential vocational education could be a vital element in a national vocational program for disadvantaged young people.

This history of this provision is instructive. In 1963 the Congress, and this committee, did some of its finest work in reshaping the National Vocational Education Act. The new act directed federally supported vocational programs toward training for employment; it authorized area and regional vocational-technical programs; it freed the administration of the program from the inflexible and traditional categories of training; it modernized the legislative definition of vocational agriculture; and it authorized sufficient funding to revitalize vocational education.

Had section 14 been implemented we could now have a splendid residential vocational program in most, perhaps all, States. But the Johnson administration, in typical fashion, wanted a huge and dramatic effort as a part of its "War on Poverty." The result was the Job Corps—a hasty revival of the CCC program of the 1930's—and instructions that it was to have maximum impact prior to the 1964 elections.

The effect has not been without drama; it has been a dramatic flop with overtones of classical tragedy.

We propose now to implement section 14. We would transfer the Job Corps to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with instructions to proceed to implement it through or in close conjunction with the 1963 Vocational Education Act. This would require a period of transition in order to permit continued operation of existing Job Corps facilities until they could be phased out or phased into State vocational systems. In this way, there would be no disruption of training programs for current trainees, arrangements would be made to accommodate trainees who would not have access to a residential facility in their State, and the substantial investment in Job Corps facilities would not be thrown away.

It is imperative that this transition be started immediately. Our first concern is for the young men and women who are not receiving either adequate training or adequate placement help from the existing Job Corps operation. Our second concern is for the long-range future of vocational education, which in every State should include residential components for area vocational-technical schools in order to meet the educational needs of all young men and women; ultimately this will result in a far greater training capacity than could otherwise be realized, and with a consequent strengthening of the entire vocational system. Finally, we are deeply concerned that the entire concept of residential training may be lost in a public revulsion against enormously high costs and pitifully low performance in terms of results. In our considered judgment, the Job Corps has no future at all in its existing structure.

Amendments adopted by the committee give additional urgency to the proposed transfer. S. 2388, as amended, authorizes the Director to provide for both residential and nonresidential training in the facilities, and for their utilization in programs for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It also authorizes an expanded program of educational research. Thus, the Job Corps is being converted into a structure that would parallel the regular vocational educational system and duplicate existing educational research and demonstration programs. If the residential character of the Job Corps is to be thus eroded (and this was the primary rationale for its creation), then there is all the more reason to have it administered under vocational education.

An additional strength of administration through State vocational systems is that the program should not be exclusively residential, but according to all the expert advice we have received on the matter, could most profitably be conducted in connection with area vocational and vocational-technical schools. In this manner, the residential trainees would not be isolated from the general educational structure (or socially isolated, for that matter), but would be a part of an educational complex combining all the strengths of residential and non-residential training, with greatly increased administrative flexibility in meeting individual needs and far greater cost effectiveness.

The only way all of these objectives can be met is by phasing the Job Corps program into the State systems of vocational education to be operated as residential vocational education centers in conjunction with area vocational schools.



We would leave open the question of whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare might continue the operation of a limited number of conservation camps under delegation to the Departments of Agriculture or the Interior. He would have to assess the needs for such training and the employment prospects for graduates, as well as the possibility of State operation.

### TRANSFER OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is supposed to be a combination of in-school work-study programs (similar or identical to the 1963 Vocational Education Act work-study program and out-of-school work-training programs). On the whole, only the in-school portion of the program has had any success, and this due to management by school authorities.

The out-of-school program, typically, has consisted of make-work projects having absolutely no value as training. Both of these programs were plagued initially by considerable scandal, including payroll padding and flagrant political abuse. Mere delegation of authority to the Department of Labor to run the program, with OEO calling the tune, has not proved a satisfactory solution to the problem.

We propose to transfer the in-school part of NYC to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be conducted as a work-study program in the schools and closely tied to the administration of the Vocational Education Act, among others. It simply does not make good sense—even if OEO could provide competent administration—to scatter education programs among agencies having no responsibility for education. In deed, one could well argue that if this were a proper responsibility of OEO large parts of existing education programs, such as title I of ESEA and the education opportunity grants, should be transferred to that agency. We might end up with one federally financed school system for poor children and another locally controlled system for more fortunate children. We regard movements in this direction as tragically and absurdly wrong.

At the same time, we believe with equal conviction that the place for a national manpower program is the Department of Labor. Accordingly, we would transfer the out-of-school portion of NYC to that Department, to be administered in close conjunction with the Manpower Development and Training Act. Young men and women who are out of school and out of work desperately need solid training to fit them for useful and remunerative employment in the private economy; they do not need a make-work program euphemistically described as “work experience.”

Fortunately, the entire Neighborhood Youth Corps program fits perfectly into the programs and responsibilities of these two departments, and there is neither a defensible rationale nor a public purpose for leaving it under the auspices of OEO.

### A REVIEW ON THE “WAR ON POVERTY”

#### A. JOB CORPS

When the Job Corps began 3 years ago, apparently Mr. Shriver felt it so necessary to get off to a crash beginning that OEO officials failed, or did not have the time, to make the necessary preparations for

a successful program. No provision was made for program evaluation, placement of graduates in jobs, or followup studies, to mention just a few neglected areas. Ever since this hasty beginning, both performance and reputation of the Job Corps have suffered greatly.

Two years too late an evaluation system has finally been placed in operation, by which the Job Corps can evaluate the accomplishments of corpsmen and effectiveness of centers and the program in general. As noted in a report published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, this comes "after more than \$486 million has been spent on 60,000 enrollees who have already left the Job Corps and who, for the purposes of evaluation, are lost."

Because of Job Corps complete inability to evaluate their program in mid-1966 private polling firms were contracted to survey terminated corpsmen for followup information. Through these surveys and other private surveys and analyses, we are fortunate to have available data on which to base some judgment of the effectiveness of the Job Corps program in fulfilling the purposes of title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act. A few of the major conclusions which concern us greatly include:

### Dropouts

It is clearly indicated the degree of success of a corpsman is closely related to the length of stay in the Job Corps program. Studies indicate and Job Corps officials themselves estimate that a minimum of 6 months educational and skill training within the center is required to make any significant impact upon a youth's employability. With this in mind, we are alarmed to note that in fiscal 1967, more than 40 percent of enrollees terminated in less than 3 months and another 24 percent terminated in less than 6 months, for a total of 67 percent of the enrollees who in the Job Corps own words do not stay long enough to make a significant impact on their status.

### Training

Only a small percent of corpsmen are working in the job for which they were trained. One study concludes 23 percent of all enrollees are in any way using their Job Corps training in their employment. One of the reasons for this appears to be inadequate training. According to Louis Harris & Associates, while 65 percent of all corpsmen (43 percent of graduates) felt their training was helpful, only one-quarter thought they had received enough training to get a job in that field. It is interesting to note that several "graduates" responded to one survey they had not "completed their course" and another survey noted that only 60 percent of urban graduates and only 31 percent of conservation center graduates cite "course completion" as a reason for leaving.

### Placement

The Job Corps has made little attempt to place its enrollees. Approximately one out of 10 enrollees receives any placement assistance and these tend to be the most employable youths. Few dropouts receive any assistance. Our concern in this area is for the many youths who are either unemployed or not utilizing their training which could be prop-



erly placed with organized Job Corps assistance. At a cost of \$8,046 per enrollee, we feel the Job Corps should make a concerted effort to place all enrollees in employment in which they can utilize and further the training they have received.

### Meaningful Gains

Job Corps officials proclaim success with 53 percent of enrollees employed. However, since 58 percent were working when they enrolled this does not represent to us any meaningful gain. We are further concerned because most enrollees do not remain with their jobs for any length of time and reasons for leaving employment indicate that not enough emphasis is given in their training to attitudinal or character development and many cases reflect inadequate skill training.

Based on a thorough review of all studies available we can only come to the conclusion that the Job Corps has not been meeting the needs of these youths who so desperately need a second chance.

### Costs

From the very beginning a major criticism of the Job Corps has been the extremely high cost, commonly referred to in a cost-per-enrollee figure. In past years, Job Corps officials have repeatedly denied the \$11,000 and \$15,000 per enrollee figures which have been estimated. Now they are admitting to these high cost figures in the past but are saying the "new Job Corps" operating costs are very low. We tend to believe the costs have been reduced but still feel the OEO figures do not present a true picture of costs.

In their congressional presentation this past June, Job Corps officials claim centers are operating under the \$7,500 cost per enrollee limit placed on direct operating costs by Congress in 1966 amendments to the act. In reviewing OEO's statistics furnished, we find however, they have interpreted this limitation not as a limit for each center, but collectively, and in actuality only one men's urban center and one women's center are operating below the \$7,500 limitation in fiscal 1967. The 88 conservation centers are, according to OEO, operating at \$6,122 per enrollee level. This, however, as revealed in a study by Sar A. Levitan for a Senate subcommittee, does not include the \$854 per enrollee cost for materials used in training in conservation work. Neither do any of the figures provided for fiscal 1967 (conservation, \$6,122; women's \$8,642; men's urban, \$7,630) include \$600 per enrollee cost for amortization of capital investment or \$603 per enrollee cost for recruitment, screening, placement and Job Corps headquarters and regional expenses. An accurate picture should include these items and would produce an average per enrollee figure of \$8,076 per enrollee, broken down as \$8,664 for enrollees in men's urban centers; \$9,735 for enrollees in women's centers; and \$7,315 for those enrollees in conservation centers. It should be noted here that these figures are for those centers which have been in operation 9 months or more and do not represent startup expenses.

The Job Corps Division justifies this high cost per enrollee figure by saying these youths would all be on welfare and make no contribution to society but for their Job Corps' experience. This argument

does not hold up in view of the high dropout rates, short length of stay in camps, and meager training these youths are receiving. In addition, a survey of those youths who applied for Job Corps but did not show for various reasons indicates that 60 percent of these youths are working and 14 percent have returned to school. The survey concludes the status of the "no-shows" is about the same as the status of the dropouts and discharges who account for two-thirds of all enrollees. Then we are to understand that two-thirds of all Job Corps enrollees, at \$8,076 per enrollee, are no better off than those who did not go to the Job Corps.

### Successes

The receipt of the following letter from the father of a Job Corps "success" with 28 months of Job Corps' training at an estimated total expenditure of \$25,000, however, can only cause us to ask "How many Job Corps successes are really successes?"

Letter to OEO, Job Corps Division, Washington, D.C.; dated September 15, 1967;

Re Gary James Thompson.

"DEAR SIRs:

"Request your consideration for a waiver of time and allow my son, Gary James Thompson to enter the manpower program in Oklahoma City, Okla.

"According to your statistics, and verbally authenticated by Mr. Daniel Lagunas and Mr. Wayne Wallace—Gary has graduated from the Job Corps. In fact, I am informed that he graduated from both basic and advanced electronics.

"Attached is a certificate of participation attesting to the fact that he did attend classes in electronics for 5 months.

"I must admit and compliment those that have contributed to my son's development as a young man. The corps has contributed measurably and without hesitation I admit that I am very proud of him.

"I do take exception however to the end result in training and education. Gary had achieved a very low education level and certainly was not equipped to pursue a course in electronics. Further, the exigencies of the Job Corps in his being moved from one place to another. This did nothing to help his advancement.

"First let us eliminate the moving around. He signed into Poplar Bluff, Mo., on January 30, 1965 (no electronics were offered there, this may be the place he should have stayed). He was transferred to Tongue Point, Oreg., on February 20, 1966, and on closing of that center, transferred to San Marcos, Tex., January 20, 1967. He was released May 29, 1967.

"Gary is still ill-equipped to take his place in society. Uneducated and untrained. We waited for the school year to start, only to find that not one credit can be obtained for his 23 months in the corps.

"A 19-year-old boy cannot fit into a freshman class in high school, and education is the greatest desire of his heart.

"Through this thorough evaluation I have learned one important thing. The boy has a good ability and if I can find the right approach, he will progress rapidly. In taking the Air Force entrance exams he scored 65 on electronics, 55 on mechanical, 45 on administration, and 60 in the general area. However, with a 56 on the Armed Forces qualifying exam he cannot enlist in the Air Force as he is not a high school



graduate. (As a category 4, non-high-school graduate he must score less than 30 on the Armed Forces exam.)

"At the moment, Gary is going to the adult study center high school. However, it will take at least 3 years to obtain a high school diploma in this way. He will undoubtedly be drafted before completion.

"To reiterate, I believe that Gary could qualify for a high school diploma with his current night school studies and the manpower program in less than a year. Respectfully request a waiver to enter him into this retraining program at the earliest possible date.

"Sincerely;

"CARL T. THOMPSON."

Perhaps the explanation for this situation is that centers which this youth attended provided a training program similar to the one at the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Women's Job Corps Center.

### "Job Corps Girls Are Angry \* \* \* And Not Busy

This newspaper headline appeared during the controversy at the Albuquerque center in February 1967, when four counselors resigned their positions with the center charging, among other things, that the educational program at the center was badly organized, and the girls were not learning anything that would be of practical help to them. They also complained that class schedules for enrollees called for only 1, 2, 3, or 4 classes a day involving from 45 minutes to less than 4 hours a day.

One counselor said, "Too many girls stay in bed all morning and loll around all afternoon. By night, they're raring to go."

Records of the center substantiate that there were only from 1 to 4 classes scheduled each day, with classes beginning late in the morning and only running through early afternoon. No classes were held on Saturday or Sunday and only driver's education classes were scheduled in the evenings. Average class time reflected on the schedules was approximately 9 to 12 hours a week, with some as low as 6 hours a week. A few interesting schedules are noted:

#### *Enrollee A*

Date of entry: May 19, 1966; vocation: Not indicated.

Schedule:

	<i>Per week</i>
Creative writing.....	2'15"
Photography .....	4'30"
Driver's education.....	8'
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>14'45"</b>

#### *Enrollee B*

Date of entry: Sept. 13, 1966; vocation: Not indicated.

Schedule:

Language arts.....	1'30"
Science .....	1'30"
Math .....	1'30"
Physical improvement.....	1'30"
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>6'</b>

*Enrollee C*

Date of entry : Aug. 9, 1966; vocation : NA (nurses aid), LPN (licensed practical nurse). (It is noted there is no LPN program at the center.)

Schedule:

	<i>Per week</i>
First aid -----	2'15''
Citizenship -----	2'15''
English -----	2'15''
Math -----	3'45''
 Total -----	 10'30''

*Enrollee D*

Date of entry : Dec. 27, 1966; vocation : Not indicated.

Schedule:

	<i>Per week</i>
Reading -----	2'15''
Basic science -----	1'30''
Citizenship -----	1'30''
Study skills -----	1'30''
 Total -----	 6'45''

(Note : Cost per enrollee : \$12,658.)

Job Corps officials in a review of the center's program at this time noted the following regarding the vocational program :

"The vocational program needs to be strengthened and reevaluated. It needs to be upgraded \* \* \*.

"There is little evidence of any evaluative analyses of the Corpswomen's individual program and progress in a vocational skill. She should be kept informed of her progress and of her ability. She should know at what level she is at a given time. Corpswomen apparently do not know. There is a great need for vocational guidance at the center. At this moment there is none."

These girls have enrolled in Job Corps because they had a very weak educational background and felt this was a second chance to obtain the educational and vocational training they badly needed. With flimsy curriculum and weak educational programing such as that exhibited at the Albuquerque center, the Job Corps is letting these girls down.

*Fake Curriculum*

In November, the OEO sent out a survey and review team to the center for an investigation, after which the survey and review team reported that Albuquerque was one of the best Job Corps centers for women in the country. This led us to believe that, at a cost to the Federal Government of \$12,658 per girl per year, an intensified training program was being provided which would enable these girls to go on to meaningful remunerative employment.

Yet in February, less than 3 months after the "excellent" rating of the survey and review team, fraudulently prepared schedules were



brought to light, girls were found to be in classes only 6 hours of the total week, and OEO saw to it that the director and assistant director at the Albuquerque center were allowed to "resign."

From what we can learn, the programs of most Job Corps centers are similar to the one at the Pleasanton, Calif., Camp Parks Center, as to which a study of the General Accounting Office noted:

"The effectiveness of the program appears to be adversely influenced by a training day that provides only 5 hours of classroom and laboratory work. The balance of the day is free for counseling and avocational activities. The effectiveness of the program is also adversely influenced by an absentee rate which in some sections has reached 20 percent.

"No standards have been applied to govern entrance into various programs, and an individual's lack of aptitude, as indicated by test scores, is not a controlling factor for entry into the more difficult programs. No studies had been made to show what factors were involved or necessary to successfully complete a program."

### Camp Parks—One of the Best

Job Corps officials have long praised Camp Parks as "one of the best" centers in operation. Thanks to a study conducted by the General Accounting Office on the entire operation at Parks, we are fortunate to have an insight into the actual operations of one of the Job Corps' "best" camps. The following quoted conclusions from this study we think are most revealing:

"\* \* \* while the contractor has reported that a number (enrollees) have been successfully trained and placed, an even larger number have left without completing a training program. Information has not been prepared to show the gains made by individuals during their stay at the center.

"The contractor's initial estimated program costs have been far exceeded in operations, and while positive results have been obtained with some enrollees, we are of the opinion that some costs have been unnecessarily incurred, that disciplinary matters have been laxly and inconsistently handled, and that managerial control of the center's operations can be significantly improved while simultaneously reducing costs.

"Although the center had been in operation for over 18 months at Pleasanton, Calif., the contractor has yet to establish adequate records to provide systematic and centralized information and evaluations showing the progress of enrollees and the effectiveness of the various courses.

"By its very nature, an experimental program to develop new and unique methods to train persons who had previously failed, requires continuous review of each individual's activity to evaluate the effectiveness of existing methods and to ascertain whether different teaching and control techniques are needed. However, this has not been done by the contractor and we found no evidence that OEO has done such work. Development of information on successful techniques and procedures and dissemination to all centers could significantly reduce the number of times the same problem is solved at Government expense.

"The contractor has permitted some individuals with recognized behavior problems to remain in the program \* \* \* the continued

presence of such persons has been extremely disrupting to other enrollees. The potential benefits of rehabilitating a few problem individuals may be far outweighed by the loss of many enrollees who have left the center citing disciplinary problems as their reason. \* \* \* Application of various aspects of employer-employee relationships, including a system for giving or withholding monetary allowances, including the readjustment allowance, could be of particular value.

"We also believe that some of the techniques employed by the Army in their training program have merit and should be considered for use at the center. \* \* \* Army officials advised that their schedule minimizes behavior problems since there is little idle time. Again, the center permits enrollees to enter any vocation they desire, while the Army permits the trainee to enter only those courses in which he can reasonably be expected to succeed.

"We recommend that the Job Corps act to assure that the contractor continue, and expand his efforts to improve enrollee records and program evaluations, and that this data be used by management to effect program improvements. We also recommend that in order to improve control of enrollee behavior that the Job Corps require the center to establish and publish rules of conduct which will provide appropriate procedures to engender conformance."

We recommend that the Job Corps require the center to make a detailed analysis of the instructional television installation and other special equipment, texts, and group tutorials. This analysis should compare the costs involved with the benefits attainable. If the center cannot adequately justify use of these items, they should be made available to other Government activities and the Litton material should be returned for full credit.

### Rosy Picture

This past June, Job Corps officials provided members of the Education and Labor Committee with two large volumes filled with testimony relating glowing reports and statistics which paint a rosy picture of the Job Corps. They say problems of community relations and discipline which have plagued them in the past, are no longer. If we are to believe the Job Corps' version then we must discount as false and nonexistent the following problems which we know to plague the Job Corps:

### Discipline

Even though the officials may be able to discount the "150 student disturbance just short of a riot" occurring inside the Poland Springs, Maine, women's center in April or later disturbances in Tomah, Wis., and Evansville, Ind., which resulted in enrollees from nearby centers being temporarily barred from those cities, as insignificant, they cannot overlook the 2-hour disturbance in New Bedford, Mass., on July 3, 1967, when approximately 200 angry corpsmen were attempting to batter down the gate of the Rodman Center and throwing rocks at police cars and policemen. Before this activity ceased, women and children were evacuated from neighboring residences, for fear of



their safety. Again on October 6, 1967, approximately 100 corpsmen and six policemen were involved in a "scuffle of near-riot proportions" which resulted in the New Bedford City Council passing the following resolution:

Resolution of the New Bedford, Mass., City Council  
October 9, 1967 (adopted by a 9 to 0 vote)

Resolved, that a communication be sent to Mr. Theodore Nelson, Fort Rodman Job Corps Center requesting he discontinue the policy of the Job Corps Center allowing Job Corps students to leave the confines of the Rodman Center without responsible supervision until such time as a Federal police force, provided and paid for by the Federal Government, is made available to exercise the necessary control over Job Corps students while in the city and also at Fort Rodman for the balance of the time the Job Corps is located in New Bedford. . . .

An August disturbance with distinct racial overtones at Camp McCook in Nebraska resulted in 12 corpsmen being fired and 51 more quitting. The Omaha, Nebr., Evening World Herald account of August 3 follows:

63 CORPSMEN AGREE TO LEAVE MCCOOK CAMP

ACTION IS PROMISED AGAINST THE "GUILTY" IN VIOLENCE

MCCOOK, NEBR.—Officials of the Job Corps Conservation Camp here announced Thursday that 63 corpsmen will leave the camp as a result of a disturbance which had racial overtones Sunday night.

Twenty-nine are Negroes and 34 are white youths. Twelve of the Negroes were discharged. And the other 51 corpsmen agreed to leave voluntarily, officials said.

Camp Director Clem Griffin promised that action would be taken against "all who are guilty."

The camp had an enrollment of 158 before the disturbances began. Center officials said up to 55 percent of the trainees were Negro.

The incident brought three Job Corps officials from Washington to investigate the camp. One of the three was Bernie Diamond, Job Corps Community Relations Director.

Mr. Diamond said he was directed to visit the camp to "see what the problem areas are." He said he learned after arriving that the problem was not "as great as indicated."

THE SECOND

Mr. Griffin said the trouble occurred Sunday night when "about a dozen Negro and white boys became involved in a fight in front of the camp's administration building."

Mr. Griffin first said the incident was "just a little misunderstanding." He later said the disturbance was "most definitely motivated by rioting in cities around the country."

After the incident, Red Willow County Attorney Dallas Wood, Jr., said several white corpsmen told him they were "afraid to remain at the camp."

The incident was the second flareup at the camp within 16 months.

In March 1966 eight trainees were arrested and subsequently expelled after a fight in the messhall.

Mr. Griffin said at that time that the fracas was apparently triggered by racial prejudice.

In July 1966 about 50 of the camp's Negro trainees were transferred.

Job Corps officials said the transfers were a move to break up cliques, boost morale, improve racial balance and bring about an enrollment more representative of McCook's population.

## AT OLD BASE

"With no Negro families in McCook, the lack of social outlets frustrates the corpsmen," officials said then.

The camp, sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation, opened in December 1965. It is one of two Federal Job Corps conservation camps in Nebraska. The other is near Chadron.

Located at the old McCook bomber base, the camp trains 16-to-21-years-olds who are out of work, out of school, and from poor families.

Trainees work on access roads, recreational facilities, tree planting, and other projects near the four major dam reservoirs in southwest Nebraska. Basic education is also provided.

## WHITE JOB CORPSMEN "AFRAID To Go BACK"

(By Bill Billotte)

McCook, NEBR.—In the living room of the home of a McCook taxicab driver, four former members of the Jobs Corps Conservation Camp 10 miles northwest of here described a night of terror they experienced.

Two said they were beaten Sunday night when the camp erupted in violence after bitter words had been exchanged at an afternoon swimming party at Butler Lake in Frontier County.

Two, who were with the swimming party, said that the argument continued between Negro and white corpsmen on a bus returning them to camp.

They said the violence occurred at about 9:30 p.m. with some of the corps officials attempting to break it up.

One youth said he was beaten unconscious. Another showed a cut in his hand, inflicted, he said, by a razor blade.

One said that he saw a white corpsman beaten to the floor with mopsticks and pool cues and dragged into the hall outside the honor dormitory.

The fourth youth said he was saved from a beating by friendly Negro corpsmen.

But he said he could not escape during the night because "they were sitting on all the steps with broomsticks and razor blades when I tried to figure a way to sneak out."

The corpsmen interviewed and their time of service:

Robert Queen, 17, Akron, Ohio, 10 months; Tommy Edward James, 16, Axson, Ga., 3 months; George Russell, 17, Omaha, 7 months, and Bruce Dobson, 17, Cold Springs, Tex., 9 months.

One of the youths said, and the others agreed, that they had not been treated unfairly by Job Corps authorities at the camp—that "the authorities are doing the best job they can with the problems they have."

The corpsmen also said that the tensions had been building up since "about Christmas" and that the chief resentment among Negroes seemed to be that the Negroes did not have girls of their own race to date.

The four youths said that the disturbance almost got out of control and that others were beaten more severely than they.

A young Job Corps instructor interviewed at the Red Willow County Fair said a reporter could depend on anything that Bruce Dobson could tell him about the corps.

## OUTSTANDING

The instructor said that Bruce had been outstanding, having been chosen "corpsman of the month" for his performance in education, work, group living, and leadership.

The instructor said that it was also his opinion that the lack of female companionship for Negro corpsmen was one of the major causes of unrest.

"I don't believe it had anything to do with the rioting in the cities," he said, "although I am sure all are fully informed on what is going on."

Young James said he was talking with a girl by telephone in an outdoor booth Sunday evening when the swimmers' bus arrived. He said a Negro banged on the door of the booth and said to "open the door before I kill you."

He said the Negro ripped open the door and "beat me down."

"Several staff members," he said, "pulled him off me and in a daze, I staggered over to a picnic table."



He said he then had his back to the crowd as he sat on the bench.

"That's the last thing I remembered," he said.

Young James was placed in the camp dispensary until Monday afternoon. Then, with two others, he was taken to a McCook clinic.

After two hours of examination and treatment he was taken to the police station where he told authorities he didn't want to return to the camp.

#### "GET OUT"

Young Russell, the Omaha youth, said that he had just returned from a 72-hour pass and was packing his clothes to go to Enders Lake where corpsmen do reclamation work during the week. He said he had finished and went to watch television when a friend yelled: "George, get out, there's going to be a riot."

Young Russell said he ran for the door but it was blocked by Negroes. He said he was punched in the temple and told: "We're going to get you after bed check."

He said he ran through the door, getting his hands cut by a razor in the process, and got away from the base, spending the night under a tractor a quarter mile from the camp.

He said that he and another corpsman walked into the police station the next morning and said they were afraid to return.

Young Dodson, the honor corpsman, said the violence started as he returned to his dormitory after being gone on a 72-hour pass.

"A bunch started after me but some of my Negro friends stepped in and stopped them," he said.

He said that as the night wore on it became evident that his friends would not be able to protect him again. He tried to sneak out.

"But I couldn't make it. They were on all the steps with broom handles, mops, and razor blades," he said.

Young Dobson said he went to town the next afternoon.

#### "GRADUATE"

He said that because of the incident he has been permitted to leave the camp as a "graduate" although he is still short several subjects.

The youth said one of the officials told several corpsmen: "If anyone wants to leave, I won't try to stop you."

Young Queen said he witnessed another corpsman being beaten and dragged into the hall in the honor dorm by about 30 Negroes.

He said he was not hurt during the night but heard discussions about beating him up if he stayed. He said he had requested permission to leave the camp but was told that he would be considered absent without leave and it would go against his record.

Young Queen said he told authorities he was worried more about his physical welfare.

Recently, officials at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center for Women at Astoria, Oreg., declared that center off limits to the Fort Simcoe Job Corps Center of Yakima, Wash., as a result of a recent disturbance.

The following letters and comments from ex-corpsmen and employees reveal more of the problems existing within these centers:

Christopher Weeks, former Job Corps Administrator:

The kid is told when he joins that this is a last ditch attempt to salvage him. So in his first day at camp, he's beaten up; his stuff is swiped the second day; after 10 days he goes home. The Corps has reinforced a failure.

Remarks placed in the Congressional Record of April 13, 1967, by Congressman Gubser:

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said regarding the inadequate supervision of Job Corps trainees, and many serious cases of violence, crime, and wrongdoing have been exposed. I have not drawn a conclusion which condemns the Job Corps on the basis of these reports. However, they have become so numerous and appear so authentic that I believe the time has come for a candid investigation and report from the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have recently received a letter from a mother of a Job Corps trainee at Camp Park in California who informs me that her son observed dope addiction and thievery, and lived in constant fear of harm from hoodlums enrolled at the camp. She has authorized me to place her letter in the Congressional Record but has asked that her name be withheld. I now submit her communication, with my request that the Office of Economic Opportunity thoroughly investigate the situation. The letter follows:

"Mr. CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: I am writing this letter in regards of the horrible situation at Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton, Calif.

"My son joined the Job Corps and was sent to Parks \* \* \* looking forward to taking a 2-year electronics course, but under some terrifying circumstances he was forced to come back home the following Monday morning, early, determined never to return to this place until it is thoroughly free of dope addicts, thieves, and hoodlums.

"He said the last 2 nights he spent there, he was in constant fear, as there is not enough adult supervision for protection to help the few decent boys who are there. A place like this that is supported and run by our Government, and a place like this that is so highly recommended on TV, should be a decent place for the boys who are interested in the education and training they would and could get if it wasn't for the dope addicts and hoodlums who somehow manage to go there.

"As a mother of a boy who has experienced the situation at Parks Job Corps and as a taxpayer, I would like you to arrange a Government investigation and make Parks a nice, clean, and *safe* place for our boys to go and take advantage of this, as it is a very good thing for young people to advance themselves for the future. I would be the last person to ask that it be discontinued, but it should definitely be investigated and made a more proper place for decent boys.

"I am aware of the fact that some boys have made it through this training with very little trouble, but I am also aware of the fact that some of our boys get back from Vietnam and others are not so lucky. I know I should not compare the two situations, but if my son is killed by another boy or man, I would rather know he was fighting for his country and not killed by some boy who would do this to him for a pack of cigarettes or what little money he had on him.

"Please take this into consideration and have the Government investigation as I am sure my son would like to return and so would many more who were forced to leave because of the lack of adult supervision and protection.

"I could tell you much more about this place, but I can't seem to have the right words to put it on paper.

"I'm sure my son would be more than happy to tell you all he knows if you are interested, so feel free to call any time after 4 p.m. as I work.

"Thank you,

\_\_\_\_\_."

The disciplinary problems which exist at various centers may be in part due to the degree of discipline demanded by the center authorities. One conclusion arrived at in the Government agency report on Parks was:

A significant number of the Parks' enrollees have cited these (violence and discipline) reasons for leaving the program. Absenteeism also has been identified as a discipline problem at Parks . . . no centerwide standards of conduct and penalties have been established and enrollees may not be aware of what is expected of them or the consequences of improper behavior.

Furthermore, to accustom the enrollee to the employee-employer relationship that he will eventually encounter, failure of individuals to comply with reasonable standards of attendance and behavior should result in appropriate reduction of pay and allowances. This is an especially critical area since a basic objective of the Job Corps program is to prepare enrollees for employment and since a number of former en-



rollees have been fired for poor attendance or other disciplinary reasons.

### Albuquerque Job Corps Center

The Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women was placed in the national spotlight last February when four counselors resigned their positions leveling charges of poor discipline, employment of a narcotics "pusher" at the center who was responsible for a number of girls becoming pregnant, and poor staff morale and conflicts. These charges resulted in Congresswoman Edith Green, Congressman Thomas G. Morris, and Senator Clinton Anderson demanding an investigation of the Albuquerque Center.

Although OEO public information people promptly "kissed-off" reports of trouble by saying "the charges were a lot of loose talk \* \* \* 99 percent of these things never happened," OEO dispatched an investigative team to the Albuquerque Center which did in its report establish that the majority of the charges were true. Job Corps officials admitted to lax discipline, the employment of a narcotics "pusher" who was believed to be responsible for the pregnancy of one girl, and a serious problem of dissention and conflict among the staff which was considered detrimental to the corpswomen.

### Coexistence

Poor judgment in location of numerous Job Corps centers, particularly those conservation centers in remote areas, has created many of the problems realized in discipline and community relations. One comment of corpsmen during the McCook disturbance was the "chief resentment among Negroes seemed to be that the Negroes did not have girls of their own race to date," or in the words of another McCook corpsman, "The biggest flaw in the camp routine from the standpoint of the Negro corpsman stems from its location." Regarding the Price Job Corps Center in Price, Utah, which has reached 60 percent Negro enrollment at times, Price Mayor Murray Mathis commented: "We must be realistic, the town has no Negro population." The plea of Job Corps officials' in April 1967 for 80 white girls to attend the Saturday night dances at McCoy Job Corps Center, suggests that the remote location of these centers create problems for all enrollees. This problem of isolation affects the operation of approximately 80 percent of all Job Corps centers.

### Hurting Business Community

Job Corps went to the opposite extreme and located several women's centers in the downtown business districts of a number of large cities. Complaints are being voiced by businessmen that the location of these centers is hurting the business community. One businessman in Albuquerque, N. Mex. commented:

The Job Corps is a noble dream but in operation it has certainly hurt Albuquerque downtown business.

Business leaders in Omaha, Nebr., have similar sentiments regarding their two Job Corps establishments in the downtown Regis and Paxton

I have recently received a letter from a mother of a Job Corps trainee at Camp Park in California who informs me that her son observed dope addiction and thievery, and lived in constant fear of harm from hoodlums enrolled at the camp. She has authorized me to place her letter in the Congressional Record but has asked that her name be withheld. I now submit her communication, with my request that the Office of Economic Opportunity thoroughly investigate the situation. The letter follows:

"Mr. CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: I am writing this letter in regards of the horrible situation at Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton, Calif.

"My son joined the Job Corps and was sent to Parks \* \* \* looking forward to taking a 2-year electronics course, but under some terrifying circumstances he was forced to come back home the following Monday morning, early, determined never to return to this place until it is thoroughly free of dope addicts, thieves, and hoodlums.

"He said the last 2 nights he spent there, he was in constant fear, as there is not enough adult supervision for protection to help the few decent boys who are there. A place like this that is supported and run by our Government, and a place like this that is so highly recommended on TV, should be a decent place for the boys who are interested in the education and training they would and could get if it wasn't for the dope addicts and hoodlums who somehow manage to go there.

"As a mother of a boy who has experienced the situation at Parks Job Corps and as a taxpayer, I would like you to arrange a Government investigation and make Parks a nice, clean, and *safe* place for our boys to go and take advantage of this, as it is a very good thing for young people to advance themselves for the future. I would be the last person to ask that it be discontinued, but it should definitely be investigated and made a more proper place for decent boys.

"I am aware of the fact that some boys have made it through this training with very little trouble, but I am also aware of the fact that some of our boys get back from Vietnam and others are not so lucky. I know I should not compare the two situations, but if my son is killed by another boy or man, I would rather know he was fighting for his country and not killed by some boy who would do this to him for a pack of cigarettes or what little money he had on him.

"Please take this into consideration and have the Government investigation as I am sure my son would like to return and so would many more who were forced to leave because of the lack of adult supervision and protection.

"I could tell you much more about this place, but I can't seem to have the right words to put it on paper.

"I'm sure my son would be more than happy to tell you all he knows if you are interested, so feel free to call any time after 4 p.m. as I work.

"Thank you,

\_\_\_\_\_."

The disciplinary problems which exist at various centers may be in part due to the degree of discipline demanded by the center authorities. One conclusion arrived at in the Government agency report on Parks was:

A significant number of the Parks' enrollees have cited these (violence and discipline) reasons for leaving the program. Absenteeism also has been identified as a discipline problem at Parks . . . no centerwide standards of conduct and penalties have been established and enrollees may not be aware of what is expected of them or the consequences of improper behavior.

Furthermore, to accustom the enrollee to the employee-employer relationship that he will eventually encounter, failure of individuals to comply with reasonable standards of attendance and behavior should result in appropriate reduction of pay and allowances. This is an especially critical area since a basic objective of the Job Corps program is to prepare enrollees for employment and since a number of former en-



rollees have been fired for poor attendance or other disciplinary reasons.

### Albuquerque Job Corps Center

The Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women was placed in the national spotlight last February when four counselors resigned their positions leveling charges of poor discipline, employment of a narcotics "pusher" at the center who was responsible for a number of girls becoming pregnant, and poor staff morale and conflicts. These charges resulted in Congresswoman Edith Green, Congressman Thomas G. Morris, and Senator Clinton Anderson demanding an investigation of the Albuquerque Center.

Although OEO public information people promptly "kissed-off" reports of trouble by saying "the charges were a lot of loose talk \* \* \* 99 percent of these things never happened," OEO dispatched an investigative team to the Albuquerque Center which did in its report establish that the majority of the charges were true. Job Corps officials admitted to lax discipline, the employment of a narcotics "pusher" who was believed to be responsible for the pregnancy of one girl, and a serious problem of dissention and conflict among the staff which was considered detrimental to the corpswomen.

### Coexistence

Poor judgment in location of numerous Job Corps centers, particularly those conservation centers in remote areas, has created many of the problems realized in discipline and community relations. One comment of corpsmen during the McCook disturbance was the "chief resentment among Negroes seemed to be that the Negroes did not have girls of their own race to date," or in the words of another McCook corpsman, "The biggest flaw in the camp routine from the standpoint of the Negro corpsman stems from its location." Regarding the Price Job Corps Center in Price, Utah, which has reached 60 percent Negro enrollment at times, Price Mayor Murray Mathis commented: "We must be realistic, the town has no Negro population." The plea of Job Corps officials' in April 1967 for 80 white girls to attend the Saturday night dances at McCoy Job Corps Center, suggests that the remote location of these centers create problems for all enrollees. This problem of isolation affects the operation of approximately 80 percent of all Job Corps centers.

### Hurting Business Community

Job Corps went to the opposite extreme and located several women's centers in the downtown business districts of a number of large cities. Complaints are being voiced by businessmen that the location of these centers is hurting the business community. One businessman in Albuquerque, N. Mex. commented:

The Job Corps is a noble dream but in operation it has certainly hurt Albuquerque downtown business.

Business leaders in Omaha, Nebr., have similar sentiments regarding their two Job Corps establishments in the downtown Regis and Paxton

Hotels, as noted in the following article which appeared in the Omaha Morning World-Herald on October 12, 1967:

#### OMAHA BUSINESS LEADERS DECIDE JOB CORPS IS HURTING DOWNTOWN

(By Arnold Garson)

Two Omaha business leaders called Wednesday for the transfer of the Women's Job Corps Center from the city's downtown area.

George T. Wruck, general manager of the Associated Retailers of Omaha, said the Federal job training program has hurt the city's image and economy.

Alfred C. Kennedy, chairman of the Central Omaha Committee, said the Job Corps has been "harmful to downtown."

Their comments came in separate interviews after Mayor Sorensen said it "probably was a mistake" to locate the center downtown. The mayor voiced that opinion Tuesday in response to a question raised at a Junior League of Omaha luncheon.

#### CORPS SILENT

Job Corps officials declined to comment on the situation until after a meeting with "community leaders," possibly next week.

Mr. Wruck said it was a mistake to have "this much of a concentration of Job Corps girls" downtown.

"I think Omaha has made a great sacrifice. It has caused problems and we're uncomfortable about it," Mr. Wruck said.

He said many callers have complained that they have had to walk through large groups of Job Corps girls and the boys they attract.

There are about 800 Job Corps girls living at the former Paxton and Regis Hotels. Sixty percent of the enrollees are Negro; 24 percent are white, and 16 percent are Spanish-American, Indian, or oriental, corps officials said.

Some downtown businessmen reportedly have complained that Negro enrollees on the streets and young men congregating around the hotels have discouraged shoppers from coming downtown.

#### "MAY OR MAY NOT"

Mr. Wruck said businessmen who must work late now try to park as close to their offices as possible because "there are dangers in coming into the area."

He said businessmen have "sensed these dangers within the last year, and that they may or may not be directly related to the Job Corps."

In addition, the loss of two hotels has "handicapped the city in accommodating visitors," he said.

"We're getting a disturbing reputation as a city, nationally," as a result of the Job Corps' downtown location, he said.

Mr. Wruck said he would like the program moved to a location outside the downtown area. "If we could solve some of these discomforts, it would be a better program," he said.

Mr. Kennedy said the Job Corps has "very definitely been harmful to business conditions downtown."

#### "NOT DESIRABLE"

"The type of girl who enrolls in the Job Corps and the type of person she attracts are not desirable for a downtown district," Mr. Kennedy said.

He added that he would be "indifferent as to whether the center remained in Omaha."

The Job Corps program is for unemployed, out-of-school 16 to 21-year-olds. The Omaha Center is operated under Federal contract by the Burroughs Corp.

Mayor Sorensen said he suggested last week that Center Director Robert W. Anderson set up a meeting to discuss the problem caused by having the Job Corps downtown.

Leo Armatis, Job Corps public relations official, said there has been talk of such a meeting for the last week or 10 days, and that he understands the meeting will be early next week, although Job Corps officials did not set it up.

Mr. Wruck said his association "sees no reason to hold a meeting on the subject at this time."



## TRY FOR SOLUTION

Mr. Armatis said: "We have known for some time that retailers are upset about groups of youths on the street and we are trying to work out a solution."

In an interview Tuesday, Mayor Sorensen said enrollees "need more open areas where they can enjoy the out of doors. If they go out of doors now, they are on a main business street."

Mr. Sorensen said he would not start or support any effort to have the Job Corps moved out of the downtown hotels.

"Foot traffic has increased tremendously in the downtown area and businessmen are very concerned about it," the mayor said.

Mr. Sorensen said he asked Mr. Anderson to reduce the foot traffic. The mayor said he suggested staggering free time given enrollees and "encouraging the girls to use recreation facilities in the hotels."

Prior to his meeting with Mr. Anderson, the mayor said, the Job Corps had begun providing buses for enrollees going about three blocks between the hotels and had hired more police officers.

"The Job Corps has been very cooperative," Mr. Sorensen added.

## LOCATION "USUAL"

The Omaha Center is one of six urban centers located in a downtown business district, according to Richard C. Gilliland, of Kansas City, Mo., acting regional Job Corps administrator.

Mr. Gilliland, in a telephone interview, said women's Job Corps centers need to be "near libraries and the urban social atmosphere."

In a survey of former corpsmen contracted by the Job Corps, it is noted only 56 percent of the corpsmen felt their chances to meet people in the community were good. Although in some instances there has been a wholehearted acceptance and welcoming of the corpsmen into the community, we feel for the most part, it is merely a matter of coexistence.

While we listen to the Job Corps officials paint their pretty picture during their testimony before the committee, we are very irritated because, as Mrs. Green so aptly said it:

As one member of the committee I get a little bit leery when I get a snow job that everything is great \* \* \* if we are going to have successful hearings and if we are going to do anything constructive as far as our time is concerned it seems to me that we ought to know the weaknesses as well as the strengths of the program and then see how we could tighten it up to do the best job possible.

## Credibility Gap

The credibility gap created by the two widely varying versions of the Job Corps story is further widened by the charges of Mr. James Tice, former Manager of Student Information Services for the Guthrie, Okla., Job Corps Center, who advised that early in June this year, regional OEO officials, Austin, Tex., instructed the Guthrie Job Corps Center officials to falsify daily reports reflecting the "on-board strength" of corpswomen. He explained that, as corpswomen resigned or were given disciplinary discharges from the center, they were not reported to OEO until the end of fiscal 1967 (June 30, 1967).

A review of the situation reveals Mr. Tice said the center director requested the site representative (OEO) to have these instructions put in writing by regional OEO; however, OEO refused to put the

instructions in writing and reportedly told the center director, if they (Philco-Ford) wanted to retain the contract, they had better comply. Mr. Tice said he was not formerly told why the records had to be falsified, but it was the impression of center officials that OEO wanted to build the total of Job Corps enrollees to 41,000 in time for the OEO congressional presentation in order to justify retention of all Job Corps Centers at current funding levels.

Among the material Mr. Tice furnished were copies of "termination requests" from the center reflecting that 22 enrollees who were terminated in June were not reported until July 3, 1967.

The following observations were set out in an investigative report of the Guthrie matter and were later established in ad hoc subcommittee hearings:

It is the observation of the investigator that the procedure of placing dropouts and discharges in an administrative leave status after they had departed the center and for the remainder of the month of June resulted in the following:

1. Since the on-board strength for the days in June after the dropouts had left the center included those in an administrative leave status, the final computations of corpswomen days (13,148) and corpswomen months (438) were inflated and this resulted in a lower operating cost per corpswoman for the month of June.

2. Carrying the corpswomen in an administrative leave status after they had returned to their homes resulted in the delay of severance pay being forwarded to the girls. This may have caused some hardships. It is noted that several of the youths had to wait 2 months or 9 weeks for their separation pay.

When additional letters are received, such as this sent to Congressman Smith from Oklahoma, questions are presented regarding the statistics furnished by OEO.

MOUNTAIN PARK, OKLA., October 4, 1967.

HON. JAMES V. SMITH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I wish to congratulate you on your recent announcement of a discovery of irregularities in enrollment records at Guthrie Job Corps Center for Women.

As a resident of your district, I wish to encourage you to further investigate the Job Corps. I resigned on June 1, 1967, after spending 2 years as principal and teacher with the Job Corps at Ouachita Job Corps Center, Royal, Ark. I assure you that what was discovered at Guthrie is not limited to that center, but has been done at all centers by direction of OEO. Enrollment records have long been manipulated by OEO officials. Several times during my tenure with the Job Corps, orders were received from OEO, directing centers not to release names of corpsmen who would be leaving the center until a certain date. At times orders were sent to centers directing center officials not to send any corpsmen home until after a certain date.

A method used to cover up dropout rates is that of considering all corpsmen as enrollees for the first 30 days. If corpsmen drop out during that time, no dropout is recorded.

One important facet of Job Corps' statistics is the number of graduates reported. Only a very small percentage of Job Corps graduates have actually completed the program and truly bettered themselves. Corpsmen leaving after a stay of only 5, 6, or 8 weeks are generally considered graduates for record purposes. Many times corpsmen go AWOL and are recorded as graduates.



During the 2 years I spent at Ouachita Job Corps Center, out of over 500 enrollees, only 1 percent could actually be considered graduates of the program. The others merely spent time there.

I feel I can speak with some authority when I say that the Job Corps is a program of much deceit and waste. Unless the program is radically changed, I feel that it should be abolished.

I will be happy to provide you with any help you might desire should you decide to continue your inquest into the Job Corps.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. DEEDS.

## B. NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The longrange answer to the employment problems of the disadvantaged cannot reside in a program to be simply an "aging vat," providing youths with some income and work during their early years in the labor force. It must reside in a well-developed program based on providing participants with a thorough knowledge and skill in a particular field that will provide permanence.

We oppose the indefinite funding of Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) and urge that steps be taken toward a permanent training program for youth—a program that will lead to more than "make work," a program that will lead to a better standard of living for the participants.

Last year one of our major criticisms of the NYC was the small percentage of enrollees who were receiving any form of remedial education or vocational training. The Office of Education testified at the 1966 House hearings that only 20 percent of all enrollees and only 10 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving any such education or training assistance. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz confirmed this and admitted he was not satisfied. Since the intent of the Congress in legislating the out-of-school program was to enable high school dropouts to return to school or to provide them with meaningful vocational training on which to build a career, we are, like Mr. Wirtz, totally dissatisfied. It was felt much of the problem was created by the Economic Opportunity Act itself, which barred the participation of private, profitmaking firms, leaving the enrollees to be placed in "make work" jobs with local governments or nonprofit agencies. For this reason, Congress last year amended NYC legislation to permit private, profitmaking employers to participate in the NYC.

### One Year Later

We returned to the 1967 House hearings eager to see how this amendment and employment with private firms had improved the status of high school dropouts and the NYC's figures, but were told that only four projects involving private employers had been approved, which included a mere 164 enrollees out of 25,000 total enrollment. So we again asked, "How many enrollees were receiving any remedial education or vocational training during fiscal 1967?" Mr. Jack Howard, Administrator of the Bureau of Works program, responded that now 30 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving remedial or vocational education training. A closer look at this statement reveals to us that 70 percent of all out-of-school NYC enrollees, at \$2,930 apiece, are still in "make-work" jobs and receiving no remedial education or vocational training.

### Measurement of Success

A reduction in the high school dropout rates and the placement of former enrollees in jobs are the final measures of success of the NYC. So we looked to the Labor Department for the followup records of past enrollees by which we could evaluate the program—but found no such regular system of information is maintained. A few samples of program results have been conducted by Labor Department and projected as being typical of what is happening nationally. These projections would indicate the in-school program has resulted in a noticeable decline in high school dropout rates and possibly a reduction in juvenile delinquency rates.

Like Job Corps, NYC officials, to fill the gap, have contracted with a few private firms to make studies of the NYC program. These and other private studies which are available to us indicate that approximately one-third of the enrollees are known to have returned to school, received additional training or obtained employment upon leaving the program. The studies also indicate that, while in training, nearly five of every six enrollees thought that they would need additional education or training to meet their occupational goals. Also, when seeking employment, nearly two of every five who found jobs did not use the NYC as a reference.

In view of the above type of results, we consider it vital that more detailed information be developed by the NYC about the program so that an informed evaluation can be made.

### C. COMMUNITY ACTION

Community Action, under the misdirection of OEO administrators, has done more to impede the war on poverty than any other component. From the beginning it was obvious that OEO read things into the Economic Opportunity Act that were never intended by the Congress. The concept of social reform by force and development of abrasive relations between Community Action agencies on the one hand and public officials and established agencies on the other was developed and propounded by the OEO in Washington and by regional OEO representatives.

Community Action agency personnel have organized and directed confrontations and demonstrations against public officials to a degree where tensions have mounted and complete community disruption has resulted. Too frequently these displays of hostility have been coincident with racial unrest and have polarized the Negro and white communities.

The lack of coordination and cooperation between Community Action agencies on one hand and school officials, welfare agencies, housing authorities, and representatives of private enterprise on the other, have brought about total alienation of these community leaders from antipoverty programs. Until these malfunctions are corrected, it is unlikely that Community Action will be able to bring about changes to improve conditions which contribute to poverty.

Community Action agencies have become so deeply involved in voter registration drives and subsequent elections that the role of paid anti-poverty workers in "politics" has been clearly identified and estab-



lished. Elected officials and candidates, especially in urban areas, consider Community Action agencies as a most powerful base in local political arenas.

Community reaction to the excessive political and organizational aspects of Community Action has developed an atmosphere of conflict and bitterness.

Irresponsible handling of large sums of money and lack of fiscal accountability continue to plague Community Action programs.

There is little indication that Community Action is reaching a significant number of poor or that the poverty stricken are being assisted in tangible or visible ways. It is likely that the heavy emphasis on organization and political and demonstration activity have detracted from the performance of Community Action agencies in these regards.

### Community Disruption

Investigation by this committee in 1965 and 1967 revealed that Community Action in Newark, N.J., has developed bitterness and conflict between the poor and public officials of that city.

Community Action personnel during early summer, 1967, organized and participated in demonstrations of protest against the mayor and the Newark School Board. At public meetings antipoverty personnel made numerous inflammatory public speeches advocating violence. On July 13, 1967, antipoverty workers distributed announcements of a police brutality rally to be held at a Newark police station. Later that evening antipoverty workers organized the demonstration which was attended by several hundred demonstrators. The Newark riots started at this rally.

Although public officials are reluctant to express their views publicly concerning Community Action there has been ample evidence that hostility and conflict has existed between antipoverty agencies on one hand and elected officials and community agencies on the other in Syracuse, N.Y.; Rochester, N.Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Houston, Tex.; Elgin, Ill.; Durham, N.C.; and many other cities.

Community Action leaders seem to have overlooked their responsibility to "mobilize and utilize" resources, public or private, of a community in an attack on poverty. Rather, the contrary appears to be true, the resources of the Community Action agency (80 or 90 percent Federal funds) have been literally utilized in attacks on mayors, police departments, welfare and housing agencies, school authorities, and at times private individuals and firms. The abrasive relations existing between CAA's and other community agencies can only lead to failure of programs and eventual collapse of the Community Action agency involved.

We feel the responsibility for much of the disruptive and destructive activities of Community Action programs lies with the Office of Economic Opportunity. The concept that public officials and traditional services agencies are to be considered adversaries of the poor is popular among Community Action officials. It is shared and at times propounded by OEO administrators. This is illustrated in an exchange of letters between the mayor of Houston, Tex., and the Office of Economic Opportunity in May and July 1967.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
CITY OF HOUSTON, TEX.

The attached constitutes a series of questions that this office feels it can no longer delay in raising. The questions are of both a conceptual and specific nature concerning the poverty program on the national level and on the local level.

It seems particularly imperative for this information to be given careful scrutiny at this time and for answers to be obtained to the questions raised.

As the OEO in both Washington and Austin knows, there has been deep concern about the poverty program in the Houston area for some time but it has only been in the last few weeks that the problem has reached a point where this office must bring the sort of information and questions contained in the attached to the attention of those in authority on a national level.

LOUIE WELCH, *Mayor*.

A. CONCEPTUAL

1. *National level*

(a) According to the Community Action Program Guide, volume 1, October 1965, the purpose of "Federal assistance to community action programs is to help urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty \* \* \* A vital feature of every Community Action program is the involvement of the poor themselves—the residents of the areas and members of the groups to be served—in planning, policymaking, and operation of the program \* \* \* The long-range objective of every Community Action program is to effect a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted by poverty to deal effectively with their own problems so that they need no further assistance" (p. 7).

(b) According to President Lyndon B. Johnson's state of the Union message, 1965, " \* \* \* the central problem is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

Question. What is the Washington OEO's position as to whether the above purposes can be accomplished and the problems alleviated by local CAP agencies working with and taking advantage of the resources of local government?

Question. What is the Washington OEO's position on whether local CAP employees should encourage and promote conflict with local government when remedies through mediation and negotiation have not been exhausted?

2. *Local level*

(a) In the attempts between the Houston-Harris County Economic Opportunity Organization to merge with the Houston Action for Youth, the following statements were contained in HHCEO material outlining their philosophy and approach.

(1) In contrasting the EEO approach with HAY's approach, this position was taken by EEO: "Their (HAY) approach is directed toward leadership development, direct services, and cultural enrichment. They are not, however, intent on rapid social change and do not employ the concept of power in their social theory. Given the political structures of our day, their approach is of little significance in forming a large power base of the poor" (p. 4, "Operation Discovery," spring 1967).

Question. The most rapid social change is revolution. Is revolution the goal of EEO?

Question. Does the EEO consider the "political structures of our day" so inflexible that the voices of the poor cannot be heard and the poor cannot obtain programs they initiate without confrontation and conflict with "the establishment?"

(2) " \* \* \* It is only in this manner that Houston's largest concentrations of inner city poor can be organized into the large power organization which would force its way into the center of the decisionmaking processes which control the city" (p. 5, Operation Discovery).

Question. What is meant by "force?" Is it felt that the "decisionmaking processes" have no interest in including the poor, who are constituents in a community just as much as people with greater means? Does the EEO mean that "force" is the only way the poor can be included or does the EEO really mean this is the EEO's opinion?

(3) In "action phase I" of the EEO's approach in the community, this description is given of the organizer's job: "It is up to the organizer to deter-



mine which of the problems should be selected to act upon first. Once this is done the community organizer seeks out a situation which will dramatize the problem. This situation becomes the "gut issue" around which the community organizer rallies the people (HHCEO community organization component proposal).

Question. What does it mean to "seek out" a dramatic situation? In Houston, EOO used a case in which county deputy constables were involved in Settegast to bring two busloads to city hall to protest "police brutality." What elaboration can be given on the "gut issue" approach—is it one designed to stir people up to the point that their emotions can be used by EOO workers to "force" the poor into "decisionmaking processes?"

Question. Since it appears that the EOO program is based, at least in part, on that used by the Woodlawn Organization initiated by Saul Alinsky, is it the opinion of the OEO that confrontation and conflict are the only means by which the poor can be heard by "the power structure" and mediation of problems is a method not open to the impoverished?

#### B. SPECIFIC

1. Activities of employees of Houston-Harris County Economic Opportunity Organization (now part of the Harris County Community Action Association).

(a) What is—and was—the role of EOO employees in the following type situations?

(1) At Texas Southern University:

(a) On the night of Tuesday, May 16, and early morning of Wednesday, May 17, when a gun battle occurred between dormitory students at TSU and police, an EOO employee named Roosevelt "Rudy" Huffpower stated that he had been in the dormitory where students had guns and were firing them. Was he there to dissuade them from firing or to encourage them? What was his function?

Earl Allen, director of community organization for EOO, also appeared and his offer to accompany other "dissuaders" to the dormitory was accepted. Any report that has been submitted saying Allen's help was solicited by the mayor's office or police is not correct. He claims to have rapport with TSU students and thus his offer to go to the dormitory with three other Negro "leaders" was accepted. The "leaders" failed to dissuade the students from shooting. The main question in connection with Allen and TSU is that reports have been picked up that he and other EOO workers have claimed that they have "kept the situation down" at TSU and if it hadn't been for them, trouble would have come sooner. Such is not true. A second question is: What has any attempt at intervention at TSU have to do with the poverty program? Certainly, in a crisis such as Tuesday night, help from any quarter would be welcomed. But the claim has been made since March that EOO workers have been "helping keep the situation down" at TSU and, until Tuesday night they were at the college strictly on their own initiative. (More discussion on this point will follow.)

(b) Reports have been picked up that EOO workers have stated that they knew students had 17 weapons in the dormitories and could have "disarmed" them. If EOO workers were so anxious to "keep the situation down" at TSU, why didn't they turn such information over to proper authorities. And why didn't they "disarm" the students on the night of the shooting, if they could, since Huffpower himself said he was in the dormitory where the guns were?

(c) In connection with the frequent claims that EOO workers have contributed to holding the TSU situation down, the following questions need to be answered:

On the night of Saturday, April 22, when 24 cars were damaged by bricks and rocks thrown from the TSU campus at passing motorists, injuring six of them (two seriously), where were the EOO "mediators?" The mayor's office assistant in race relations was in Dallas and didn't return until Sunday.

On the night of Sunday, April 23, when the mayor's aide was back in town, he was told by Dean of Students J. B. Jones that the situation was as explosive as ever and bricks would probably again be thrown. The mayor's aide persuaded the head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who had not been involved in the brick throwing, to go to the campus and try to dispel some 200 students who had gathered. He did so. Where were the EOO "mediators?"

On Monday night, April 24, the same situation repeated itself and the same assistance was provided by the mayor's office. None came from the EOO workers.

On Tuesday night, April 25, the mayor's office aide conferred with SNCC leaders on a "campus policing" routine to keep disorders down. SNCC agreed to take on the job. EOO was not involved.

Until Wednesday, April 26, Wheeler Street was having to be blocked off regularly and from 100 to 300 policemen stationed three blocks away for possible intervention on the campus.

(d) All these details are furnished to dispel rumors that EOO workers have helped keep order at TSU. They have not.

(e) On Monday, May 22, an EOO worker identified as Pluria Marshall, who was given a leave of absence after being at the scene of TSU street-blocking demonstrations in April, was seen passing out inflammatory material on the trouble at TSU May 16. A copy of the material has been obtained. Marshall is back on the EOO payroll.

Question. Is this a legitimate function of a war on poverty worker and, if it is, what relationship does it have to creating or executing programs helping the poor? The distribution of the material was being made in the 3000 block of Rosedale, six blocks from TSU, a section known as Riverside, where homes in the area sell for \$14,000 to \$20,000.

(2) At the Holmes Road dump—preachers in the area have led a series of street blockings to keep garbage trucks from using the dump. Arrests have followed.

(a) On Saturday, May 20, three EOO workers were at the church where Rev. O. L. Hughes was organizing a new group of people to block the street to the dump.

(b) According to Francis Williams, board chairman of the merged Harris County Community Action Association, their assignment was to keep people from "becoming wrought up" and "doing anything impulsive" since there was tension in the city from the May 17 disturbance at TSU.

(c) Paraphrased, these are the kind of statements the three EOO workers made to a mayor's office assistant in the presence of neighborhood people who gathered around for the discussion:

When is your racist mayor going to wake up to the fact that this town is going to burn if he doesn't do something?

The shooting by students at TSU was justified because the white man has been oppressing the Negro for 300 years and now it is the black man's turn.

Don't you know this town is going to burn and there are people just waiting to loot the stores?

Question. Are such statements, made outside an organizational meeting for a demonstration, designed to "keep people from getting wrought up?" The statements came from Roosevelt "Rudy" Huffpower, Bertain English, and Robert Becnel. Huffpower had been issued 3 days before, at the request of EOO Executive Director Charles Kelly, a "special representative of mayor's" card to enable him to cross police lines such as at TSU. Huffpower was the EOO worker who was loudly branding the mayor a "racist" at the Holmes Road meeting site. Kelly was asked May 23 to return all mayor's cards.

Question. Has the Washington OEO agency been receiving reports that Houston is "going to burn" and the EOO workers are the ones who are keeping things under control? Reports picked up locally are that Earl Allen has repeatedly used "the town is going to burn" theme to indicate that only himself and his people have the power to keep things under control.

### (3) In northeast Houston

(a) On the evening of Tuesday, May 16, before any shooting at TSU, EOO workers appeared at the homes in the area where there was tension over picketing and arrests at the nearby Northwood Junior High School.

Question. Why did these people intervene in an area where the Scenic Woods homes are all brick, costing from \$10,000 to \$15,000, and there is no indication of poverty?

(b) On the same evening, after the TSU shooting started, the mayor's office was informed that Francis Williams, EOO board chairman had made his staff available to keep people from going to the streets in other areas of the city or creating disorder not in the interest of community peace. EOO workers Larry Thomas, Robert Benjamin and Warren Fincke were "assigned" to the Northeast area.

(c) On the night of Thursday, May 18, Larry Thomas signed a letter, which was delivered by Fincke, for four to six parents in the northeast area wanting



a meeting with the superintendent at noon the next day. The parents would not sign or deliver the letter themselves. The superintendent wanted to know what business the EOO had in the affair, which concerned suspensions of students who were children of the four to six parents.

(d) On the morning of Thursday, May 18, a former employer of one of the parents of a suspended student at Northwood Junior High School received a call from the parent saying that "agitators" had moved into his home and were "dangerous." He identified a "Larry Thomas" and said he feared these people might try to do "something like blow up the school."

(e) Reports have picked up locally that EOO workers are blaming Sam Price, Earl Allen's counterpart at HAY, for telling police where a suspect in the TSU trouble was staying.

Question. Has the OEO agency in Washington received this report and does it consider that a man's life may be in danger as a result?

(f) Tuesday, May 23, without intervention from either EOO or HAY workers (now both members of the Harris County Community Action Association), arrangements were made through a representative of the mayor's office for dissident parents in Northeast Houston to meet with the school superintendent, with the result that all but two students were reinstated in Northwood Junior High School. This was accomplished through mediation, without use of the confrontation-conflict technique advocated in such situations by the local EOO and without need of further picketing or demonstrations by the suspended students, their parents or outside "help" from TSU students.

Such reinstatement should not be interpreted to mean there will not be any more trouble in the Northeast Houston area or at the Northwood Junior High School. It simply means that any reports the Washington OEO agency may have received about the critical nature of the situation has been negated, as far as problems from dissident parents are concerned.

(b) Questions on Charles Kelly, EOO executive director, and sources of "city in crisis" rumors:

(1) In December 1966, Kelly told a mayor's office aide of a report that there would be "a burning" in the third ward during the Christmas holiday and that "the CIA was working on it."

(2) In March 1967, Kelly said that the controversy in Settegast between residents and EOO workers was being handled right by EOO and was a "gut issue."

(3) Repeated reports have come from EOO workers in the past week that Houston is "about to burn" and only they can save the situation.

2. Activities of James M. Simons, whose "card of introduction" identifies him as with the Office of Economic Opportunity, 314 West 11th Street, Austin, Tex.

(a) What is his role and function?

(1) Sam Price, head of neighborhood organization for Houston Action for Youth, said Simons originally identified himself as assigned to OEO Office of Inspector, under Ed Terrones, but working for the U.S. Department of Justice.

(2) Price said Simons first came to Houston approximately 1 month ago to investigate the participation of EOO workers in civil rights demonstrations.

(3) To this date, Simons has never paid a visit to the mayor's office to obtain information it might have on any EOO worker leaving his assigned area to work with the poor and appearing at TSU and other areas to encourage or participate in demonstrations. On Thursday, May 18, a mayor's assistant, who happened to be at Houston Action for Youth for a meeting of the merged group, was introduced to Simons, who also was at HAY. After visiting TSU, Simons came back and had approximately 5 minutes of conversation with the mayor's assistant and asked for some "off the record" opinions.

(b) What is the nature of the reports Simons has been sending in?

(1) From reports in Houston, Simons has gained a reputation as a completely naive, inexperienced young man who has been taken in by the Earl Allen group in EOO on the need for militant participation by EOO in "civil rights" activities.

(2) As Simons was leaving HAY headquarters, he was told by a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee who had been with him to read a certain book the SNCC member had recommended. The SNCC member said it would indoctrinate Simons. Simons said he was already indoctrinated.

(3) It is believed that Simons also obtained information, mostly from the EOO faction, on the situation in northeast Houston and has reported that it is explosive. It is doubtful he made any mention of the arrangements, made through the mayor's office, that resulted Tuesday in reinstatement of all but two students.

Question. If Simons is meant to investigate the participation of EOO in Houston in demonstrations and TSU disturbances, has he given any indication of covering "both sides," and interviewing people who are not in favor of the EOO activities as well as those who are?

3. Acceptance of the poor of the antipoverty program in Houston :

(a) Since July 1966, a survey team of Negro interviewers has conducted interviews in all Negro neighborhoods of Houston, asking opinions on various problems and issues, including attitudes toward the "War on Poverty."

(b) These interviews were conducted among low-income Negroes, those included in the poverty bracket. Neighborhoods covered included those from Sunnyside to Settegast.

(c) Low-income Negroes themselves have not been found to have positive opinions toward the war on poverty. The results to date are :

51 percent say the war on poverty has done a fair job in terms of results.

31 percent say it has done a bad job.

12 percent say it has done a good job.

6 percent say they have never heard of the program.

(d) In addition to asking low-income Negroes their opinion about the poverty program in Houston, the interview subjects also were asked such open-ended questions as : "What are the causes of racial tension in Houston?"

(Random comments have included negative comments about the poverty program. An example, from the last survey: "People are bitter because the so-called poverty program hasn't done no good.")

---

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
SOUTHWEST REGION,  
Austin, Tex., July 21, 1967.

Hon. LOUIE WELCH,  
Mayor of Houston,  
Houston, Tex.

DEAR MAYOR WELCH : Sargent Shriver has asked me to answer your communication to him of May 25, 1967, concerning the poverty program nationally and in Houston.

First, allow me to deal generally with the conceptual questions you have raised. I do not find the same implications in the use of the word "force" which your questionnaire quoted from an HHCEOO document called "Operation Discovery," nor do I find that revolution in its popular sense is implied in the document. This document was prepared by the community organization staff of the former HHCEOO organization's community development component which our office funded in June. The program will be discussed later in this letter.

I am convinced that OEO and the legislation which provides its mandate have already "forced" new types of decisionmaking structures all over this Nation. In countless communities, the people to be served are sitting for the first time in governing bodies which are deciding their destinies. It is most essential that these new voices join with the traditional governmental, agency based, and general community representatives to frame programs and strategies which will eliminate the obstacles to their fullest economic and cultural opportunities. Without the most extensive participation of the major local governments, these plans will be doomed from the beginning.

The record of interest and concern of both the metropolitan governments and the county government of Harris County in all phases of the attack on poverty has proved the willingness of the political leaders there to use their resources to the maximum extent. This is in the best tradition of OEO which is revolutionary only in the sense that existing structures are mobilized in new ways to do the job of providing new economic opportunities through making it possible for the poor to help themselves. I feel certain that the restructured Community Action Agency in Harris County, even though it is no mere extension of governmental agencies, will involve all public officials in an integral way in the anti-poverty decisions which only Harris County's citizens can make.

On the other hand, we have discovered that because the poor have been so long a voiceless segment of our communities, they may view the traditional public and private policymaking bodies as obstacles to their full development. Anyone can expect, during the poverty war's infancy, a measure of conflict between the



traditional responsible elements of a community and those who, in many cases, are being introduced to civic responsibility for the first time. The community action agencies are placed in the dilemma of being the advocate for the poor, their chief reason for being, and the mobilizers of support from groups which the poor may at times criticize. In view of this, OEO must support the necessity for all CAA's to enable the poor to express their grievances at all times in an orderly manner using first the traditional tools of petition and hearing and only then, that failing, their constitutional right to assemble peacefully to demonstrate publicly the wrongs they seek to redress.

The CAA and its staff should not promote conflict in any instance, yet it should never discourage the use of orderly methods in effecting necessary change. It is, in fact, remiss when it is not actively involved in helping to order these expressions, but it is also remiss when it or its staff seeks to participate actively in these efforts to the extent that the initiative and participation of the poor would be replaced. The CAA must always enable the poor to speak effectively and forcefully, but it must not become a substitute for their voice. Also, I do not believe it is accurate to impute to the poverty program those frustrations and aggressions which find their impetus in the uneven struggles of racial minorities for community recognition of age-old grievances.

Violence of any type is not an acceptable means of developing community organizations. On the contrary, it has been our official and well-publicized position that such activity will not be countenanced under the poverty program. Those few individuals who have been unable to operate within the program under this constraint have been asked to leave. Others were fired upon the presentation of proof that they were engaged in encouraging or fomenting violent acts. Far from encouraging violence, the poverty program has provided the poor, including minority poor, with a legitimate framework, encompassing community resources, for expressing grievances through nonviolent means. In my opinion, this endeavor in almost every instance has been singularly successful.

This regional office has recently approved applications from the newly merged community action agency in Harris County which include a community development component. The methodology described in this program includes the organization of poverty residents around the central issues of their concern. These are called gut issues, and they refer to needs for normal community services and facilities.

There is no hint in this proposal that issues and solutions will be emotionally based; rather, it is planned that the development staff will conduct extensive surveys and profiles of the community and that they will follow this discovery of immediate needs with a carefully planned strategy to seek the satisfaction of these needs. This strategy is to be determined by the residents themselves. Conflict is not inherent in this plan; however, confrontation is, in the sense that the fullest expression of these needs should enable the policymaking community organizations to become more directly sensitive and responsive to the problems of daily life in the poverty areas.

The poor do not need to be forced into the decisionmaking process in Harris County. They are already there, through their own duly elected representatives and through those sympathetic representatives of the governmental bodies and the community at large. The goals of community development are to enable poverty residents to speak with clarity and with strength to the problems they know best, thus increasing the effectiveness of all of their advocates on the CAA board and on other policy bodies in Harris County.

It must be added that, in my opinion, the degree of success in building effective neighborhood voice through such community development projects will determine the degree of Harris County's success in arresting the tensions that occur when that voice is not able to be heard. This is not to say that, in Harris County, public officials have not been ready to listen; rather it is to say that the expressions of concern from the poor have been fragmented, disjointed, and scattered and therefore ineffective. It is the role of the CAA to reform these expressions and aid all local decisionmakers to meet the problems head on. This is what I mean by confrontation.

The role of the neighborhood organization staffs in the two former Harris County Community Action Agencies has been spotty and uneven. We are appraised of incidents in which staff members have exceeded the roles they serve. This must not continue to occur. I believe that under the leadership of a newly united board, neighborhood organizers will be able to become much more aware

of their assignments and goals as well as their limitations. We have been encouraged by the initiative shown by the new board chairman, Mr. Francis Williams, in supervising the utilization of staff members during the recent tensions in Harris County.

Mr. Williams has offered to you the HOAA staff insofar as it can be helpful in resolving the conflict that have occurred. It has been charged to effect the role of observer in these tensions. Some effective work has been done, and when either of the two neighborhood staffs (HAY and HHCEO) worked at cross-purposes or exceeded their assignments, Mr. Williams dealt with each issue, and conflict with authority and fairness. He has seen fit to make difficult decisions regarding staff assignments in the midst of disputes over methods of approach. We believe that his actions signify a more positively directed neighborhood staff and that the newly-unified operation in Harris County will enable the CAA to implement and evaluate better the goals and direction toward those goals of neighborhood organization.

The local CAA will always have to decide case by case whether or not neighborhood conflict is related to the conditions of poverty in the community and whether or not the conflict has a direct bearing on ongoing CAA efforts. However, when the CAA can clearly show that it has a stake in the issue at hand, I am prepared to support its involvement within the limitations I have stated.

OEO both regionally and nationally is constantly evaluating the role of CAAs and their staff in neighborhood affairs especially when tensions flare. It is under this necessity to discover and interpret the facts that it recently sent to Houston both Mr. Ray Reusche and Mr. Jim Simons from its Office of Inspection. Both of these men have presented us with full and unbiased reports regarding staff involvement. Mr. Reusche worked primarily with public officials and CAA staff, and Mr. Simons worked primarily with the officials and staffs of both HAY and HHCEO plus city, county, and university officials and neighborhood residents.

Mr. Simons has worked especially close with our office's field representatives, and they have commented favorably on the thoroughness of his work as well as Mrs. Reusche's. Based on Mr. Reusche's and Mr. Simons' reports, in no instance have we discovered any intent or act designed to stir up violence or conflict on the part of CAA staff members, even though many have become closely involved in the areas to which they have been assigned and with those people who would use grievances as a source for inflammatory action.

Our investigations are not at an end, and we will continue to seek to discover the facts behind the problems and the issues that involve CAA members.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. RICHTER,  
*Director, Southwest Region.*

---

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
SOUTHWEST REGION,  
Austin, Tex., July 21, 1967.

Hon. LOUIE WELCH,  
*Mayor of Houston,  
Houston, Tex.*

DEAR MAYOR WELCH: I appreciate very much having had the opportunity to meet with you briefly yesterday, and I hope to make an effort to keep in touch with you more closely in the future.

Enclosed is my official written response to your letter of May 25, something I drafted and forwarded to the central office shortly after being informed of your inquiry. At a meeting in Washington in late June, I learned that this information had not been forwarded to you and was assured that something would be done. About 10 days ago I had one of my staff people check on it and received further assurances.

Before I left Houston yesterday I called my man in our Austin office to tell him to get some action, and he informed me that yesterday morning he had had a call from Washington advising that the copy of the letter had been mailed. It arrived with a letter of transmittal from Bert Harding dated June 22 with a handwritten note signed by Don Baker, an OEO attorney, which read: "It's all my fault—I had wanted to edit it—but each day was exhausted by crises and some time passed. So here it is! As was!"



I dislike elaborating on excuses when the whole thing is inexcusable, but I wanted you to understand that the ball dropping was essentially the fault of one guy and certainly does not reflect the manner in which Mr. Shriver or Mr. Harding normally handle their important correspondence.

Regarding the absence of direct comment on a number of questions which you posed about activities of the local OEO-funded operations. I have first a statement and then a suggestion.

My statement has, admittedly, dealt with your conceptual questions, because in almost every specific instance cited the official OEO stance is explained by this statement of policy and philosophy. To have tried to establish an objective, documented investigation of each happening and situation referred to would have been a mammoth and almost impossible undertaking.

This probably relates to your comment about not having been consulted in an "investigation" since there was none based on the specifics in your inquiry. The inquiries I referred to were extensive inspection and factfinding efforts, mainly by several teams from the central office and supported in some instances by our own staff. These certainly should have included considerable contacts with you and other city officials.

Because I want in no way to shirk our responsibility in responding to specific circumstances and situations referred to in your letter, I should like to make the following suggestion. If possible on August 3 and 4, since these are the first days available for our staff people concerned, I would like for Frank Moffitt and Fred Holt of our staff to meet with Dr. Justice, Mr. Fairchild, and possibly others of your staff and Francis Williams for the purpose of reviewing item by item the questions you have raised in the light of the OEO position as reflected in my response to you. Also, I would want the review procedure to cover a person-by-person review of instances in which your office feels that prior criminal involvements constitute cause for dismissal.

As I mentioned yesterday, the area of responsibility of the Southwest region (representing the Federal Government) for involvement in local problem areas is a delicate and sensitive matter, but I would hope that the individuals assembled could reach agreement on most of the situations and problems under review.

My suggestion further is that in those instances when there is not a clear understanding of the OEO position at our level I be brought into the picture, preferably in a conference with you, so that I could make a final policy judgment.

I hope you will agree with this suggestion and that I may hear from you either approving the August 3 or 4 dates for the preliminary meeting or suggesting an alternate date.

I just talked to Bert Harding on the telephone a few minutes ago. He asked me to give you his personal regards and to express his deep regret over the woefully inadequate manner in which your inquiry was handled.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. RICHTER,  
*Director, Southwest Region.*

Urban rioting and "rotten politics" have seriously undermined congressional support for poverty war legislation, Congressman Phil M. Landrum said in August.

"I have about reached the conclusion that the Community Action programs are hopeless. So much local responsibility is required for them, and there is so little judgment in what they do. \* \* \* One group of extremists has wanted to use Community Action for civil rights, another for politics," Congressman Landrum said.

### Politics and Power—The Name of the Game

Despite a 1966 amendment which the Congress hoped would take politics out of the war on poverty, the OEO continues to allow the most obvious political abuses to flourish in antipoverty programs.

In Durham, N.C., this year, Operation Breakthrough (the Community Action agency), with the advice and consent of OEO officials, developed a highly professional vote delivering apparatus.

For 3 months, January to March, antipoverty workers poured over voter registration books, copying registration lists and other political data.

In April, using poverty-financed vehicles, Operation Breakthrough employees transported hundreds of Durham residents to polling places for registration.

In May, antipoverty workers, serving as checkers at the polls and using personally owned cars, delivered citizens to the polls during the Durham municipal general election.

All of this, according to the Director of OEO did not violate any laws. Whether or not laws were broken, it was apparent to all that the Durham antipoverty agency was in the political arena in a very big way.

### Partisan Politics?

An investigation of the General Accounting Office revealed that in Palm Beach County, Fla., in the fall of 1966, two antipoverty workers, serving as voting registrars and conducting "on the spot" registration of migrant workers, signed up 686 voters, 680 of whom registered Democrat.

### Haven for Politicians

In Newark, N.J., according to the city's mayor, Hugh Addonizio, the \$6 million antipoverty agency, United Community Corporation, is a haven for defeated political candidates and aspirants to public office.

### Power Play

In Syracuse, N.Y., 3 years of Community Action has seen two Community Action agencies fold up after prolonged power struggles with that city's administration.

### Voter Registration—A Powerful Political Weapon

In September 1967, U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen, protesting voter registration drives in Gary, Ind., warned that voter registration drives by poverty war workers, viewed on a national scale, could become a potent political weapon in the hands of the administration.

### They Made Their Quotas

Early this year in Houston, Tex., antipoverty workers signed up thousands of Harris County residents in a voter registration drive. When four of the poverty warriors failed to meet their quotas, they resorted to apartment house lists, trailer camp directories, and nameplates on mailboxes, filled out registration forms, and within days had more than met their quotas.

A subsequent \$25,000 investigation of voter registration in Houston revealed that an estimated 8,000 were phony.

### Earmarking of Programs

During debate on the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 we warned that earmarking of funds under title II-A would impair the effective-



ness of Community Action programs. Despite our pleas a bill was passed which provided that 60 percent of the funds (\$486.5 million) be allocated to specific, prepackaged programs. As we predicted, this formula resulted in priorities of programs at local levels which contrasted with the needs of respective communities.

The following statements of Community Action directors, 6 months after the bill was passed, reflect the feeling of knowledgeable anti-poverty administrators:

Too often we are told by the OEO what to plan, in fact, given the plan and told to "sign here."

The long arm of Washington is reaching in with funds and telling us what to do.

Community Action programs have reached the turning point in whether they will live or die. There are those who say Community Action programs will not work and that local authority is being usurped by the earmarking of funds.

The key to the success of such programs is that they be geared to specific needs and that we maintain the local concept.

Mr. Clark said he would like to remind regional officials that St. Paul is not Chicago, not Detroit, or Omaha, but has its own unique problems and cannot be fitted into a mold.

"But we must also maintain the grassroots level. We have shown that it works and must continue our efforts to keep local autonomy," said Carlson.

We should be free within board policy lines to determine our own needs and perhaps, even make our own mistakes.

The OEO seems to have overlooked the fact that many communities—including St. Paul—have interwoven networks of agencies, many of which have pioneered efforts to abolish poverty.

### Testimony Before the Committee on Education and Labor, July 12, 1967

Shirley Tannenbaum, Director, Frederick County, Md., CAP, stated:

"Shortly after assuming the role of CAP Director (1966) the national picture began to change. Not only did Congress begin to cut appropriations, but it also began deciding what the funds should be used for (i.e., Headstart, Upward Bound, Legal Aid, etc.).

"This seems to me to be a direct contradiction to the philosophy put forth by OEO and the original law which required maximum feasible participation of the poor and local determination of priorities.

"It is conceivable that none including Headstart of the so-called canned programs may be applicable or seen as necessary by the poor themselves in some localities. \* \* \*

"We were told that homemakers programs were low priority. Low priority to whom? In Frederick County it was high priority.

"It seems to me that if the legislators want to earmark funds and decide on a national level what programs will get funds they should also eliminate the hypocrisy of getting representation of the poor. Why bother to ask them what they need and then say you can't have it because there are no funds allocated for that?

"If this alternative is chosen, then OEO will become another dispenser of programs and services. Another bureaucratic empire will be built. But it will not eliminate poverty."

Again this year we find the Senate bill (S. 2388) earmarks 50 percent of the funds authorized for community action programs. We intend to oppose this provision of the Senate's bill and leave the funds free for local communities to establish their own priorities.

### HEADSTART

Although Sargent Shriver has described Headstart as "OEO's greatest, single, measurable success," it has experienced continuous turmoil created by last-minute funding, constantly changing policies, and dual funding through the OEO and Office of Education.

We have, in the past, criticized the circumstance of funding by two separate agencies, which is in part responsible for much of the confusion and delay in funding. Numerous applications are shuttled from agency to agency while each claims the other should fund them. A chamber of commerce study on Headstart programs also criticizes the coordination between the two agencies, stating: "\* \* \* OEO does not consider the role of the Office of Education when making projections of future Headstart program needs. They do not even maintain information on how many projects they are funding jointly with the Office of Education."

Hundreds of administrators of Headstart programs complain about funding problems. As an example, here is the lament of the director of the Detroit program in the Summer of 1966:

We were funded on Friday and had to open 400 classes for 6,210 children on the following Monday. This made innumerable problems concerning personnel, recruiting, and equipment. We could not officially hire aids, doctors, and so forth, until we were sure that the funds were available.

### The Too-Late Headstart

The administrative OEO machinery is largely responsible for these problems. An evaluation of Summer 1966, Headstart projects of Lake County, Ind., by Drs. Harold A. Gram and Leon J. Tolle of Valparaiso University, clearly illustrates the problems experienced by that program:

Briefly, the evaluators found plans and proposals were submitted to the regional office about March 18; however, the regional office did not respond until June 7, the date the program was to have begun. On that day, OEO regional personnel began making corrections and revision of contracts with the delegate agencies. According to the evaluators, these revisions were "communicated to the delegate agencies on June 14, 1966, (and) were apparently made without any communication or coordination with Lake County OEO or the delegate agencies. Furthermore, they were neither consistent or logical." First funds were not made available until June 27, 1966.

The effect of this timing and lack of coordination in the planning stages had two general results:

First, it created an atmosphere of confusion, frustration, and uncertainty which was not really overcome in some districts until the program was under way if at all. This atmos-



phers lowered morale in the Headstart program which obviously depends heavily on enthusiasm and commitment of its participating people. The damage caused by this poor administration of planning was diminishing fortunately by the presence of dedicated and experienced personnel who were able to tolerate and to some extent overcome the confusion.

Second, the delays and intransigence in early planning phases caused delays and ineffectiveness in subordinate plans, notably in recruiting and orientation of personnel, in purchasing and procurement of supplies, and in the establishment of effective policies and control procedures at the county and district levels.

The study attributes the poor planning to three conditions: "ineffective and inexperienced personnel in regional OEO; a lack of clear, comprehensive directives and guidelines at any level; and understaffing and personnel turnover at the county OEO office."

The evaluators were likewise critical of the lack of policy formulation and commented that "after 1 year's experience, a greater maturity and stability than was found should be expected." They commented specifically that "policy was lacking on personnel qualifications and records; on child-family eligibility; on type, limits and tolerance on budget expenditures; on required program content; on closed-downed and on followup policies."

They go on to say "perhaps more important, however, was the lack of clarity and conciseness which burdens most of the OEO literature. Important directives and guidelines are buried in masses of fancy rhetoric and vocabulary. The result is frequent oversight and misunderstanding of what is to be done."

Regarding assistance from the regional offices, the report indicates that "the Lake County OEO Office relied materially on five area coordinators to coordinate its several programs. It was beyond the scope of our study to determine the overall effectiveness of this group, but it was clearly apparent that they did relatively little for Headstart. Several of them were barely aware of the program and had not visited it while it was in progress."

Regarding controls, "a major complaint about the previous year's program (1965) was the large amount of reporting which had to be done. The 1966 session of Headstart apparently was swung to the opposite extreme."

Among Dr. Gram's and Dr. Tolle's conclusions were the points that "formulation with OEO policy must achieve greater consistency and stability. This is especially true with regional OEO levels where ex post facto policy formulation must be avoided."

### More Redtape

These problems continued to exist last fall as illustrated by the complaints of officials at the Hayward Unified School District of Hayward, Calif., who said their program "may be dumped because of a Federal redtape snarl." Their application for a year-round program was submitted in April 1966, and 5 months later, one-half week before the program was to have begun, officials received word that the regional OEO had reviewed the application and made changes. Superin-

tendent William Cuninghame blamed officials at San Francisco regional office for not keeping them informed of changes in guidelines and said: "Frankly, I am getting completely disenchanted with the redtape we've been fighting for the past few months with that office."

In late May 1967, at a time when all plans, funds and programs should be ready to begin, officials were again complaining over last-minute changes in guidelines and no funds. The last week in May, the Christian County School System, Kentucky, announced it would "pull out of the Headstart program this summer unless Federal funds are approved by tomorrow."

Although the program did finally take place, Dr. Guy S. Potts of the Fayette County School System announced on May 20 their school system had dropped the 1967 Summer Headstart program, citing funding problems, late notification by the Federal Government, and "bureaucratic bungling" as reasons. The target date for the Government's approval of this Headstart grant was February 28, but a copy of the approved budget did not reach Dr. Potts until the last week in May. In light of "confused" directions from Washington transmitted by "memoranda, letters, guidelines, telephone calls, various verbal information, and training sessions," Dr. Potts said he felt it was impossible to clearly understand conditions.

Officials in Atlanta, Cleveland, and other cities and counties throughout the country have suffered through the same experience this summer and will continue to each year until they finally decide to forget about the Federal grant and develop their own programs, using whatever local funds they can find, as East Cleveland decided to do this summer.

#### OEO—THE GREAT BUREAUCRACY

Placing OEO in the Executive Office of the President was to have provided the leverage OEO needed to coordinate the efforts of Cabinet-level departments. Unfortunately, due to a lack of interest and backing on the part of the President and antagonism between the OEO Director and other department heads, this has failed to have any effect. As James L. Sundquist notes in his study of OEO coordinative efforts for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty:

The other agencies of Government do not look upon OEO staff members as Presidential agents speaking for the President and exercising his authority, like staff members of the White House, the Budget Bureau, or the Council of Economic Advisers. OEO is looked upon, and acts as, another operating agency on a par with the Cabinet departments—not on an organizational level above them. Its staff role is ancillary to its operating role in much the same sense as are the Presidential staff roles of the Secretaries of HUD, Labor, and the other departments.

#### Coordinator of Its Own Programs

We would at least expect that OEO, in its administration of Job Corps, Community Action and VISTA, would attempt to coordinate



with other agencies who are administering like programs or with other levels of government which are attempting to coordinate programs within their States. We are sorry to see very little evidence of such coordination by OEO.

One example of this lack of coordination is in the area of Indian Programs. "A Comprehensive Evaluation of OEO Community Action Programs on Six Selected American Indian Reservations" by Human Science Research, Inc., concluded:

As indicated in the descriptions of a number of problems, coordination between such Federal agencies as OEO, EDI, BIA, PHS, and PHA, not to mention State and local agencies, school boards, law enforcement agencies and the like \* \* \* would be of inestimable value in launching programs which could strike at the roots of Indian poverty. The economic development, housing and other construction provisions of CAP component space and of any other aspects of the War on Poverty would be facilitated were such cooperation the rule rather than the exception."

A number of instances have been reported of surveys being conducted under OEO auspices to gather information already collected by local BIA agencies. Considerable expense and time would have been saved had there been any mechanization in existence to acquaint either or both of these agencies with the other's activities.

### State Technical Assistance

OEO professes to maintain a satisfactory degree of coordination with the States through their grants to State agencies for technical assistance programs. In actual operation, however, the expertise and valuable knowledge of most States offices are wasted except for the small role they play in providing technical assistance to community action agencies.

Directors of State technical assistance agencies (STA's) held a conference in Washington this summer at which a position paper was drawn up and signed by all but two of the directors present. Some suggestions in this position paper were:

1. That the State agencies should be permitted to submit an annual State plan for expenditure of funds in concert with the Federal, regional, and local OEO, and consultation between State and regional or national OEO should take place before funds are granted or approved in any State; and

2. STA's should be included in OEO's checkpoint procedures relating to all OEO programs and that the STA's be involved with the OEO, regional and community action agencies in developing evaluation procedures.

Voluminous testimony at the hearings and numerous letters and comments from STA directors indicate the present State role is not great enough, that State agencies presently have no say in the allocation of funds within a State. The regional offices of OEO make such allocations taking no effort either to provide an equitable distribution of the money to the poor over the State or to concentrate it in the areas where most needed.

## VIEWS FROM THE STATES

One State director commented on the problem of coordination of various programs within the State:

The linkage between community action programs and work programs is tenuous at best, especially in the rural areas. The Office of Economic Opportunity has to be given muscle to effectively coordinate these programs with its own. Likewise, the State officials should be a critical point for this function, and it should be spelled out in the law.

Former Connecticut OEO Director Joseph P. Dyer stated before our committee this summer:

Under the terms of the present Economic Opportunity Act, a STA director has little muscle to impose regulations, has no responsibility for evaluating results, and is considered as an afterthought by most OEO Washington and regional office personnel.

He also notes that the—

Sole strength we have to control local poverty spending is a Governor's veto—which can be overridden by the national director—and the public information media.

E. R. Rankin, Jr., director, North Carolina Department of Administration, likewise complained that:

Federal antipoverty programs are usually prepared without any knowledge of the Governor and are submitted for the approval or disapproval of the Governor after public announcement in Washington that the OEO has approved the grant, or other Federal assistance.

Further concerned with the lack of coordination, Mr. Rankin states:

The well-known OEO policy of ignoring and bypassing existing State and local governmental agencies has certainly not assisted in North Carolina's efforts to improve poverty and poverty conditions. Any long-term improvement in local community conditions must involve the existing agencies and local leadership in these agencies.

Another State director notes the nearly complete exclusion of the State from proposal review, and the lack of program evaluation by OEO:

Presently, a proposal, when submitted by the CAA to the regional office, is reviewed by a regional analyst, who has the authority to add or delete from the component. This practice in almost all cases goes on without consultation with the State TA. The local community, thus sensing that the ultimate responsibility for the success of their proposal rests with a regional analyst, turns to the regional office for assistance. In all too many instances, the analyst encourages the local community to obviate the STA. This dual service leads inevitably to confusion and mistrust.

At present, the evaluation of funded programs is not required. Thus, proposals are refunded without a knowledge



on the part of the reviewer if the program was effective and meaningful to the lives of the disadvantaged. It is conceivable that good money is supporting ineffective programs.

The following letter to Congressman Quie from Governor LeVander of Minnesota not only provides an excellent statement of the plight of the States under present policies of OEO, but also furnishes realistic alternatives that we think would immeasurably strengthen community action and other poverty programs:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
St. Paul, Minn., April 18, 1967.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR AL: I am most grateful for your letter of April 13 and the copy of the news release outlining your proposed "Republican Opportunity Crusade" to inject new life into the faltering poverty program.

Public reaction to your proposed changes is generally quite favorable, and even enthusiastic in some quarters. However, there are many who are confused—and have been led to believe that your plan for new direction and new vitality in the program is really an effort to discontinue Federal programs for the poor. This is unfortunate, and you might consider another release stressing your concern for redirection and realistic administration of antipoverty programs in order to restore confidence and respect of the American public and those who should be benefiting from these expenditures.

Of particular importance is the development of sound administration, new direction, and new vitality for the poverty programs and the establishment of sound management and direction so desperately needed by the local CAP councils.

Actually, here in Minnesota, the Governor's office of economic opportunity is the "Governor's" in name only. The State OEO office "dangles" haplessly, between the local CAP councils and the regional office, doing housekeeping chores, providing routine assistance to CAP councils, with no real authority to act. Only out-State (rural) OEO programs in Minnesota are under the Governor's OEO office. As you know, metropolitan programs in the Twin Cities, Indian programs on reservations, and special service programs funded with earmarked moneys require my approval (waiver). As Governor, I have neither control nor authority over the programs once they are operational. Similarly, programs of local community action councils require executive approval (waiver), but regulations provide no real basis for authority by the State over the council actions once the funds and the projects have had approval from the regional office.

As part of your proposal for reestablishment and rejuvenation of these programs for the poor through the opportunity crusade concept, there is great need to strengthen the State's position in administration of the programs and in allocation of funds. Ideally, allocation and utilization of funds should be handled by a designated State office responsible to the Governor. This office, operating with a combination of State and Federal funds, and working with local communities and community action councils would make determination of programs and projects based on local needs, with specific goals and purpose.

There is, as your proposal indicates, need to lift the philosophy and attitudes of the program and the people involved to a "positive" rather than negative approach.

There is need for more imaginative programs keyed to local needs. With funding approval centered in a regional office by people who have no familiarity with an area or its problems, it becomes almost impossible to get acceptance of a special, imaginative program that is different than the standard. This, in itself, defeats the purpose of the community action concept and results in the sameness of programs throughout the State.

Under present administrative procedures, the regional office in Chicago now handles the function of funding and approving programs, completely bypassing the State office. It certainly would be desirable to amend the act and/or regulations to allow funds for administration and programs to be granted directly to the State. With the funds, there should also be requirement that local CAP

councils meet minimum standards in administrative procedures, bookkeeping, management and other criteria to insure proper utilization of funds in keeping with the intent of the law. States desiring to administer the programs should be required to meet certain criteria such as:

- (1) A demonstrated knowledge of the goals and philosophy of the act based on past performance);
- (2) Full compliance with civil rights legislation;
- (3) Adequate staff to give technical assistance to CAP councils;
- (4) A demonstrated ability to write, suggest, and evaluate programs to meet specific needs;
- (5) A continuous evidence of interest in helping low-income people improve their position;
- (6) A demonstrated understanding and willingness to have liaison with the programs of other State and Federal agencies, so as to avoid costly overlapping, duplicating effort;
- (7) A willingness to communicate and furnish public information to the community, the State, and Federal agencies pursuant to the operation of the Technical Assistance Office and/or any CAP council under its jurisdiction.

It is to the best interests of the Governors of all States that the community action programs which go on in their States be more responsive to the needs within the State. It is unfair to ask a Governor to agree to participation in a program, to whatever limits, without his having any authority in the matter. The various State technical assistance offices at present, along with the various Governors' offices, are in the middle and with the planning outlined above, this could all be changed for the good of the program in the State involved.

Similarly, antipoverty programs on Indian reservations are inadequately supervised and potentially explosive. The programs on Indian reservations are funded directly from the Indian Desk in Washington, but I hold the responsibility of approval or disapproval—not really knowing precisely what is being approved. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity both stand on the sidelines with no actual authority over the programs or administration of the CAP councils on Indian reservations \* \* \*. Modifications in the act or regulations to provide each Governor greater jurisdiction over the anti-poverty programs on Indian reservations in his State is imperative toward accomplishing the goals outlined in your "Opportunity Crusade" proposal.

As of mid-March, Minnesota had received \$40,497,212 in antipoverty funds since the initial grants were made to Hennepin and Ramsey Counties in December 1964. The seven Indian reservations in Minnesota have received \$5,908,130 since the start of these OEO programs for Indians.

There is great need for guidance in the development of meaningful programs on the reservations which will result in better utilization of these funds, and to provide programs of a more lasting effect than most of the projects now being funded.

Please accept my good wishes that your proposals for a new "Opportunity Crusade" will result in new and vigorous programs that are both meaningful and effective.

Kindest personal regards,  
Cordially,

HAROLD LEVANDER,  
Governor.

#### RECORD OF ADMINISTRATION

By now, due to the tireless efforts of those in charge to obfuscate, confuse, and delay, OEO must have gained the reputation of being the "black sheep" of all departments and agencies in Washington, D.C. This is certainly true with most Members of Congress. Numerous Members have complained on the floor of the House and otherwise that any dealings with OEO are a drawnout, frustrating experience. Congressman James M. Manley, of New York, gained the sympathy of every Member of Congress when he read into the record:



## BUCKPASSING BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(Mr. Hanley (at the request of Mr. Cabell) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the great privilege of representing Onondaga County in the House of Representatives. It is a thriving area, full of the bustle traditional to any American community on the move. It is also full of the anxieties and pressures which confront an American community trying to adjust to the temperament of the 1960's.

The city of Syracuse is located in Onondaga County, and it is to this fact and its ramifications that I wish to address the attention of my colleagues this afternoon.

In 1964, the city of Syracuse established as a grantee agency the mayor's commission for youth designed as a vehicle for distribution of funds under the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency. As you will recall, Congress in the summer of 1964, enacted the Economic Opportunity Act whose purposes were, first to provide an umbrella operation for then existing programs such as the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency; and second, to expand economic and social opportunities to those to whom these words had been empty and meaningless.

The Economic Opportunity Act represented a brandnew conceptual approach to the problems of cyclical poverty. Its preamble held that more than welfare and the dole were necessary to root out the social malaise which had afflicted the lower economic classes of our Nation for generations. It held that a massive program of self-help was not only possible but absolutely necessary.

While not a Member of this body at the time EOA was enacted, I did do my part as an interested citizen to engender support for its enactment and proper implementation.

Fortunately, despite a few initial, temporary setbacks and despite constant sniper attacks, the Office of Economic Opportunity did get off the ground. Equally as fortunate was the fact that my own hometown of Syracuse became one of the initial participants in the war on poverty.

I suspect that no other agency of the Federal Government had more significant hurdles to overcome than OEO, if for no other reason than the hurculean nature of the task handed to it. Any agency dealing with the emotional fabric of our society, with the stridency of deep rooted passions and with the societal barnacles of myth, has its work cut out for it. But there were those of us in whose breast beliefs and confidence ran high—belief that cyclical poverty could be licked and confidence that our society had lost neither its taste nor its capacity for adjustment.

Since no new program can be expected to attain perfection in a short period of time, if in fact, considering the elements of human frailty, it ever can, we were well counseled to accept the reality of slow progress toward our professed goals in the poverty war.

To be certain, no one, not even the most optimistic, believed that we could win the war only with injections of good faith and money. Hard decisions both at the local level and at the national administrative level had to be made. This item, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the main thrust of my remarks this afternoon.

The poverty program in Syracuse, N.Y., is in the throes of desperation. I will not attempt to recount the bitterness which has rooted its way into the foundations of the Syracuse agency. Suffice it to say, without any blameful attributions, that a Mexican standoff has been effected between opposing elements intimately involved with the program in Syracuse. I said I would make no blameful attributions because the air is rife with charges and countercharges each of which has been brought bluntly and forcefully to the attention of the highest echelon of the Office of Economic Opportunity during the last month.

Mr. Speaker, the funds for the war on poverty in Syracuse are due to expire tomorrow evening at midnight and no decision on the part of OEO has as yet been forthcoming on the future of that program. The decision is beyond the pale of local resolution. It is now even beyond the reach of the OEO regional office in New York City. It is squarely, as it has been for a week, in the hands of OEO headquarters in downtown Washington.

I have supported the aims of the war on poverty and in all likelihood I will continue to support them. But I can guarantee that the authorization of new funds will provide one of the hottest debates this Chamber has ever had.

In my 3 years in Congress, I have witnessed mountains of bureaucratic indecision and gobbledygook. I have seen bureaucratic vacillation that would have shaken less stable governments; I have been the recipient of conflicting reports which might drive some men onto a diet of sasparilla and strychnine, but never in my congressional tenure, Mr. Speaker, have I seen a more blundering mish-mash of indecision than that served up to me by OEO during the last month.

I used to think, in my greener days, that the semicomical portrayal of bureaucratic operations was something one only read about in the columns of crusading journalists—but now I have become a believer. During the last month either I or a member of my staff has talked with just about every warm body in the OEO establishment. I have pled, cajoled, begged, demanded, and otherwise sought some decision out of that administrative monstrosity only to have my pleading, cajolery, begging, and demands fall on deaf ears. I have been plugged into more telephone connections at OEO than any operator on their switchboard. It seems to me that the only decision anyone down there is capable of making is that someone else is making the decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Congress order a carload of medals for buckpassing struck and then direct that the carload be delivered en masse to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Congressman Albert H. Quie has experienced such delay and confusion since OEO's inception. This spring, when OEO attempted to outdo its previous record of delay in answering letters, the following chain of correspondence ensued:

#### AN ANSWER FROM MR. SHRIVER

(Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Stanton) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, for over 18 months I have been attempting, without much success, to get certain vital information from the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Director, Mr. R. Sargent Shriver. I am today inserting in the Congressional Record a series of letters and one telegram to illustrate how difficult it is to elicit even a reply from Mr. Shriver.

The opening letter is dated January 12, 1967, to which no reply was received. On March 2, 1967, I again wrote to Mr. Shriver. A third letter was sent on April 6, 1967. I waited until April 13, 1967, at which time I sent a telegram to Mr. Shriver which contained this phrase:

"Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators, House Education and Labor Committee, will be at your office, nine a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence four-week investigation at OEO headquarters."

The telegram, at last, galvanized Mr. Shriver into an answer, which is also included, dated April 14, 1967. I am also including my reply to Mr. Shriver of April 17, 1967.

I believe a careful reading of the letters and telegram illustrates a serious administrative defect in the operations of OEO. As I wrote in my letter of April 17, 1967:

"A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12, (1967), concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to reasonable inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency."

Mr. Spaker, it would appear to me that OEO already has enough problems without compounding them by refusing to answer a reasonable request from a Member of Congress.

As Members of Congress know, I am not out to eliminate the poverty programs. With my colleague, Mr. Goodell, I have worked hard to prepare a substitute for the administration's war on poverty, called the opportunity crusade. The opportunity crusade would transfer the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act from OEO to existing agencies and would provide for the involvement of States and private industry in an effort to make meaningful studies toward eliminating poverty.

The purpose of many contacts with OEO is to make the faltering war on poverty a successful opportunity crusade.



Mr. Speaker, I trust my colleagues will take note of this exchange of letters, and Mr. Shriver's belated reply. To vote intelligently we must have more facts. I hope Mr. Shriver and his associates will in the future be more cooperative when a Member of Congress makes a reasonable request for information.

The letters and telegram follow :

JANUARY 12, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
*Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The December 20, 1966, issue of the Omaha, Nebraska, *World Herald* carried an article captioned "GOCA Given Bonus Offer—Job Corps Prospects Worth \$25 Each." The Director of the Greater Omaha Community Action agency reported he had been asked to participate in a "bonus" program to attract more male youths into the Job Corps. He said the Community Action agency would receive \$25 for each youth it recruited and sent to the State Employment Service where screening and testing is done. GOCA reportedly would be paid whether or not the youth entered the Corps.

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Kenneth E. Shearer, Director, Greater Omaha Community Action, confirmed the above and stated this bonus program had been set up in many states because of "some difficulties in recruiting youngsters."

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Don Thomasson, Regional Director of OEO, Kansas City, Missouri, advised a staff investigator of the House Education and Labor Committee that the above program was conceived early in December and all Regional Offices of OEO had been encouraged to participate.

Perhaps you will recall that during the Senate debate of the 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, there was some criticism of OEO for paying amounts up to \$80 to the United States Employment Service and private organizations for recruiting Job Corps prospects. The 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, Section 103(e) provided "that the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the corps."

It seems to me that a plan to reimburse another anti-poverty agency for recruiting or referring Jobs Corps prospects is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended. Further, I would expect that the recruitment and counseling of prospects for Job Corps would receive high priority in community action programs and that these activities are provided for in funds granted community action agencies for conduct and administration.

I would appreciate your comments regarding the above matter.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*Member of Congress.*

MARCH 2, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
*Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The Sunday, December 11, 1966, issue of the *San Francisco* (California) *Examiner* carried a front-page story exposing fiscal irregularities in the operation of the Economic Opportunity Council (EOC), San Francisco's Community Action Agency. The Examiner's story was based on an Office of Economic Opportunity audit report released by the Western Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Concerning the release of the OEO audit report, the Regional OEO Director said it was a public document open to inspection by anyone.

I was somewhat surprised to learn that OEO considers audit reports public documents. During the past eighteen months, there has been considerable publicity resulting from alleged improper expenditures of War on Poverty funds. To my knowledge, neither the Congress nor the public have been given the results of audits of programs where scandals have occurred and in most instances have not learned of the ultimate disposition of these matters.

I know you are aware of my deep interest in anti-poverty legislation and the development of anti-poverty programs across the country. In order that the Congress can be apprised of the results of official OEO audits of programs having alleged fiscal difficulties, please forward to me OEO audit reports regarding the following matters:

1) Interim and final audit reports concerning Haryou-Act during the 1965-1966 period;

2) Interim and final audit reports concerning EYOA, the Lost Angeles Community Action Agency, audited early in 1966. (You will recall that during the 1966 War on Poverty hearings, the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee ordered that these reports be submitted for the record. The record does not include the Los Angeles audit reports.)

3) Interim and final audit reports concerning the ABCD, Boston's Community Action Agency, which was involved in difficulties late in 1965 and early 1966;

4) Interim and final audit reports regarding CDGM, Mississippi's Head Start sponsor much of which has been publicized;

5) Audit reports concerning EOC, San Francisco's Community Action Agency, which were released to the press in December, 1966;

6) Audit reports reflecting the results of an investigation in Newark, New Jersey, which culminated in the conviction of Phillip Thigpen, an NYC administrator, and his assistant;

7) Inspection reports regarding the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs which received widespread publicity late in 1965;

8) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Atterbury, Indiana, Job Corps Center prior to change of sponsor in 1966;

9) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Breckenridge, Ky., Job Corps Center prior to the change of sponsor in 1966;

10) Audit reports concerning the Cleveland Action for Youth program where, prior to September, 1966, \$1,632 admittedly was paid to a fictitious employee;

11) Audit reports regarding Cleveland's (Ohio) Neighborhood Youth Corps where in September, 1966, alleged payroll padding scandals were exposed;

12) Audit reports of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) antipoverty programs. It was reported in July, 1966, that U.S. Representative Sam Gibbons had requested OEO to make a "top-to-bottom" re-examination of the Suncoast poverty war; and

13) Any audit or inspection reports of the Mingo, West Virginia, County Community Action Agency.

An early reply to the above request will be appreciated very much.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*Member of Congress.*

APRIL 6, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
*Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I am told that on the Easter Sunday "Meet the Press" program you stated you would welcome a long, hard look, at the antipoverty program by the Congress. I find this invitation most interesting and particularly appropriate at this time. I am hopeful that in the near future the House Education and Labor Committee will be considering anti-poverty legislation. It is my feeling that the Committee would find most useful data that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been gathering for the past year. I have noted that several million dollars have been spent by the OEO to study and evaluate a variety of its programs.

It would be appreciated if you will agree to make OEO records available to staff investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee at the OEO Headquarters during the period April 17—May 12, 1967. I would like your assurance that investigators will be permitted access to personnel and administrative records, Inspector General's reports of OEO investigations, all fiscal records including OEO audit reports, all OEO contracts and memoranda and reports concerning studies and evaluations of War on Poverty programs. It is likely that copies of selected data will be requested for review by the Committee. Further, it would be most helpful if you would make members of your staff available, their schedules permitting, for interviews.

I would appreciate an early reply in order that the necessary arrangements can be made.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE.



R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
*Director, OEO,*  
*Washington, D.C.:*

Reference my letter April 6, 1967. Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators. House Education and Labor Committee will be at your office, 9 a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence 4-week investigation at OEO headquarters.

Regards,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*Member of Congress.*

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Your telegram of April 13 and your letter of April 6 have been the subject of a discussion between myself and the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Chairman Perkins indicated that he would shortly inform me of his Committee's desires with respect to the handling of this year's poverty bill.

I assured the Chairman that I would welcome a long hard look at the anti-poverty programs by his Committee, that this agency was fully prepared to comply with any appropriate requests for information from his Committee, and that we were ready to cooperate in every possible way to facilitate the deliberations of his Committee.

I am prepared to answer any questions that you or any other Member of Congress may have with respect to this agency's operations. Members of my staff are prepared at any time, their schedules permitting, to answer any questions you or any other Member of Congress may wish to present to them.

I don't think that my attitude with respect to Congressional examination of Economic Opportunity Act programs differs significantly from those of the heads of other agencies in connection with their requests for funds and legislation. I am, therefore, somewhat surprised that what I have said on this point should give rise to the suggestion that your staff should be permitted to range at will through the files and records of this agency—a request that, so far as I know, is completely unprecedented.

The files of this agency, like those of others, contain a variety of material that bears on internal decision-making processes, upon the private affairs of many thousands of individuals, and upon possible or alleged but as yet undetermined violations of law or regulations on the part of specific individuals and organizations. I am certain you will recognize that much of this material is traditionally protected and not of the nature that any agency head could be expected to make available on the terms you suggest.

Apart from questions of law or basic propriety, I would also point out that what you suggest would most certainly interfere with operations of this agency at the busiest time of the year. It would also most certainly interfere with the grant process and inhibit our own efforts to prepare and assemble our justification materials for the Congress in an orderly and efficient manner.

The evaluation reports of OEO programs, as we have previously indicated, are available at any time. They are voluminous and we have them in a special library that is open to the public and certainly would be available to any of your staff who would like to review them. They may contact Dr. Levine (Government Code 128-6021) and they will be permitted access to the reports.

In response to your letter of March 2 with respect to certain audit reports, neither this agency nor any other in the Federal Government considers such reports automatically public documents. The fact that one report was issued prematurely is not a justification for considering all such reports public information.

The report of the auditors is but one step in an over-all auditing process that may involve a good many internal staff communications of the kind that are not normally available even in litigation with an agency. An audit report, moreover, may well lead to or become a part of an administrative or court proceeding. It is clear that premature release of this kind of document can be wholly subversive of the purpose for which those documents are prepared. Obviously the Fed-

eral interest could not be protected by the disclosure of every potential claim, charge, or action while it is under discussion. Public disclosure would, in fact, jeopardize in many instances the Federal case if the matter eventually results in a formal proceeding or a criminal prosecution.

Most of the audits on which you requested reports have not as yet been brought to final resolution. The audit report of the 1965 summer program of Haryou, for instance, was completed early this year. It was followed by a response on the part of the grantee which resolved some of the problems. That response has been reviewed by lawyers, accountants, and program people who have made recommendations to the regional director. He is now consulting further with Haryou on the basis of the recommendations made by the reviewing staff. Should his determinations be accepted by Haryou, a final order bringing the matter to a conclusion will be prepared. If not, Haryou will be entitled to an administrative or judicial hearing.

There follows a status report on the other matters on which you requested information.

1. EYOA (The Los Angeles Community Action Agency)—The audit report has been completed and a response has been made by the grantee. This response is being evaluated and no final determinations have been made.

2. ABCD (Boston's Community Action Agency)—A series of audits have been completed. The grantee has responded and the process is moving forward. One or two elements are being evaluated by the Justice Department.

3. CDGM—1965 Summer Head Start Program—Audit process has been completed. A substantial amount of money was recovered. A report on this matter will be provided to you shortly. An interim audit by Ernst and Ernst of the 1966 CDGM Head Start Program is being evaluated as a basis for final audit by OEO staff.

4. EOC (San Francisco's Community Action Agency)—The report was completed. The response of the grantee is now being evaluated.

5. Your requests relating to the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs of ABCD in Boston, and Newark, New Jersey, the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland Action for Youth, and the Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps, I have referred to Jack Howard who will respond to your inquiry.

6. The audits of Camp Atterbury and Camp Breckenridge Job Corps Centers are now in process. When they are completed, the Contracting Officer will make his decisions and a close-out voucher will be submitted.

7. The audits of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) are being wound up. Information disclosed by the auditors has already resulted in the conviction of one individual for the misappropriation of funds.

8. Mingo County (West Virginia)—An audit is underway.

I stand ready, of course, to answer any specific question you may have with respect to any grant or contract made by this agency. I am also prepared to provide you with the final determination of the audit process as each is completed.

The General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has automatic access to the reports of our audits and continuously scrutinizes our auditing process. If you have genuine doubts as to how this agency is handling the audits of its programs, you might want to request GAO for an evaluation of our efforts either generally or with respect to particular matters. People at the GAO are experienced and competent to carry out such work. Their experience and objectivity would preclude the misinterpretation and confusion that might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally. As for the reports of our Office of Inspection, they are not and never have been public information. These reports are prepared for investigatory purposes and for law enforcement. They are internal communications directed to me as Director of this agency, most frequently at my specific request, giving advisory interpretations of specific fact situations. They almost invariably contain information given in confidence and material which if publicly disclosed would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. By their very nature, they must be protected for public disclosure if they are to serve the purpose for which they are intended.

Your vigilant concern for the problems local anti-poverty programs have met in the past is well known to all of us. I believe that most of these problems, now more than a year behind us, have been resolved. I sincerely trust that as our new



legislation goes forward you will be as vigilant in maintaining the OEO programs which have proven so vital to the continued progress of America's poor.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director.

APRIL 17, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Thank you for your letter of April 14, 1967. I was pleased to note the communication did not reflect the hostility which was conveyed by Saturday morning's *Washington Post's* account of it. I read the *Post's* article first.

As the time for the House Education and Labor Committee's hearings on the anti-poverty program rapidly approaches, I am most anxious to see that valid, objective data bearing upon the progress, or lack of it, of War on Poverty programs is presented properly to the Committee. Perhaps you will recall that a substantial part of the testimony at last year's hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act was provided by representatives of Federal agencies. My efforts to have sixty-seven witnesses called were ignored. It was my feeling that these individuals, a cross section of proponents and dissidents and all knowledgeable regarding specific aspects of the War on Poverty, could have furnished information of value for the legislative deliberations of the Committee.

Misappropriation and diversion of anti-poverty funds are of vital concern to the Congress and the taxpayers. We in the Congress have been rather patient, I think, waiting for reliable reports of fiscal scandals that broke in the news media eighteen months ago. If disposition of the audits I requested on March 2nd isn't available for this year's hearings, when will it be? Why is it that the Comptroller of the City of New York can release his report on the Haryou situation and the Congress must remain in the dark concerning OEO's findings in this matter?

At last year's hearings you will recall a discussion of the Los Angeles Community Action Agency's audit by the OEO. At that time the Chairman ordered this report be placed in the record and it was not done. Now, one year later, you tell me no final determinations have been made. Are there no administrative devices to expedite these important matters?

Your reasons for denying Congressional examinations of OEO audit reports and reports of your Office of Inspection appear to be substantial; however, I'm not convinced the reasons take precedence over the need for the Congress to know their contents.

Why was OEO's audit report of San Francisco's Community Action Agency released to the press in December, 1966, and what basis did your Regional Director have for stating the audit report was a public document open to inspection by anyone? It seems to me there may have been a compelling reason to release the San Francisco report, if your attitude regarding audit reports was the same then as it is now.

You suggest I might want to request the General Accounting Office to evaluate the handling of OEO audits. I reject this suggestion since it would constitute duplication of the process that your auditors have performed. At this point I have no quarrel with your auditing procedures. It is the findings of the audits that would be of interest to the Congress, the House Education and Labor Committee, and the general public.

I would take exception to your feeling that "misinterpretation and confusion might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally" by Congressional staff investigators. I can assure you that the minority investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee are experienced, competent and thorough and would be capable of a completely objective review of your agency's records.

What did you mean when you said on the March 26th, nationally televised, "Meet the Press" program when you stated, "We would welcome, as I've said many times, a close scrutiny of all parts of the War against Poverty?" It is my view that any close scrutiny of the War on Poverty must include an examination of the OEO Headquarters' operations, the very heart of the problems that plague anti-poverty efforts.

Naturally, I would prefer that any investigation of OEO Headquarters or examination of OEO records be scheduled with your approval and cooperation. If at some future date I still feel the need of Congress to be apprised of the results of OEO audits and inspection reports, I intend to explore the possibilities of examining OEO records under the provisions of legislation enacted by the Congress last year (Public Law 89-487, Public Information, Availability).

A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12, concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to responsible inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency. When irate taxpayers and responsible representatives of the news media request information from me concerning anti-poverty programs, I do not expect they should be kept waiting for periods of months for answers to their inquiries. Any steps you can take to expedite responses will be greatly appreciated. I might add this view is shared by a large number of my colleagues.

Your invitation to my staff to review evaluation reports of OEO programs at your library is appreciated. I would appreciate it if you will forward the following reports to me so that I might look them over in my office prior to this year's anti-poverty hearings:

Two reports prepared by the Louis Harris Associates concerning surveys of Job Corps graduates and dropouts.

The evaluation report of neighborhood centers prepared by Kirschner Associates of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Report of the study made by Dr. Max Wolff, Senior Research Sociologist for the Center of Urban Education at the University of New York City, on the Head Start program.

410-page report prepared by the Human Sciences Research, Inc., McLean, Virginia, resulting from a study of six Indian reservations.

310-page report on the jobs for the poor in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and Rochester, prepared by the National Committee on Employment of Youth under contract to OEO.

Report on Camp Atterbury prepared by Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., in late 1965.

With every best wish, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
*Member of Congress.*

Many proponents of the OEO and its programs feel about the programs as Representative Phil M. Landrum, one responsible for the initial legislation, when he said:

I still feel strongly that the so-called poverty program is sound in concept and designed to go after these problems on a long-range basis of education and training. But I am saddened that the administration of the program has been so poorly carried out and that so many bad judgments have been made.

#### Regional Offices

Since the decentralization of OEO most of the decisions and policies affecting individual programs are established within the six regional offices. A study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., in April 1967 entitled "Strengthening the Organization and Process of the CAP Regional Offices," thoroughly reviewed the operation of the regional offices and contained the following major conclusions:

Headquarters imposes an excessive number of information demands on the regional offices \* \* \*. We identified several examples of inquiries from two or more headquarters offices about the same problem on the same day. While we have not



conducted a detailed \* \* \* (one) underlying cause: A lack of understanding on the part of headquarters personnel of the role headquarters is to play in the management process, and an unwillingness to function within the boundaries of that role.

The regional offices frequently receive detailed direction from a multitude of headquarters personnel. \* \* \* This problem grows out of a lack of understanding at headquarters of line authority and of the functional and advisory authorities of the various staff units.

\* \* \* personnel at each level must develop and instill in subordinates a greater degree of discipline than has heretofore existed in CAP. By "organizational discipline," we mean the frame of mind with which individuals carry out their assigned responsibilities without dissipating time in nonessential meetings or veering off into areas of responsibility outside their own.

\* \* \* the lack of adequate headquarters discipline is a problem to the regional offices because of the excessive information requests that have been imposed, the management improvement projects that have been launched but have not been completed, and the needed actions that were delayed when decisions were not properly coordinated or when unauthorized persons intervened.

CAP critically needs to be able to apportion work and assign responsibilities in a logical manner so that each person fulfills his responsibilities without drifting into another's area of responsibility.

However, CAP has been hampered by an excessively high turnover in personnel that has undermined efforts to develop a fully experienced and effective staff. The magnitude of this problem is indicated by the following findings:

a. The rate of turnover among regional analysts has been 52 percent per year. The average length of service for analysts is only 10.6 months.

b. Every top-level position at CAP headquarters and at OEO, with the exception of the Director of OEO, has had at least two occupants during the past 2½ years. Some positions have had three or four occupants.

\* \* \* Some of the reasons for this situation were identified through interviews and through questionnaires completed by regional analysts. Low morale and general dissatisfaction were mentioned frequently in five of the seven regional offices.

Regional analysts are frustrated by the confusion, time demands, and lack of support under which they must work.

\* \* \* indicated substantial frustration due to the "confused paperwork maze" in which they must function. \* \* \* The average analyst spends only 2.2 days per month in the field, and some have never visited their grantees.

A review of programs in the Northeastern and Southeastern regions conducted for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower,

and Poverty this year contained several criticisms and suggestions, some of which were:

### Northeastern Regional Office

Yet we are convinced that the Federal regional role needs adjustment. OEO/New York needs more emissaries in the field and fewer "desk men" in the regional office. More personal and continuous contact is needed between the communities and OEO, and the point of contact should be the field staff of the OEO regional office. Preferably, the New Jersey, upstate New York, and New England field teams should be physically located in the communities they serve. And should operate as articulate spokesmen of the Federal stake in community action programs. Without these local contacts, there is little advantage in locating a regional office on Madison Avenue rather than in Washington where the field services for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands remain.

The field staff and, on occasion, the regional director and his deputies could help communities to resolve interagency or interpersonal squabbles. Indeed, they have played this role but one suspects not as often as needed.

### Southeastern Regional Office

The Southeastern regional office has served more in the role of control and review than in leadership in program development and evaluation. Apparently the resources of the regional office have been limited to the extent that its efforts have had to be directed more toward the review of applications and the determination of compliance than to helpful guidance and direction. All agencies expressed regret that regional representatives could not spend more time in their communities to understand their programs and to help them in program evaluation.

\* \* \* It would appear that stronger coordination at the State and Federal level of all related programs is mandatory. The State agency should be given more clearly defined responsibility to effect such coordination at the local level, particularly where State-controlled programs are operating in the local community.

One State technical assistant director has commented "probably the most important difficulty results from exasperating and seemingly arbitrary actions by national and regional OEO in the realm of policies and procedures".

### Program Evaluation

Another complaint of various State technical assistant directors is that OEO policies do not include as one of the criteria for renewing funds for any program any proof of effectiveness through the form of evaluation to determine the extent to which the program has contributed to the alleviation of poverty or its causes. This is a very seri-



ous deficiency and can result in millions of dollars of antipoverty funds being spent on ineffective and wasteful programs.

Mrs. Shirley Tannebaum, director of the Frederick County, Md., Community Action program, testified during hearings before our committee to her frustrating experiences with regional OEO:

Upon presenting this program package to OEO, we began a long series of negotiations which if it were not so serious could be called a comedy of errors. The day after presenting our proposals to regional office, the program analyst for my county resigned.

Since then I have had six program analysts. Every time I have had to go through these programs again, explaining and describing once again. This particular process went on for about a year.

Never was I told that the program was bad. The proposals were not rejected. They simply never were funded.

### ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

Probably the most effective and efficient administrative effort in the entire OEO is in the area of public relations. A budget of \$2.4 million is utilized in a furious churning out of beautiful brochures and tons of press releases which tell what a grand and glorious job OEO is doing to lift the poverty stricken up by the boot straps. OEO pays great attention to the press, and whenever articles are written which are favorable to OEO they are reproduced and sent to Members of Congress as well as countless others.

Many problems facing OEO today have been created from overselling a program which has in no way been able to fulfill the promises made.

OEO public relations efforts include the technique of swiftly issuing press releases rebutting any and all criticisms of the program, regardless of the facts. Such "rebuttals" in the past have ranged from casting aspersions on a congressional report (as in the press release criticizing the minority views of this committee on the 1966 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act) to a complete denial of facts previously established. Consider the case of the Liberation Hate School in Nashville, Tenn., brought to light in the testimony of Capt. John A. Sorace of the Nashville Police Department before the Senate Judiciary Committee in early August of this year. Captain Sorace testified that OEO funds had been issued to support a liberation school connected with the North Nashville summer project at St. Anselm's Episcopal Church in Nashville at which, under the direction of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee affiliated employments, children were being taught to "hate whitey." After a denial of such support by Rev. Dr. Paschell Davis the following day before the committee, Dr. Davis sent a telegram to the committee in which he restated the case and admitted that some expenses of the school had been or would be borne by the metropolitan action commission, the antipoverty agency funded under the OEO appropriation.

The following letter published in several southeastern newspapers on and around August 25, 3 weeks after use of OEO funds for the

liberation hate school was firmly established, contains a denial in one form or another in every paragraph, and leaves one with the impression that OEO funds were not in anyway involved. Although the release is carefully worded and numerous denials as stated are correct, the general denial that "not one dime of Federal funds has been used in the controversial liberation school" is contrary to the established and true facts:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Aug. 25, 1967.]

PULSE OF THE PUBLIC—FREEDOM SCHOOL NOT OEO'S

ATLANTA.—A wire service story out of Nashville August 17 reported on some controversial classes at the liberation school, connected with the North Nashville summer project of St. Anselm's Episcopal Church. Unfortunately, the news report identified these activities, skits acting out the slaughter of white plantation owners in the Nat Turner slave rebellion of over a century ago, as being paid from Federal funds provided by OEO. This is definitely not the case, and we regret that some newsmen have failed to note the repeated and emphatic denials of any participation by our agency in that project.

Not one dime of Federal funds has been used in the controversial liberation school, and that fact has been thoroughly documented and publicly presented on several conspicuous occasions during the past 2 weeks. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, stated flatly that none of our funds have ever been used in that project.

The Reverend Dr. Paschall Davis, chairman of the metropolitan action commission, our community-action agency in Nashville, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that no Federal expenditures have ever been made in that project.

Several others connected with our agency, and with the various relationships it has in Nashville, Tenn., have all stated publicly that absolutely no OEO funds have ever been used by the liberation school.

In spite of the latest erroneous reports, sensationalizing the unfortunate events in Nashville, we trust that your readers understand that the school in question is definitely not supported by the funds from OEO.

Thank you for your kindness in making this clarification for us.

DUPREE JORDAN,

*Director of Public Affairs, Southeast Regional Office, Office of Economic Opportunity.*

We would suggest to OEO that if its high-powered public relations staff were put to work straightening out the administrative confusions in the poverty programs, the time, money, and energy would be better spent.

### Lobbying

A serious matter of congressional lobbying was brought to the attention of Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford by Mayor Wallace Johnson of Berkeley, Calif., and later substantiated by other mayors. Following is Mayor Johnson's letter:

CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
October 3, 1967.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORD: Today, long distance collect from Washington, an assistant of Sargent Shriver, Lewis Ritter, telephoned me to secure my commendation of the OEO program. He went on to explain that, with the approval of Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell, of Honolulu, he was calling the Republican mayors of this country to solicit their support of OEO. If I were favorably disposed to append my name to a petition or statement in support of OEO, Mr. Ritter explained, he would send me a copy of the text of such a statement.



I asked him what was the general content of the statement. He responded that it included the thought that the OEO program in the local communities was working well and effectively, and that furthermore I, as a Republican mayor, endorsed it. I promptly advised this man that I was not enthusiastic about the OEO program, and could see no evidence that it was attaining its objectives.

My purpose in writing to you is to tell you that as a citizen, a public servant, and a fellow Republican, I resent Sargent Shriver and his aides using public funds and facilities to, in effect, lobby among local Republican officials in an effort to put pressure on Gerald Ford and Everett Dirksen. Mr. Ritter quite candidly stated that the purpose of his endeavor was to prepare a message endorsed by a large number of Republican mayors, and then to confront you with it.

I have written a book on politics, "Responsible Individualism," which will be published later this month by Devin-Adair. A chapter of this book, "Bureaucracy—the 4th Arm of Government," describes the growing power of nonelected officials and the importance of keeping the power and prerogatives of administrative staff in their proper subordinate role. Here is a flagrant example of staff lobbying against legislators. You can count on my full cooperation to help correct this abuse.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE JOHNSON, *Mayor*.

The efforts of Mr. Ritter did result in a telegram signed by 22 Republican mayors being sent to Minority Leaders Everett Dirksen and Gerald Ford urging the minority leaders "to encourage Members of Congress to support the OEO budget so that these dynamic and imaginative programs may be carried on in a successful manner."

Congressman Goodell responded with the following release reminding OEO of the criminal lobbying law:

Congressman Charles E. Goodell, a ranking Republican on the House committee writing poverty legislation and a member of the House Republican leadership, today charged OEO with violation of Federal criminal law prohibiting Government employees from lobbying Congress at the taxpayers' expense. The charge leveled by Congressman Goodell involved solicitation by OEO employees of favorable comments from Republican mayors with reference to the war on poverty.

"Information has come to me from several Republican mayors that they resented pressure from OEO officials to whom they must apply for funds," Congressman Goodell asserted "All mayors of major cities in this country face fiscal problems and they want as much Federal money to come to their cities as is possible, however poorly written and poorly administered the Federal laws may be. They acknowledge that they do not have information about suggested improvements or redirection of the war on poverty. When they are called or contacted by mail, the context inevitably is: 'You want us to make money available to your community, now you do something for us. Urge congressional leadership to expand the war on poverty and to carry it on in its present form.'

"This is a very serious matter. Letters are going out from OEO every day and wires are burning with OEO employees urging public officials, labor unions, business groups, and other organizations to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress. Unfortunately, these people being solicited are getting only one side of the story. They are told: 'Members of Congress are trying to kill the poverty war. If you want to save it and keep getting some money in your community, go to work on your Congressman.' They are not told about the Opportunity Crusade or other proposals to improve and redirect the program."

Congressman Goodell cited title 18 of the U.S. Code, Section 913, which provides as follows:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed

to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Exceptions are provided in the law for direct communications between Federal agencies and Members of Congress. Those exceptions are not involved in the cases in question," Congressman Goodell stated.

"Congress provided this safeguard to protect the people and the representatives of the people from the overwhelming lobbying power of Federal employees using the taxpayers' money to perpetuate and promote the programs understandably supported by the people who administer those programs. This is a particularly dangerous practice when organizations or public officials solicited receive large amounts of Federal money from the very administrators who are soliciting them. OEO employees have been flagrant in their abuse of the intent of these criminal provisions. These abuses must cease immediately.

"It is quite possible that some officials favor continuation of the present war on poverty without change. If so, they don't need to be influenced or pressured by OEO to make their opinions felt in Congress. Congressmen welcome unpressured opinions from all citizens with reference to the legislative problems we face.

"I am referring the clear violations that have come to my attention in this instance to the Department of Justice and the General Accounting Office for investigation and appropriate prosecution."

---

OEO in conjunction with other departments initiated a concentrated employment program in 19 of the larger cities and two rural areas throughout the country early in June, but in their usual fashion—with all the administrative bungling, fast approval of programs without thought, without planning or the waste involved. This crash effort was considered by many merely as an attempt to keep the cities "cool" this summer and was criticized widely:

James Banks, former UPO director here in Washington said:

The Government's whole method of approaching summer is a crazy, illogical, emotional response to a problem which deserves more serious consideration. There is something rather immoral about it. The Government's response is "Let us keep down riots and violence" rather than let us eliminate the causes of riots and violence.

Mitchell Sviridoff, former director of the New York City Human Resources Administration likewise commented:

In my opinion, the concentrated employment program is one of the most promising manpower efforts ever initiated by the Department of Labor. I enthusiastically support it. I also support summer programs. It's just that I do not believe that in themselves, summer programs are enough.

After the mad rush in May and June to get the program underway, the EYOA in Los Angeles received a 1-year allocation to fund a concentrated employment program, effective July 1. It is unbelievable that as of September 14 not one person had been employed. As noted in a letter Supervisor Kenneth Hahn sent to Mr. Shriver criticizing the concentrated employment program and the antipoverty administration in Washington:



\* \* \* although the effective date of this program was July 1, 1967, when 2,100 persons were to go on the payroll, as of this date not one person has been actually employed.

Mr. Hahn has further commented the concentrated employment program is "so snarled in redtape that it's hurting—not helping—existing work and training programs in county government."

Even Zane Meckler, San Francisco Acting Regional Manager of Community Action Programs, indicated his disapproval of this type of administration when he said:

The crash program approach to several recent Federal projects has caught my office on the wrong foot, too. We are exceedingly embarrassed by last-minute release of funds, which we know will cause nothing but havoc. Programs which allow local agencies only a few weeks or days to organize local projects and apply for funds have obvious drawbacks.

#### URBAN BIAS

Studies and hearings have been conducted during the past year into the problem of poverty in rural America, regarding what is being done to check it and what needs to be done. Two facts have been established that are of concern to us: One-half of the Nation's poor live in rural America, but only 31 percent of antipoverty Community Action funds are going to agencies serving the rural poor.

Because the cities were able to organize, apply, get funded and move quickly, it's understandable that a greater percentage of the funds went to urban programs in the beginning. Such is not the situation now as there are more than 1050 Community Action programs in operation and, according to OEO officials, with the planned creation of 40 new agencies, all rural counties which fall into the "concentrated poverty" bracket will be covered by a Community Action agency. These agencies are ready, willing and asking for funds needed to assist the rural poor, but OEO plans for fiscal 1968 will continue to give a disproportionately large share of funds to urban communities.

Dr. James Bonnen, an economist at Michigan State University, who recently spent 2 years on the President's Council of Economic Advisers, bluntly explains the oversight:

An administrator of national programs is under the gun to get the biggest bang for the buck. So he doesn't operate in areas where he encounters the highest cost per unit of program output. In other words, there is a concentration of poor in the cities while the rural poor are dotted here and there over thousands of square miles. It takes more money and effort to even reach them, much less help them.

State OEO directors, Community Action agency directors, and many groups concerned with the rural poor strongly oppose this inequity in funding and so testified before our committee this summer. Mrs. Shirley Tannenbaum, director of the Frederick, Md., Community Action agency, said that "in the mid-Atlantic region the rural areas with smaller and less skilled staffs must compete with such cities as Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Washington. The result is that there is not much left to be distributed to rural Community Action programs."

## How You Going To Keep Them Down on the Farm?

Although the President is urging an increase in Federal aid programs which will help the poor stay in rural America, top thinkers at OEO disagree. According to Nick Kotz, correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, Robert A. Levine, Assistant Director of OEO, "has actively opposed programs to establish housing, job training and economic development designed to help the hard-core rural poor stay where they are. He believes these programs are doomed to failure and that migration to the city is inevitable." Mr. Kotz claims the Minneapolis Tribune has obtained a series of confidential government memorandums which reveal a fundamental disagreement in the Government over what to do about rural poverty.

Thomas Karter, who resigned as Director of OEO's migrant and seasonal farmworkers program, has protested:

Rural programs are not being properly funded. It's not fair to expect people to stay in rural areas when money is not forthcoming to help them toward a better life there. The philosophy Levine is expressing represents the actual policy and programs not only of OEO but of several other Federal agencies.

### RESEARCH

Under OEO's authority to conduct or contract for research into the problems of poverty and evaluation of its programs, a total of \$70 million has been spent. Of course, research into all aspects of poverty is necessary, but so is proper administration of research efforts, including coordination with other agencies and organizations, whether Federal, State, or local, to avoid duplication, and to obtain subsequent full utilization of the findings of such studies. Otherwise, such funds spent on research are "poured down the drain."

Unfortunately, OEO has in the past approached research into poverty as if no effort had ever been made in this field. We are told that prior to 1964, when OEO was legislated, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had contracted for or conducted approximately 300 studies into the problems of poverty. In response to an inquiry from the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs of the Government Operations Committee, in connection with their study on "The Use of Social Research in Federal Domestic Programs," Mr. Joseph A. Kershaw, former Director of OEO Research, commented regarding coordination:

There was never any organized system for doing this and perhaps the agencies ought to have some kind of regularized exchange developed between them.

During "markup" of the poverty bill last week, Congressman John Dent made reference to an OEO contract with Princeton University for an evaluation of technical and training schools in six States. He also noted that he had been advised by a representative of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Information that this information is available and "they can get it for a 5 cent stamp if they wrote for it."

A large percentage of research funds are spent evaluating the anti-poverty programs' administration by OEO or other agencies under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Since OEO is able to



provide realistic evaluation of its own programs, such contracting with private scholars is desirable; however, those knowledgeable with the administration in the Research Division of OEO are highly critical of the effect these evaluations and other research studies have on policies and decisionmaking. Dr. Oscar A. Ornati of New York University contends:

Too few of the senior administrators are familiar with them; there is little systematic analysis of the reports and no routinized way for the findings to be distributed either to the Community Action agencies that administer the programs or to the regional offices of OEO that increasingly pass on fund applications.

#### Secrecy as a Policy

Also of concern to us is the policy of OEO to write into some research contracts language which forbids the contractor to "publish, permit to be published, or distribute for public consumption, any information \* \* \* concerning the objectives, results, or conclusions \* \* \* without the prior written consent of the contracting officer." This restriction has applied to 88 OEO grants totaling over \$12 million during fiscal 1965 and 1966.

Dr. Sar A. Levitan, George Washington University, also concerned over this practice, has said:

An increasingly dangerous practice is Government contracting with private consulting firms and academic institutions for survey and evaluation of public programs. The products of the outside experts become the property of the contracting agency and are not frequently published.

Thus far, the product of the OEO research staff remains largely in the files of the "Poverty House". \* \* \* All that we know about this significant work is based on sketchy newspaper reports or the result of some "leaks," inadvertent or perhaps contrived. It is very doubtful that the product of OEO research and conclusions will ever become public property, unless the recommendations are adopted as official Government policy—an unlikely event. Neither Congress nor the public, therefore, may ever have an opportunity to assess knowledgeably the merits of the proposed multibillion-dollar programs. \* \* \*

There is, however, an urgent need in a free society for the public and Congress to be better informed than they are about the operations of publicly funded programs. At the very minimum, the public is entitled to frank discussion and interpretations of program operations prepared by detached experts without vested interests.

\* \* \* the product of the research must be freely available, and the researcher must be independent of thought controls.

Congressmen Quie and Goodell, as well as countless others interested in the war on poverty, have experienced great difficulty in the past in obtaining copies of research and evaluation reports. Congressman Henry Reuss, chairman of the subcommittee making the

above study, urged the OEO to change their "secrecy policies" after which he was assured new policies would be forthcoming soon. Following a couple of months of silence and no change in policies by OEO officials, Congressman Reuss made a public release criticizing OEO's release of information policies:

Unless the Office of Economic Opportunity changes its information policy, the public will believe that OEO permits its contractors to release only those facts it wants the public to know.

My subcommittee was told that the OEO policy of restricting the release of contract research findings would be changed in the middle of November, but it is the third week of January and nothing has yet been done. Until these restrictions are lifted, Congress will believe that OEO is playing politics with its research funds, rather than conducting a dispassionate research for the truth, letting the facts fall as they may.

The war on poverty has enough trouble from its enemies. It should not get into trouble with its friends over this issue.

OEO policy of prohibiting the release of certain research results came to my attention in an inquiry into federally financed social research conducted by the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, \* \* \*

#### F. UNPOPULARITY POLLS

The responses to surveys conducted by Members of the Congress reflect the unpopularity of the war on poverty and overwhelming dissatisfaction with antipoverty programs. The following release sets out the results of 19 congressional polls:

##### QUIE SAYS DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN POLLS REVEAL WIDESPREAD DISSATISFACTION WITH WAR ON POVERTY PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Minnesota Congressman Albert H. Quie said today (Friday) 19 recent polls by Members of Congress reflect widespread dissatisfaction with the administration's war on poverty program. Representative Quie, Republican of Minnesota, pointed out that the four Democratic polls were as negative as the 15 Republican polls.

He said the polls, placed in the Congressional Record between January 10 and July 10, included every poll that contained a question about the war on poverty. "This, I believe, is a fair sample of what the American people think," he said.

Quie cited the question from Representative O. C. Fisher, Democrat of Texas: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" The "Yes" answers totaled only 6 percent while 87.5 percent answered "No." The poll of another Democrat, Representative Charles E. Bennett, of Florida, gave the war on poverty program only a 12-percent affirmative vote and an 85-percent negative rating.

Representative Quie said Representative Jerome L. Waldie, Democrat of California, asked: "Should we transfer proven programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to regular Federal agencies; e.g., Operation Headstart to HEW, not thereby reducing expenditures, but perhaps increasing efficiency?" The answers were 79 percent "Yes" and only 9 percent "No."

Quie said this only confirms what sponsors of the Opportunity Crusade have been saying all along, that to be truly effective, programs such as Headstart should be transferred to HEW.

He also said the poll results illustrate that the antipoverty program must be revamped and redirected along the lines proposed in the Republican alternative, the Opportunity Crusade. The Opportunity Crusade, he said, is gaining more and more support from Democrats.



## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM THE 19 POLLS

Representative Charlotte T. Reid, Republican of Illinois: "Do you think that the majority of the war on poverty programs have been effective?" Yes, 10 percent; no, 84 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

Representative Delbert L. Latta, Republican of Ohio: "Do you believe the administration's poverty program is making progress toward the elimination of poverty?" Yes, 11 percent; no, 89 percent.

Representative Edward Hutchinson, Republican of Michigan: "The various war on poverty programs have been in effect for nearly 2 years. Thus far, do you think they have been successful in moving toward the ultimate goal of improving the lot of the poor?" Yes, 11.73 percent; no, 82.40 percent; no answer, 5.87 percent.

Representative Henry P. Smith, Republican of New York: "On balance, do you believe the administration's war on poverty has been successful?" Yes, 12.4 percent; no, 79.9 percent; no opinion, 7.7 percent.

Representative Railsback, Republican of Illinois: "Do you think the war on poverty has been (a) very successful, 2 percent; (b) slightly successful, 31.5 percent; (c) unsuccessful, 64.5 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

Representative Dave Martin, Republican of Nebraska: "We are spending this year \$1,500 million on the war on poverty. Do you feel this program has been successful?" Yes, 4.8 percent; no, 84 percent; undecided, 11.2 percent.

Representative John M. Ashbrook, Republican of Ohio: "Do you believe the \$2 billion war on poverty has been successful?" Yes, 7 percent; no, 89 percent.

Representative O. C. Fisher, Democrat of Texas: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" Yes, 6 percent; no, 87.5 percent.

Representative John J. Duncan, Republican of Tennessee: "Do you think we should continue our spending on the war on poverty?" Yes, 25 percent; no, 69 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

Representative Dan Kuykendall, Republican of Tennessee: "Do you think the war on poverty has been worth the cost?" Yes, 5.7 percent; no, 94.3 percent.

Representative William L. Scott, Republican of Virginia: "Should Government spending be cut? If so, what areas? Poverty programs?" Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

Representative Charles E. Bennett, Democrat of Florida: "Should your Congressman vote to continue the poverty program under present circumstances?" Yes, 12 percent; no, 85 percent.

Representative William L. Hungate, Democrat of Missouri: "Do you think the poverty program is worthy of being continued?" Yes, 20 percent; no, 75 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Representative Samuel L. Devine, Republican of Ohio: "Do you favor continuation of Great Society war on poverty?" Yes, 18 percent; no, 80 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

Representative Charles E. Chamberlain, Republican of Michigan: "How do you rate the war on poverty as a whole?" Good, 5 percent; fair, 19 percent; poor, 63 percent; blank, 13 percent.

Representative Jerome L. Waldie, Democrat of California: "This year's budget proposes to spend \$1.9 billion on this program (poverty), about the cost of 3 weeks of the Vietnam war. Do you believe (a) We should abolish the entire war on poverty" yes, 36 percent; no, 56 percent; undecided, 8 percent; (b) We should transfer proven programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to regular Federal agencies, e.g., Operation Headstart to HEW, not thereby reducing expenditures, but perhaps increasing efficiency?" Yes, 79 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 12 percent; (c) Do you believe we should materially reduce the War on Poverty program?" Yes, 49 percent; no, 41 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

Representative Tim Carter, Republican of Kentucky: (Should we) "Continue the war on poverty, especially the 'Happy Pappy' program?" Yes, 36.8 percent; no, 53.7 percent; undecided, 9.3 percent; "Keep VISTA and Appalachian volunteers?" Yes, 30.6 percent; no, 52.4 percent; undecided, 16.9 percent.

Representative Donald Rumsfeld, Republican of Illinois: "Do you favor an expansion of the Headstart program?" Yes, 50 percent; no, 38 percent; no answer, 12 percent.

Representative George Bush, Republican of Texas: "What should we do about the war on poverty?" (a) Increase expenditures, 3 percent; (b) Reorganize program to make it more responsive to local needs, 52 percent; (c) Eliminate program, 45 percent.

**A SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS, AUTHORIZATIONS AND PROJECTIONS OF  
TOTAL FUNDS GENERATED FROM ALL SOURCES IN ACCORDANCE  
WITH THE REVISED PROPOSALS OF THE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE**

[In thousands of dollars]

Proposals	Total funds	Opportunity crusade authorization	Description
1. Council of Economic Opportunity advisers to the President (new Initiative).	2. 50	2. 5	Create, in the Executive Office of the President, a council to assist the President in overall coordination of Federal antipoverty programs. The council would gather information, appraise various antipoverty programs, develop policies of coordination, make reports and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.
2. Residential vocational training program (new initiative)-----	190. 00	190. 0	Assist the States to plan, develop and conduct, at residential centers, a program of basic education, vocational training, job experience, counseling, and placement for jobs, for disadvantaged youth who require a substantial change of environment as a precondition to meaningful training experience.
3. Military career training program (new initiative)-----	(1)	(1)	Provide training and education in residential military career centers administered by the Secretary of Defense for needy youth who would not otherwise qualify for military service.
4. Secondary school workstudy program (revamped Neighborhood Youth Corps).	133. 30	100. 0	Provide work opportunities with public or private nonprofit agencies for students who need extra income to stay in school. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare will administer in conjunction with other educationally oriented programs. The Federal share of the wages paid would be 75 percent; the employer's share is 25 percent. The Federal expenditure (\$100,000,000) would result in 1 additional dollar for every 3 Federal dollars spent, for a total of \$33,333,333 in funds generated under the program.
5. In-school counselor program (new initiative)-----	1, 165. 00	20. 0	Provide work opportunities with private, profitmaking employers through efforts of counselors located in schools or school systems who interview, assess the skills of and place needy high school youth with willing employers. Federal funds will pay for no more than $\frac{1}{2}$ the salary of such counselors; non-Federal funds supply the balance. Private employers pay the full amount of wages to such student employees. \$40,000,000 will pay the salaries of 5,000 counselors earning an average of \$8,000 per year. If we assume that each counselor can place an average of 200 students in part-time jobs locally, 1,000,000 needy youth will be assisted. To compute the earning power of such youth is, of course, a matter for speculation. However, it is not unreasonable to assume that such students will work approximately 15 hours weekly for a period of at least a year, and be paid a wage of \$1.50 per hour. If so, each student would earn, on the average, \$1,125 per year. The total impact of private dollars then becomes \$1,125,000,000 in addition to the \$20,000,000 paid to match the Federal dollars to hire such counselors. The Secretary of HEW will administer the program.
6. Work-training program (continuation of the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps).	40. 00	30. 0	Provide work opportunities with public or private nonprofit employers for needy youth who have terminated their formal education. The Secretary of Labor will continue to administer the program because of its manpower thrust. The Federal share of the wages paid would be 75 percent; the employer's share is 25 percent. The Federal expenditure (\$30,000,000) would result in 1 additional dollar for every 3 Federal dollars spent, for a total of \$10,000,000 in non-Federal funds generated under this program.



7. Industry Youth Corps program (new initiative)-----	280.00	70.0	Provide on-the-job training and job opportunities with private profitmaking enterprises willing to train needy youth who have terminated their formal education by reimbursing the employers for the cash value of the productivity gap between such youth and other employees performing similar work. (Not to exceed the equivalent of 25 percent of the wages paid such youth.) Each Federal dollar should generate 3 private dollars, for a total of \$210,000,000 in private funds resulting from a \$70,000,000 expenditure.
8. Urban and rural community action programs (revamped)-----	466.25	380.0	Stimulate the creation of new and imaginative programs to fight poverty through assistance to local community action boards without earmarking of funds. Continue the involvement of the poor in the design and operation of such programs, and enlarge the role and responsibility of the States for review of programs, determination of statewide needs and priorities, and assistance to local agencies. Versatile funds may be used for planning, conduct and administration of local programs. (Separate allotments will be made within each State for urban and rural programs, based upon the respective numbers of urban and rural poor in each.) Technical assistance funds will be provided for setting up community action programs and training personnel. An estimated 10 percent of the versatile funds (\$38,000,000) would be used for technical assistance, without any requirement of matching funds. The balance of the versatile funds (\$342,000,000) would be provided on an 80-20 matching basis, generating \$85,500,000 in non-Federal funds. Community action would continue to be administered nationally by the Office of Economic Opportunity, but with stringent prohibitions against engaging in or assisting political activities, whether partisan or nonpartisan.
9. State bonus program in community action (new initiative)-----	40.00	20.0	Enable the States to work in partnership with the Federal Government to develop community action programs locally. Federal dollars must be matched by State contribution, and may be used for State studies, or to supplement funding of local agencies as appropriate.
10. Vista (revamped)-----	26.00	26.0	Encourage and train volunteers to work in combating poverty. Federal funds may be used to recruit, select, train, refer, and maintain volunteers. Initiate a new "Hometown" program for local assignments.
11. Headstart and Early Years programs (revamped)-----	462.50	375.0	Provide educational and supportive services for needy children with poor social/educational backgrounds, both at preschool and early elementary stages of development. Funds will be provided on an 80-20 matching basis for planning, development, and conduct of such programs, under the administration of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare nationally, and community action agencies locally. States will be required to designate a Headstart agency to prepare plans and programs for Early Years as well as Headstart programs. Children who did not participate in Headstart but whose families satisfy eligibility criteria will be allowed to participate in Early Years programs. \$92,500,000 in non-Federal funds will be generated under these programs.
12. State bonus grants program (new initiative)-----	70.00	35.0	Provide assistance to States willing to make an extra effort in Headstart and Early Years. \$35,000,000 in Federal assistance for the States under this program must be matched by State contributions, for a total of \$70,000,000 in additional Headstart and Early Years funding.
13. Rural loan program (continuation)-----	16.00	16.0	Appropriation will be added to the revolving fund established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for loans to low-income rural families and local cooperative associations.
14. Migrant and seasonal workers program (continuation)-----	27.00	27.0	Provide special assistance for migrant and other seasonally employed agricultural workers.
15. Special small business loans and incentives (continuation)-----			Strengthen small business concerns owned by individuals who qualify under poverty standards for loans and guidance and counseling. Costs are paid by the Small Business Administration from a revolving fund administered by it. It is anticipated that \$60,000,000 will be committed to this program during fiscal year 1968.
16. Automation of job opportunity data (new initiative)-----	25.00	25.0	The Secretary of Labor is directed to use automated, high-speed data and communication systems, in order to (a) compile, and make available information regarding job opportunities, skill requirements, labor supply and other data, and (b) establish a nationwide program in the U.S. Employment Service to match job opportunities with available and qualified workers and enable the referral of individuals to places with job openings.
17. Work experience program (continuation)-----	70.00	70.0	Provide work experience for adults as presently authorized under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.
Total-----	3,013.50	1,386.5	

<sup>1</sup> To be funded by the Secretary of Defense from DOD appropriations.

Note: The foregoing summary excludes estimated administrative cost of \$5,500,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

## CONCLUSION

Despite the foregoing history of 3 years of frustrations under the Economic Opportunity Act, we are convinced that these programs could be shaped to accomplish their objectives. All of our efforts have been to this end: the development of programs which offer a real hope of success in eliminating the causes of poverty.

It is a matter of deep regret that these efforts have been turned aside by the majority at a time when the entire antipoverty program faces the distinct possibility of defeat in the House of Representatives. We made every effort to produce a bill which, with bipartisan support, would have an excellent chance to pass the House. The committee bill represents a total rejection of that opportunity. It is worse than present law.

If this entire program dies, it will be because those who profess to be the champions of a "War on Poverty"—confronted with the failings of an act that was hastily and sloppily put together and then mutilated by the most inept administration in the history of American government—would not give an inch to correct past mistakes.

For our part, we would rather see the beginning of a successful attack on poverty in America than the end to the hopes that were kindled by this legislation. It was in this spirit that we did our best to improve the act during the long committee sessions on this bill. The effort was not productive; the committee bill is unacceptable.

There is still time to redirect the "war on poverty" in a manner that would save it from extinction. The time is very short, but we shall keep trying. The American people will be the final judges in this matter.

WILLIAM H. AYERS,  
ALBERT H. QUIE,  
CHARLES E. GOODELL,  
JOHN N. ERLNBORN,  
JOHN DELLENBACK,  
MARVIN L. ESCH,  
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.



## SEPARATE DISSENTING VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

The Congressional Record has been filled in recent months with speeches and articles expressing the need to scuttle the poverty program. On several occasions, the House has voted to show its rage at the very idea that anyone would dare to try to eliminate poverty in this country. By decision of this House, those civil servants who have had the unmitigated nerve to try to carry out the program which an earlier Congress directed them to carry out, have been punished by being specifically denied the pay raise that we so enthusiastically gave to our own staffs and to all other Federal employees.

Underlying this entire symphony<sup>1</sup> of opposition to the poverty program has been the seldom admitted but always apparent feeling that this bill will somehow help black Americans, and the 90th Congress is determined to make a record of hostility to the aspirations and hopes of black people.

The Education and Labor Committee has now reported a poverty bill, and I am ashamed to admit that the hopes held in some quarters that this bill would hold out nothing for those who are in poverty because of the discriminatory burden they carry around on their skins, has been, at least in part, realized.

The poverty program holds out one hope for the American Negro, and this bill does a good deal to squelch that hope. The program is based, or was based at its inception, on the concept that the poor, and particularly the urban poor, and the prisoners of the urban ghettos need to be able to participate in the process of developing solutions to their own needs. It is not enough to be charitable, it is not enough to allow these people a grudging access to the leftover affluence that rich America allows to fall from its table. They must be allowed to participate fully in the direction of the community in which they live. And not as a favor to be "earned" individually by a token handful of "docile poor" who promise not to make trouble, but as a right, given by God when He made them in His own image, and not subject to being diminished, parceled out, withheld, or tempered with by city hall, the State legislature, Congress, or the American people. As far as the poor of the urban ghetto are concerned, this is the beginning, and the essential beginning, of any program designed to let them out of the trap they have been caught in for the past 300 years.

This bill does not meet that hope. It is seriously deficient in many respects, but nowhere does it fall farther short of what is needed than in title II—the title concerned with community action programs.

The community action agency has been, until this bill came out of committee, one of the most encouraging social inventions of this century. It is a device by which the people who are the victims of pov-

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not misspelled.

erty can make their needs felt, instead of depending upon the insights of professional welfare workers and philanthropists, who have good hearts, but whose perceptions are sometimes distorted by the fact that they look at the ghetto from a considerable distance away—and usually standing to windward. The CAP agencies, with the statutory requirement that they have on their boards persons truly representative of the people to be served, have given to the urban poor the first glimpse of a part in the power system. Their private, nonprofit status has given them a flexibility of operation that is a refreshing change from the sterile bureaucracy that makes most public welfare agencies so insensitive to the true needs of their “clients.”

Let me make a personal observation at this point. I do not believe the members of the Committee on Education and Labor were motivated by any special amount of personal bigotry or prejudice in reporting out this bill, in the form it now takes. Some of my colleagues, I am sure, honestly believe this bill will meet the needs of the urban poor as fully as the House will permit them to be met. Others are convinced, I am sure, that this is even a good bill, an adequate bill. Some may look upon it as an improvement over the present act. My colleagues on the committee have, I think, been constrained by their very realistic appraisal of the temper of this Congress in reporting to the House a bill which, while mischievous in the extreme, still has a few good sections left in it.

Title II of this bill will, I fear, kill the community action agency, and we will probably have to wait until a better mood seizes the Republic, and a Congress is elected that can return again to the decency that characterized the 88th and 89th Congresses.

I hope, fervently, that the constantly disillusioned, frequently-disappointed, but seldom-fooled urban poor will wait with us for that happier day.

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.



## SEPARATE MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JOHN M. ASHBROOK AND JAMES C. GARDNER

Although we agree with much of the analysis and many of the recommendations expressed in the foregoing minority views, we feel that additional points must be made concerning the entire operation of the so-called war on poverty.

### A Political War From the Beginning

The Johnson administration initiated this ill-conceived mess as a political move for the 1964 election; the "war on poverty" was to be a dominant theme and slogan for that campaign. The original legislation was hastily and badly drafted at the White House, virtually without the participation and at times almost over the dead bodies of responsible Cabinet officials. It was then rammed down the throat of a Congress which exercised so little legislative function that scarcely a line was changed in the White House draft. Minority members of this committee at that time forcefully and fully pointed out the grave mistakes in the legislation and accurately predicted that it would be a colossal failure.

The partisan political use of the "war on poverty" has been unremitting since 1964. In community after community, all across this Nation, the list of highly paid officials of the poverty war reads like a rollcall of professional Democratic politicians. The political use to which this program has been devoted is acknowledged even in the majority report of this committee—although the majority will do nothing effective to prohibit such use.

### Office of Economic Opportunists

At the heart of this political boondoggle is OEO, which might best be named the "office of economic opportunists." It is the highest paid, worst managed, most incompetently staffed agency in the history of the Federal Government. One out of every 42.3 of its employees is paid over \$20,000 a year; nearly one-half are paid \$10,000 a year or more. The budget of the United States lists 416 positions in OEO with pay in excess of \$15,000 a year.

The budget also estimates that 2,800 permanent Federal employees are required to run OEO, and that another 4,772 other permanent positions are required in other Federal agencies to run programs funded through OEO. These 7,572 permanent Federal positions required to run the war on poverty from Washington—according to the budget estimate—cost the hard-pressed American taxpayers a cool \$60 million for salaries alone this year.

That is only the cream skimmed off the top. At least 75 percent of the community action funds go for "administrative costs"—almost entirely in high salaries. "Community Action," according to the ma-

majority report, "employs" 95,000 persons and has cost \$1,800 million to date. It is interesting to note that less than half of the people employed by CAP are classified as poor persons—that even in this activity, the poor come off second best.

The unbelievably high costs of the Job Corps has been covered in the other minority views, but here again we note that a very large part of these costs are for administrative salaries—and that these salaries notoriously run far higher than the public schools can pay instructors and administrators of vocational education.

We do not believe that the American people—including millions of poor people who work at hard jobs for a small income from which Federal taxes are deducted—should be asked to continue to support this bloated bonanza for bureaucrats.

### Community Action for What?

There are thousands of good citizens who serve on CAP boards, teach Headstart classes, or otherwise attempt in good faith to assist the antipoverty programs. But in city after city across this Nation such selfless efforts are lost in the welter of politics, factionalism, and radical intrigue which is being passed off as "community action." In city after city "community action" has been little more than radical agitation, including, as in Newark, N.J., the organization of demonstrations, protest meetings, and inflammatory incitements which led directly to a tragic riot and the mindless destruction of property and human life.

We ask "community action for what?" It is not been action to produce jobs (except for paid employees of the program), or to train unemployed people for jobs, or to make any difference in the environment of poverty. In terms of having any real effect upon the condition of poverty, community action has been a \$1.8 billion bust.

Even the Democratic members of our committee acknowledge the excesses of this program publicly. Here are just two of the many remarks made in the open sessions to mark up the bill.

Mr. Pucinski, for example, said of the community action program:

It has not worked in many communities of America, and I tell you that in many communities it has been a catastrophic flop \* \* \*.

He also observed of Community Action that:

This program is in disrepute today because fly-by-night outfits formed overnight have come down here to Washington and because they had friends in the OEO got millions of dollars to carry on all sorts of programs and the legitimate organizations in your communities \* \* \* (were by-passed).

Mr. Carey had this observation:

If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies \* \* \*. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit



of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation.

We respectfully disagree with our colleague, Mr. Carey, that disclosing the true operation of this program is an act of "vandalism." We think it is a matter of public duty. For example, he gave a vivid account of a group of "Peaceniks" getting into one community action program and, in the course of their demonstrations, financed by decent American wage earners, desecrating a church. When brought into court, according to the account of Mr. Carey, they were defended by community action neighborhood legal services—again at the expense of the taxpayer. We agree with our colleague that Congress never intended so bizarre a use of tax funds. But this sort of thing runs rampant through the poverty program.

### Let's Act Intelligently Against Poverty

It is time to call a halt to this whole business, and turn our attention to serious efforts to assist the unemployed poor to find jobs, to strengthen our system of vocational education, and to help our schools overcome the educational handicaps of children from a background of poverty.

According to former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, the Federal Government alone in 1964 was spending over \$30 billion a year to combat poverty. Since then we have committed hundreds of millions. If these billions are not doing the job, we should find out why and redirect the programs to reach the hard-core unemployed poor. This would have been the sensible approach in the beginning. This would have been the approach of a rational administration intent upon anything other than politics.

The poor—to say nothing of the taxpayers—deserve something better than the "war on poverty."

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,  
*Member of Congress*

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES OGDEN R. REID AND ALPHONZO BELL

The need for a meaningful and effective antipoverty program has at no time been more critical. The events of the past summer underscore the fact that we have failed to meet our responsibility to those Americans for whom opportunity has been too long a promise left unfulfilled.

There are still some 30 million Americans living in poverty. Excluding youth still in school, the productive future of 2 to 2½ million of them is in large part dependent on intensive training and job placement programs. Yet by the end of this fiscal year, the Office of Economic Opportunity will have reached no more than 1 million of these. We are just beginning to realize the dimensions of the problem facing us—in terms of numbers and in terms of the kinds of needs that must be met. We are just beginning to make good on promises too often spoken and to realize the rights and hopes which have been too long deferred.

We share in part the minority views expressed by our colleagues in that certain of the elements of the Opportunity Crusade could strengthen the antipoverty program. In particular, title X, providing for automation of job opportunity data, is a step toward filling the statistical vacuum in which our manpower and training programs are operating. Outside of partial employment service figures, virtually no one in Government or allied private endeavors really knows—for the present or for the future—the industries, the geographic areas, and the skills for which we need trained workers nor does our present data accurately reflect the number and location of those Americans who are now capable of filling or could be trained for these job slots. We strongly support the systematic collection and utilization of such data.

Further, the addition of day care and of emergency food and medical services as national emphasis programs under title II, as accepted by the committee, are valuable Republican initiatives. The neglect of the most basic needs of some Americans is a tragedy in our affluent country. Vital food and medical care should be provided promptly, with a minimum of redtape. Day care services are the first step to enable mothers—often heads of families—to undertake training and jobs and thereby make a better life for themselves and their children.

In our judgment, however, this is not the time to cut back or restructure the antipoverty program; this is the time to strengthen and make good America's promise to the poor and disadvantaged.

A spirit of innovation and a capacity for creativity has characterized several of the endeavors undertaken through the antipoverty program:

Headstart has changed the future for more than 2 million youngsters.



The legal services program has assured the poor the right to equal justice which more fortunate Americans have so long enjoyed.

Neighborhood health centers have helped to break the vicious cycle of poor health and poverty for residents of 35 low-income areas.

Upward Bound has opened the doors of a higher education to some 27,000 young men and women whose potential might not otherwise have been recognized and encouraged.

The 700 neighborhood centers established by community action agencies as a multiservice unit have brought a large reservoir of heretofore untapped manpower and services to bear on the total needs of individuals and families.

The Follow Through program, which seeks to provide services of the type offered in Headstart programs to youngsters who have moved on to kindergarten and first grade, is now underway on an experimental basis for some 190,000 children, and holds promise as a meaningful addition to the regular curriculum of educationally deprived children in public schools.

These programs, and other OEO components such as the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, are concerned not only with learning to read but also with learning what books are and what they have to offer, not only with learning a skill but also with learning what it means to hold a responsible job. Participants in these programs differ from middle-income Americans not simply in terms of their paychecks but in the more tragic, the more human terms of functioning as thoughtful, responsible, and self-sufficient citizens. To learn these things—to learn to learn, if you will—is one of the most basic goals of the antipoverty program, and is a prerequisite to increasing a youngster's reading level by three grades or learning to be a television repairman. In this endeavor, the Office of Economic Opportunity has the potential, if properly administered, to provide the impetus and coordination that make such programs meaningful. The overall direction and coordination must be left with OEO. We believe that it would be a mistake to sacrifice the innovation and spirit that OEO has brought to this challenge to the more traditional approaches of many other governmental units.

Notable improvements have been achieved in certain areas of the antipoverty program this past year. While we have been critical of some aspects of the Job Corps, we nonetheless support the objectives of residential training centers for those in serious need. In this past year Job Corps costs have been reduced some 35 percent and are now more nearly in line with a productive approach to this problem, in light particularly of the special human costs involved in training these tragically deprived young men and women. We must not ignore the fact that 80 percent of the Job Corps enrollees had not seen a doctor or a dentist in 10 years, that 30 percent could not read or write.

Administrative and overhead expenses have been somewhat tightened up this year and the Washington portion of such expenses now accounts for approximately 3 percent of the total funds appropriated. Some 85 percent of the total appropriation goes directly into pro-

graming, and 90 percent of this amount is administered by private and public nonprofit organizations.

Momentum has picked up in public and private response to the antipoverty program. It is estimated that some 375,000 Americans volunteer at least 1 day a week in some aspects of the program. In a number of cities private employers have banded together to guarantee jobs to the disadvantaged. Some cities are extending more than their required local share for certain programs.

Our expression of belief in the antipoverty program, however is not without the qualification that in all too many instances it has suffered from serious maladministration on its several levels. The excessive paperwork and bureaucratic layers that must be overcome to secure approval of a project are profoundly discouraging to the applicants, who are rarely experts at grantsmanship, and the undue delays frequently encountered in funding are damaging to even the most well-formulated plans. More fundamentally, there appears to be a lack of total commitment by OEO to its own Community Action guidelines, as reflected in the frequent inability of city administrations, business and civic leaders, private social welfare agencies, and the representatives of the poor to strike a working balance in the best interest of those who most need help and training.

In our judgment, the amendment adopted by the committee to title II, restructuring Community Action agencies, will not contribute to achieving a meaningful relationship among concerned elements in the community. In fact, the amendment has the potential to do great damage to the Community Action concept by diluting the independence of existing local boards and by inhibiting the poor from playing a meaningful role in their own future. In minority views in the Senate report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, Senator Javits and his colleagues noted that:

In some cases, including cases where important political pressures are present, the agency has allowed a city administration to capture the Community Action agency in a way which effectively excludes any significant participation of the poor.

In our judgment, city hall is, with some exceptions—notably New York City—not the place where the greatest innovation is to be found. Notwithstanding the “bypass” provisions, we are concerned that the committee’s amendment will encourage a further movement in this direction. We agree completely with the statement in the minority views that the Community Action program “must be so thoroughly disengaged from local political struggles, both partisan and non-partisan, that it can become neither the instrument nor the target for political factionalism.”

More importantly, we are disturbed, as are our minority colleagues, that we have again failed sufficiently to orient antipoverty programs to the basic and paramount need for on-the-job training to upgrade skills for identifiable jobs of permanence and substance. Aside from reaching only a fraction of those in need, existing manpower programs are focused on public service jobs—the value of which lies in areas other than training for skills—rather than on lasting, substan-



tive employment in identifiable jobs in the private sector, utilizing the largely untapped cooperation of private enterprise.

While we have structured programs appealing to the young and to the old, we have largely failed to meet the needs of those men and women, generally between the ages of 21 and 30, who have responsibilities to their own families. Jobs in public service endeavors are important in relieving the immediate conditions in the ghettos but they do not provide the long-term earning power that is necessary to enable these men and women to pay the rent, buy the groceries, clothe their children, and live in decent homes. If we are to generate in these people a sense of worth, a sense of responsibility for their own future, and a sense of constructive participation in their own communities, we must provide programs that not only upgrade skills but as well identify potential, so that an individual may climb the ladder of increased skills until he is realizing the full measure of that potential.

What is needed, we believe, "to involve the enormous capabilities of of the private economy in providing training and jobs"—in the words of the minority views—is a program of far greater scope than now proposed of intensive on-the-job training and placement in meaningful jobs with private employers, serving close to 500,000 people and intended principally for men and women with responsibilities to their families.

It is essential that the House, by its action on the floor, lift the sights of the Congress to meet the expectations of the American people. We must take action of real magnitude so that we do not turn our backs on the cities and dash the hopes of our youth—and we must do so not because it will cool the cities, not because it will prevent riots, but because it is right—and long overdue.

It is our hope that the \$2.06-billion authorization in this bill will be recognized for what it is—not enough, even under present economic conditions, to do what we must for those Americans living in poverty. What we spend in Vietnam in 1 month is hardly too much to spend on the war on poverty in an entire year. We have a commitment to the ghetto dwellers, to the rural poor, principally to the young people of this country. That commitment, to be meaningful, must be enlarged, not cut back; progress in this endeavor must be intensified, not curtailed or stalled through a shift in responsibility. To do less will seriously dash the hopes of those who have little to live on but faith.

OGDEN R. REID.

ALPHONZO BELL.

## ADDITIONAL MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DELLENBACK

While I have joined in the foregoing minority views, I also file these additional views in order to emphasize in condensed and simple form my own strong feelings in the poverty area.

I think it imperative that the Congress not only be aware that there are special problems faced by both the urban poor and the rural poor in America, but that the Congress also demonstrate its capacity and deep desire to propose soundly conceived programs to help in the elimination of the problems which cause such poverty.

The present law, as structured and as administered, has clearly failed to make the necessary meaningful strides in the direction of elimination of such causes of poverty, in spite of the vast amounts of Federal tax money which have been poured into present programs.

The bill approved by the majority of the House Education and Labor Committee and which is before the House for consideration fails to make the necessary significant fundamental changes in the present law that would be necessary in order to move to any meaningful degree in the direction of helping to eliminate those causes of poverty which ought to be eliminated and which can be eliminated. The only really significant change in the present law which this bill proposes is the somewhat regressive step in connection with community action programs which is discussed in detail in the foregoing minority views.

The basic proposals of the minority members of the House Education and Labor Committee reaching in the direction of such fundamental changes in the present law were rejected by the majority of the committee. I intend to join in proposing on the floor of the House significant changes which will make even reduced amounts of Federal money act as a catalyst to bring private enterprise into effective involvement and will result in total expenditures in this field which go far beyond the Federal seed money, which will reach a very great many more individuals who are in need of help than are being reached at the present time under the present law, and which will result for these individuals in meaningful training and increased capacity to perform as contributing American citizens.

These amendments will propose changes in present law of the following types:

- (1) Material increase in involvement of all aspects of our free enterprise economy.

- (2) Reduction in Federal fund appropriations, coupled with change in application of such funds to serve as seed money so that total funds devoted to restructured programs will increase.

- (3) Increase in State involvement, both in planning and in implementation.



(4) Restructuring of community action programs to place increased emphasis on jobs and improved training therefor for people who want to work.

(5) Phasing out of Job Corps into vocational education, including some residential centers, with resulting drastic reduction in unit costs.

(6) Transfer of basic responsibility for educational programs like Headstart to HEW, with retention of parent involvement and tie to local community.

(7) Restructuring of community action agency boards to retain involvement of poor and to increase involvement of local government, industry, labor, and community agencies.

(8) Elimination of political activities my community action agencies.

(9) Some allocation of funds between programs for urban poor and programs for rural poor.

America and the Congress quite obviously have a series of extremely serious problems. One of the most serious is the elimination of the causes of poverty. We, as Republican Congressmen, are deeply concerned about this problem and are determined that the Federal Government play its proper constructive role in the attempt to eliminate the basic causes of poverty. We are in earnest hopes that a majority of the Members of the House will join with us in careful consideration of our proposed amendments and in eventual approval thereof.

*side* *and in early consideration of* JOHN DELLENBACK.

## SEPARATE MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. GARDNER

I am opposed to H.R. 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 as reported by the Education and Labor Committee.

Long before the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity the people of the United States were spending billions of dollars annually on various types of relief programs, manpower development, and education. The OEO has not added significantly to these efforts, even though each Congress adds new programs and approves additional expenditures.

The OEO was set up for two purposes: First, it was to coordinate the multitude of fragmented and single-purpose governmental programs into a coordinated attack on poverty; second, it was to innovate and to develop new programs that would attack the causes of poverty and to help individuals move from the relief rolls by equipping them for today's society.

I contend that the war on poverty, under the direction of Sargent Shriver, has not accomplished these objectives. It is wasteful, by contributing more to its own bureaucracy than to those in need. Many of its programs are duplicates of other Government programs and such OEO programs, as the community action program and the Job Corps, are incapable of their task.

Sargent Shriver not only is a bad administrator but he avoids suggestive criticism and ignores advice. It is apparent from all the congressional and public clamor that the OEO could benefit from such suggestions. However, Mr. Shriver and his lieutenants continue to ignore all criticism and recommendations.

There is a definite need for a poverty program to raise the socially and economically deprived to a new standard of living but not through the present Office of Economic Opportunity.

### The OEO and Political Activity

Evidence was uncovered in my home State of North Carolina that an OEO funded community action program, Operation Breakthrough, in Durham, N.C., has created a federally subsidized political machine.

It has been substantiated by documented proof compiled by the minority investigator of the Education and Labor Committee, that employees of Operation Breakthrough spent taxpayers' dollars to create and organize a political machine. They devoted months of their time, during working hours, researching voter registration lists in the Durham County Courthouse. They contacted unregistered voters and persuaded them to register and used Government automobiles to transport them to the polls to register. Then on April 29, 1967, during the municipal primary election and on May 3, 1967, during the municipal



general elections, Operation Breakthrough employees used their own cars to contact and deliver voters to the polls and handed out sample ballots telling the Durham citizens how to vote. These same poverty workers recruited students from nearby universities to pursue the same methods of influence on election day.

I find it difficult to correlate how copying voter lists, registering voters and supplying sample ballots to voters will help to raise the poor out of their economic and social plight. The creation of a federally subsidized political machine is not one of the goals of the poverty program.

Although I am talking about Durham, N.C., this political activity, if not stopped, could set a national precedent.

Consider for a moment the effect which this political activity, as now practiced and sanctioned by OEO, would have upon the political structure of the United States. A registration drive, as conducted in Durham by Operation Breakthrough during a nonpartisan election will have long-term results in a general election for state and Federal officials. These people should not be used as a political tool, at the expense of the American taxpayer.

The final results of the Durham registration drive by Operation Breakthrough in the five target precincts, shows that those candidates supported by the Operation Breakthrough campaign received a majority of the votes, 10 to 1 and 20 to 1, but lost the election by a 9 to 6 margin.

This brings up another vital point, the difficulty in distinguishing between "partisan" and "nonpartisan" elections. In my opinion, wherever one slate of candidates is supported over another slate, then elements of politics enters into the election. This is precisely the situation which took place in the Durham municipal election. The sample ballots which were passed out to the voters favored one slate of candidates over another.

Durham is not the only city in which community action programs of the OEO have conducted intensive registration drives. Houston, Tex., and Cincinnati, Ohio, have also experienced such political activities. If this is taking place in these three cities, one wonders if OEO is not conducting registration drives throughout the United States by all the other community action programs.

These same Durham antipoverty workers were deeply involved in the violence and unrest which occurred this past summer in Durham. They were prominent at a city council meeting on July 17, 1967, and threatened to turn Durham into another "Newark, Watts, or Vietnam." Operation Breakthrough employees used a government bus to transport people to a mass meeting the next night, which resulted in a rock throwing incident. The following evening they were again involved in a demonstration which necessitated the calling up of the National Guard to keep the peace.

A similar trend developed in Newark, N.J., as substantiated by an Education and Labor staff investigation, where city officials called on Sargent Shriver to curtail the antipoverty workers activities. The Committee investigation report states that the United Community Corporation, the Newark based community action program, contributed significantly to "create the climate" in which rioting occurred.

I deplore these activities by OEO funded agencies and believe that corrective legislation is desperately needed to prevent this type of action from reoccurring. The greatest need for the poverty program is to create jobs and improve opportunities for the poor and not be redirected to political purposes.

JAMES C. GARDNER.











90TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

Union Calendar No. 327

**S. 2388**

[Report No. 866]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 9, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

OCTOBER 27, 1967

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

---

**AN ACT**

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize  
funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity  
programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and  
for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity  
4       Amendments of 1967".

5               AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

6       SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under  
7       the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C

1 of title I of such Act); there is hereby authorized to be ap-  
 2 propriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the  
 3 sum of \$2,258,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions  
 4 of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or  
 5 made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,-  
 6 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of  
 7 part A of title I of such Act, \$567,000,000 for the purpose  
 8 of carrying out part B of title I, \$105,000,000 for the pur-  
 9 pose of carrying out part D of title I, \$1,062,000,000 for the  
 10 purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the pur-  
 11 pose of carrying out part A of title III, \$30,000,000 for the  
 12 purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$25,000,000 for  
 13 the purpose of carrying out section 406 of title IV, \$70,000,-  
 14 000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title V, \$35,-  
 15 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title V,  
 16 \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and  
 17 \$33,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and  
 18 there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,400,000,000 for  
 19 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

## 20 TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC

### 21 OPPORTUNITY ACT

#### 22 JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

23 SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Oppor-  
 24 tunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:



1                   “PART A—JOB CORPS

2                   “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

3           “SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-  
4 income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth  
5 standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-  
6 rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of  
7 residential centers in which enrollees will participate in  
8 intensive programs of education, vocational training, work  
9 experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes  
10 various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to  
11 the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps.  
12 Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can  
13 benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in  
14 a group setting, to become more responsible, employable,  
15 and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that con-  
16 tributes, where feasible, to the development of National,  
17 State, and community resources, and to the development  
18 and dissemination of techniques for working with the dis-  
19 advantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private  
20 institutions and agencies.

21                   “ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

22           “SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office  
23 of Economic Opportunity a ‘Job Corps’.

1           ~~"INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS~~

2           ~~"SEC. 103.~~ To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a  
3 young man or woman must be a person who—

4           ~~"(1)~~ is a permanent resident of the United States  
5 who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-  
6 two at the time of enrollment;

7           ~~"(2)~~ is a low-income individual or member of a  
8 low-income family who requires additional education,  
9 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance  
10 in order to secure or hold meaningful employment,  
11 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify  
12 for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy  
13 Armed Forces requirements;

14           ~~"(3)~~ is currently living in an environment so char-  
15 acterized by cultural deprivation, disruptive homelife  
16 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair  
17 his prospects for successful participation in any other  
18 program providing needed training, education, or assist-  
19 ance;

20           ~~"(4)~~ is determined, after careful screening as pro-  
21 vided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present  
22 capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure  
23 the full benefit of the program authorized in this part,  
24 and to be free of medical and behaviorial problems so  
25 serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust



1 to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern  
2 of work and training which that program involves; and

3 “(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as  
4 the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with  
5 all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

6 “SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL  
7 PROVISIONS

8 “SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary  
9 rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enroll-  
10 ment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these  
11 rules shall be implemented through arrangements which  
12 make use of appropriate agencies and organizations such as  
13 community action agencies, public employment offices, pro-  
14 fessional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall  
15 establish specific standards and procedures for conducting  
16 screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruit-  
17 ment through agencies and individuals having contact with  
18 youths over substantial periods of time and able, accord-  
19 ingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and  
20 problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with  
21 other individuals and organizations, including courts, proba-  
22 tion and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools,  
23 welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They  
24 shall also provide for—

1           “(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the pur-  
2       pose of—

3           “(A) determining whether his educational and  
4       vocational needs can best be met through the Job  
5       Corps or any alternative program in his home  
6       community;

7           “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent  
8       data relating to his background, needs, and interests  
9       for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-  
10      tential assignment; and

11          “(C) giving the applicant a full understand-  
12      ing of the Job Corps program and making clear  
13      what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the  
14      event of his acceptance.

15          “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-  
16      quiry concerning the applicant's background for the  
17      effective development and, as appropriate, clarification  
18      of information concerning his age, citizenship, school  
19      and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,  
20      family income, environment, and other matters related  
21      to a determination of his eligibility.

22          “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-  
23      dividual or organization solely as compensation for the serv-  
24      ice of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the  
25      Job Corps.



“(e) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

“SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

“SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from an official of the individual's community, such as the appropriate

1 prosecuting attorney or his deputy, sheriff or his deputy,  
2 chief of police or his deputy, parole or probation officer, or  
3 chief executive officer, certifying that the individual, if  
4 selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program  
5 and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would  
6 impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the pro-  
7 gram or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound  
8 discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center  
9 to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities.

10       “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-  
11 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or  
12 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision  
13 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually  
14 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not  
15 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director  
16 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and  
17 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-  
18 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-  
19 ments.

20                       “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

21       “SEC. 106-- (a) No individual may be enrolled in the  
22 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director  
23 may authorize in special cases.

24       “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve



1 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military  
2 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

3 “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of  
4 Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act) must take  
5 and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form:  
6 ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and  
7 allegiance to the United States of America and will support  
8 and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States  
9 against all its enemies foreign and domestic.’ The provi-  
10 sions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall  
11 be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

12 “(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appro-  
13 priate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which  
14 (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for  
15 the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of  
16 such enrollee.

17 “(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so  
18 that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those en-  
19 rollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in  
20 section 107, or to other centers or projects where their  
21 work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, de-  
22 velopment, or management of public natural resources or  
23 recreational areas and is performed under the direction of

1 personnel of agencies regularly responsible for these  
2 functions.

3 "JOB CORPS CENTERS

4 "SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements  
5 with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organiza-  
6 tions for the establishment and operation of Job Corps cen-  
7 ters. These centers shall be primarily residential in character  
8 and shall be designated and operated so as to provide en-  
9 rollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, voca-  
10 tional training, work experience (either in direct program  
11 activities or through arrangements with employers), coun-  
12 seling and other services appropriate to their needs. The  
13 centers shall include conservation centers to be located  
14 primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other  
15 training and assistance, programs of work experience focused  
16 upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural  
17 resources or public recreational areas or to assist in develop-  
18 ing community projects in the public interest. They shall  
19 also include men's training centers to be located in either  
20 urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall  
21 include training and other services appropriate for enrollees  
22 who can be expected to participate successfully in training  
23 for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment; and  
24 women's training centers, to be located in either urban or  
25 rural areas, and which shall provide education, training, and



1 other activities appropriate to the special needs and poten-  
2 tialities of young women.

3 “(b) To the extent feasible, men’s and women’s train-  
4 ing centers shall offer education and vocational training op-  
5 portunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresi-  
6 dential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of  
7 this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimburs-  
8 able basis or through such other arrangements as the Direc-  
9 tor may specify.

10 “PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

11 “SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be oper-  
12 ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-  
13 nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational  
14 training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-  
15 tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and  
16 counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-  
17 gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to  
18 assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with  
19 problems he may encounter in his home community or in  
20 adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing  
21 his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-  
22 term upward mobility. Center programs shall include re-  
23 quired participation in center maintenance support and  
24 related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in

1 increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and  
2 discipline.

3       “(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-  
4 range for enrollee education and vocational training through  
5 local public or private educational agencies, vocational edu-  
6 cational institutions, or technical institutes where these in-  
7 stitutions or institutes can provide training comparable in  
8 cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he  
9 could provide through other means.

10       “(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent  
11 feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain  
12 the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;  
13 and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of  
14 Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to  
15 be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their  
16 services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the en-  
17 rollee's level of educational attainment.

18       “(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure  
19 that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do  
20 not displace presently employed workers or impair existing  
21 contracts for service and will be coordinated with other  
22 work-experience programs in the community.

23                               “ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

24       “SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees  
25 with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such



1 quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing,  
2 recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem  
3 necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances  
4 shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month  
5 during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the  
6 program and in not to exceed \$65 per month thereafter, ex-  
7 cept that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not  
8 exceeding \$65 per month, may be provided from the be-  
9 ginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be  
10 of less than six months' duration, and the Director is author-  
11 ized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates speci-  
12 fied herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him.  
13 Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as  
14 to encourage continued participation in the program,  
15 achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so  
16 provided and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate  
17 cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable,  
18 enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs as-  
19 sociated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from  
20 their personal allowances.

21       “(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-  
22 ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of  
23 emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs  
24 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed  
25 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

1       “(c) The Director shall provide each former enrollee,  
2 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to  
3 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the  
4 Job Corps: *Provided, however,* That no enrollee shall be en-  
5 titled to that portion of a readjustment allowance which is not  
6 paid pursuant to subsection (d) of this section unless he has  
7 remained in the program at least one hundred and eighty  
8 days, except that such portion shall be paid to an enrollee  
9 who has remained in the program at least ninety days and  
10 whose participation in the program is expected to be of less  
11 than six months’ duration, and except in unusual circum-  
12 stances as determined by the Director. The Director may,  
13 from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee  
14 such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director  
15 deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations  
16 incurred by that enrollee. In the event of an enrollee’s death  
17 during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid read-  
18 justment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the pro-  
19 visions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

20       “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may  
21 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an  
22 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory  
23 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-  
24 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any  
25 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-



1 rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the  
2 payment of an equal amount by the Director.

3 "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

4 "SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of  
5 conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently  
6 enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,  
7 dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations  
8 shall be made in every instance where it is determined that  
9 retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,  
10 will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct  
11 and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other  
12 enrollees.

13 "(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-  
14 ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors  
15 of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take  
16 appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including,  
17 but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to  
18 expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as pro-  
19 vided under regulation set by the Director.

20 "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

21 "SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall  
22 cooperate in activities designed to establish mutually bene-  
23 ficial relationships between Job Corps centers and sur-  
24 rounding or nearby communities.

1                   ~~“COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT~~

2           ~~“SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the~~  
3   counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to  
4   follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

5           ~~“(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee~~  
6   prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabil-  
7   ities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for  
8   which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or  
9   shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In  
10   placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United  
11   States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

12           ~~“(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements~~  
13   to determine the status and progress of terminees and to  
14   assure that their needs for further education, training, and  
15   counseling may be met.

16           ~~“(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy~~  
17   of his pertinent records, including data derived from his  
18   counseling and testing, other than confidential information,  
19   shall be made available immediately to the Department of  
20   Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

21           ~~“(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in ac-~~  
22   cordance with section 637(b) of this Act, arrange for the  
23   readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of  
24   such Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection  
25   (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have



1 not already found employment) at the public employment  
2 service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee,  
3 if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office  
4 to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated  
5 an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make ar-  
6 rangements by which public employment service officers will  
7 maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus  
8 paid at such offices including information as to—

9       “(1) the number of former enrollees who have de-  
10       clined the offices' help in finding a job;

11       “(2) the number who were successfully placed in  
12       jobs without further education or training;

13       “(3) the number who were found to require further  
14       training before being placed in jobs and the types of  
15       training programs in which they participated; and

16       “(4) the number who were found to require fur-  
17       ther remedial or basic education in order to qualify for  
18       training programs, together with information as to the  
19       types of programs for which such former enrollees were  
20       found unqualified for enrollment.

21 If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of  
22 any other public or private organization or agency in lieu  
23 of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that  
24 organization or agency to make the payment of the readjust-

1 ment allowance and maintain the same types of records re-  
2 garding former enrollees as are herein specified for mainte-  
3 nance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish  
4 copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case  
5 of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to  
6 the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the  
7 Director shall maintain records providing pertinent place-  
8 ment and followup information.

9       “EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL  
10                                  PROJECTS

11       “SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the care-  
12 ful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program,  
13 directly or by contracting for independent evaluations,  
14 with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as prac-  
15 ticable, and providing information needed to assess the  
16 effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods  
17 of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to de-  
18 termine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of res-  
19 idential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use  
20 of facilities combining residential and nonresidential com-  
21 ponents, from the use of centers with large as opposed to  
22 small enrollments, and from the use of different types of  
23 program sponsors, including public agencies, universities,  
24 and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include  
25 comparisons with proper control groups composed of per-



1    sons who have not participated in the program. In carrying  
2    out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for  
3    obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths  
4    and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with  
5    other agencies and officials in order to compare the rel-  
6    ative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those  
7    used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through  
8    employers, schools, or other Government and private agen-  
9    cies specific information concerning the residence of former  
10   enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and suc-  
11   cess in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure,  
12   to the extent feasible, similar information directly from  
13   enrollees at appropriate intervals following their comple-  
14   tion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evalua-  
15   tion shall be published and shall be summarized in the report  
16   required by section 608.

17        “(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or  
18   contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration proj-  
19   ects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the  
20   better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjust-  
21   ment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduc-  
22   tion in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transporta-  
23   tion and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater  
24   efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under

1 this part. These projects shall include one or more projects  
2 providing youths with education, training, and other sup-  
3 portive services on a combined residential and nonresidential  
4 basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake  
5 one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who  
6 have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons  
7 or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or  
8 other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection  
9 shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other  
10 Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related pro-  
11 grams or projects and with the prime work and training spon-  
12 sors, as described in part B of this title in the communities  
13 where the projects will be carried out. They may be under-  
14 taken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted pro-  
15 grams, including programs under part B of this title, and  
16 funds otherwise available for activities under those programs  
17 shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned,  
18 be available to projects under this section to the extent they  
19 include the same or substantially similar activities. The  
20 Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds  
21 would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under  
22 this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility  
23 and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by  
24 section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the  
25 Congress concerning the actions taken under this section,



1 including a full description of progress made in connection  
2 with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

3 “(c) In order to determine whether upgraded voca-  
4 tional education schools could eliminate or substantially re-  
5 duce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how  
6 communities could make maximum utilization of expensive  
7 educational and training facilities, the Director, in coopera-  
8 tion with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into  
9 one or more agreements with State educational agencies to  
10 pay the cost of establishing and operating model community  
11 vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities  
12 shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high  
13 dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a  
14 need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill  
15 center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it  
16 contains provisions designed to assure that—

17 “(1) a job survey be made of the area;

18 “(2) the training program of the school and skill  
19 center reflect the job market needs as projected by the  
20 survey;

21 “(3) an advisory committee composed of repre-  
22 sentatives of business, labor, education, and community  
23 leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to  
24 make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

25 “(4) arrangements have been worked out with

1 schools in the area and the administrator of the skill  
 2 center for maximum utilization of the center both during  
 3 and after school hours; and

4 “(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as  
 5 the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem  
 6 necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will  
 7 be provided.

8 “PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

9 “SEC. 114. (a) The Director shall take necessary action  
 10 to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job  
 11 Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation  
 12 with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to  
 13 the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-  
 14 rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-  
 15 ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and  
 16 coordination with State-operated programs.

17 “(b) The Director may enter into agreements with  
 18 States to assist in the operation or administration of State-  
 19 operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.  
 20 The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of  
 21 the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

22 “(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility  
 23 designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-  
 24 lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-  
 25 posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and



1 such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days  
2 of such submission.

3 “APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

4 “SEC. 115. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-  
5 vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, en-  
6 rollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal  
7 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law  
8 relating to Federal employment, including those regarding  
9 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment  
10 compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

11 “(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of  
12 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security  
13 Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-  
14 ployees of the United States and any service performed by  
15 an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed  
16 in the employ of the United States.

17 “(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of  
18 title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation  
19 to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be  
20 deemed civil employees of the United States within the  
21 meaning of the term ‘employee’ as defined in section 8101 of  
22 title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-  
23 chapter shall apply except as follows:

24 “(A) The term ‘performance of duty’ shall not in-  
25 clude any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her

1 assigned post of duty, except while participating in an  
2 activity (including an activity while on pass or during  
3 travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or  
4 under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

5 “(B) In computing compensation benefits for dis-  
6 ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be  
7 deemed that received under the entrance salary for a  
8 grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of  
9 title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

10 “(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to  
11 accrue until the day following the date on which the  
12 injured enrollee is terminated.

13 “(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions  
14 in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered  
15 employees of the Government.

16 “(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to  
17 persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job  
18 Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and  
19 it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United  
20 States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not  
21 exceeding \$500.

22 “(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-  
23 tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements  
24 made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not  
25 be counted in computing strength under any law limiting



1 the strength of such services or in computing the percentage  
2 authorized by law for any grade therein.

3 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

4 "SEC. 116. (a) The Director shall not use any funds  
5 made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year  
6 ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above  
7 forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps cen-  
8 ters.

9 "(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure  
10 that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of  
11 Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at  
12 least 25 per centum shall be women.

13 "(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure  
14 that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job  
15 Corps centers which have been in operation for more than  
16 nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

17 "(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure  
18 that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced  
19 or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-  
20 tion of any conservation or training center shall become the  
21 property of the United States.

22 "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

23 "SEC. 117. (a) No officer or employee of the executive  
24 branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry  
25 concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee

1 or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures  
2 concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such  
3 membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes  
4 by law a disqualification for Government employment. No  
5 discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by  
6 any person in the executive branch of the Federal Govern-  
7 ment against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or  
8 any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his  
9 political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically  
10 authorized or required by law.

11 “(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall  
12 take any active part in political management or in political  
13 campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to  
14 statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use  
15 his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering  
16 with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such  
17 persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and  
18 to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all  
19 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee,  
20 enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political  
21 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation  
22 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

23 “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-



1 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-  
2 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for  
3 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,  
4 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as  
5 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions."

#### 6 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

7 SEC. 102. Part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity  
8 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### 9 "PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

##### 10 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

11 "SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful  
12 work and training opportunities, together with related serv-  
13 ices and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to  
14 continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed  
15 or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and  
16 hold regular competitive employment, with maximum oppor-  
17 tunities for local initiative in developing programs which  
18 respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis  
19 upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs  
20 using both public and private resources to overcome the  
21 complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in  
22 urban and rural areas having high concentrations or propor-  
23 tions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

1       “COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE  
2                               WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

3       “SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recog-  
4 nize community program areas for the purpose of planning  
5 and conducting comprehensive community work and training  
6 programs.

7       “(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be  
8 a city, county, multicity or multicounty unit, an Indian res-  
9 ervation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of  
10 boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suit-  
11 able organizational base and possesses the commonality of  
12 interest needed for a comprehensive work and training pro-  
13 gram. The Director shall consult with the heads of other  
14 Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to com-  
15 munity action, manpower services physical and economic  
16 development, housing, education, health, and other commu-  
17 nity services to encourage the establishment of coterminous  
18 or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among  
19 those programs and comprehensive work and training pro-  
20 grams assisted under this title.

21       “(c) A comprehensive work and training program must  
22 seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of serv-  
23 ices which will enable them to obtain and hold employment.  
24 It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and  
25 implementation including the linkage of relevant compo-



1   nent programs authorized by this Act with one another and  
2   with other appropriate public and private programs and activ-  
3   ities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

4           “PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

5           “SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the  
6   Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency  
7   which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under  
8   section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123  
9   (c)). This agency must be capable of planning, adminis-  
10   tering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work  
11   and training program.

12          “(b) The prime sponsor shall be the community action  
13   agency unless the Director determines, in accordance with  
14   such regulations as he may prescribe, that an alternative  
15   prime sponsor is likely to have greater capability in planning  
16   and implementing a comprehensive work and training  
17   program.

18          “(c) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation  
19   of employers and labor organizations in the planning and  
20   conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

21          “(d) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make  
22   use of public and private organizations as delegate  
23   agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive  
24   work and training program, including without lim-  
25   itation agencies governed with the participation of the

1 poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas  
 2 served, educational institutions, the public employment serv-  
 3 ice, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare  
 4 agencies, private training institutions, and other capable  
 5 public and private organizations.

6       “(e) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall  
 7 provide for participation of residents of the area and mem-  
 8 bers of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and  
 9 evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program  
 10 and its components. Such persons shall be provided maxi-  
 11 mum employment opportunity in the conduct of component  
 12 programs, including opportunity for further occupational  
 13 training and career advancement.

14       “(f) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure  
 15 that programs under this part have adequate internal admin-  
 16 istrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel stand-  
 17 ards, evaluation procedures and other policies as may be  
 18 necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

19                               ~~“ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES~~

20       ~~“SEC. 123. (a)~~ The Director may provide financial as-  
 21 sistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work  
 22 and training programs or components of such programs,  
 23 including the following:

24               ~~“(1)~~ programs to provide part-time employment,  
 25               on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-



1 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth  
2 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-  
3 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are in  
4 need of the earnings to permit them to resume or main-  
5 tain attendance in school;

6 “(2) programs to provide unemployed, underem-  
7 ployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over)  
8 with useful work and training (which must include  
9 sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job  
10 training) designed to assist those persons to develop  
11 their maximum occupational potential and to obtain  
12 regular competitive employment;

13 “(3) special programs which involve work activ-  
14 ities directed to the needs of those chronically un-  
15 employed poor who have poor employment prospects  
16 and are unable, because of age, lack of employment op-  
17 portunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employ-  
18 ment or training assistance under other programs, and  
19 which, in addition to other services provided, will  
20 enable such persons to participate in projects for the  
21 betterment or beautification of the community or area  
22 served by the program, including without limitation  
23 activities which will contribute to the management, con-  
24 servation, or development of natural resources, recrea-

1        tional areas, Federal, State, and local government parks,  
2        highways, and other lands;

3        “(4) special programs which provide unemployed  
4        or low-income persons with jobs leading to career oppor-  
5        tunities, including new types of careers, in programs  
6        designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or  
7        cultural condition of the community or area served in  
8        fields including without limitation health, education, wel-  
9        fare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety,  
10       which provide maximum prospects for advancement and  
11       continued employment without Federal assistance,  
12       which give promise of contributing to the broader adop-  
13       tion of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods  
14       of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide  
15       opportunities for further occupational training to facili-  
16       tate career advancement;

17       “(5) special programs which concentrate work and  
18       training resources in urban and rural areas having large  
19       concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed  
20       persons, which are appropriately focused to assure that  
21       work and training opportunities are extended to the most  
22       severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be  
23       expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which  
24       are supported by specific commitments of cooperation  
25       from private and public employers;



1       “(6) supportive and follow-up services to supple-  
 2       ment work and training programs under this or other  
 3       Acts including health services, counseling, day care for  
 4       children, transportation assistance, and other special  
 5       services necessary to assist individuals to achieve suc-  
 6       cess in work and training programs and in employment;

7       “(7) employment centers and mobile employment  
 8       service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and  
 9       placement services, conveniently located in urban neigh-  
 10      borhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the  
 11      most disadvantaged;

12      “(8) programs to provide incentives to private  
 13      employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train  
 14      or employ unemployed or low-income persons, includ-  
 15      ing arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to  
 16      employers for a limited period when an employee might  
 17      not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counsel-  
 18      ing and other supportive services, payment of all or part  
 19      of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and  
 20      rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of un-  
 21      employed or low-income persons, and payments to per-  
 22      mit employers to provide employees resident in such  
 23      areas with transportation to and from work or to reim-  
 24      burse such employees for such transportation: *Provided,*

1       That in making such reimbursements to employers the  
2       Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee  
3       shall not be less than the minimum wage which would  
4       be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor  
5       Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied  
6       to the employee and he was exempt under section  
7       13 thereof; and

8       “(9) means of planning, administering, coordinat-  
9       ing, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training  
10      program.

11      “(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training  
12      component programs conducted in a community under this  
13      section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work  
14      and training program and financial assistance for such com-  
15      ponents shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the  
16      Director determines there is a good cause for providing an  
17      extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsec-  
18      tion (c). After that date, the work and training components  
19      of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by  
20      section 261 of part A of title II of the Manpower Develop-  
21      ment and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent  
22      feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training  
23      program, including funding through the prime sponsor  
24      where appropriate.

25      “(e) The Director may provide financial assistance to



1 a public agency or private organization other than a prime  
 2 sponsor to carry out one or more component programs  
 3 described in subsection (a) when he determines, after solie-  
 4 iting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if  
 5 any, that such assistance would enhance program effective-  
 6 ness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would  
 7 serve the purposes of this title. In the case of programs under  
 8 subsection (a)(1) to this section, financial assistance may  
 9 be provided directly to local or State educational agencies  
 10 pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Seere-  
 11 tary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs  
 12 under direct grants or contracts.

#### 13 "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

14 "SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial  
 15 assistance for any program under this part unless he deter-  
 16 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-  
 17 scribe, that—

18 "(1) no participant will be employed on projects  
 19 involving political parties, or the construction, opera-  
 20 tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is  
 21 used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place  
 22 for religious worship;

23 "(2) the program will not result in the displace-  
 24 ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts  
 25 for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for

1       other funds in connection with work that would other-  
2       wise be performed;

3           “(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-  
4       training and education, and other conditions of employ-  
5       ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light  
6       of such factors as the type of work, geographical region,  
7       and proficiency of the participant;

8           “(4) the program will, to the maximum extent  
9       feasible, contribute to the occupational development or  
10      upward mobility of individual participants.

11          “(b) For programs which provide work and training  
12      related to physical improvements, preference shall be given  
13      to those improvements which will be substantially used by  
14      low-income persons and families or which will contribute  
15      substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas  
16      having high concentrations or proportions of low-income  
17      persons and families.

18          “(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the  
19      maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of  
20      artificial barriers to employment and occupational advance-  
21      ment.

22          “(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maxi-  
23      mum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs  
24      for work and training and the resources of the private sector.



1                   “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

2           “SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part

3 must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director,  
4 in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall  
5 establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration  
6 family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and  
7 other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be  
8 from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare  
9 payments.

10          “(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the  
11 United States.

12          “(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-  
13 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law  
14 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to  
15 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment  
16 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

17                   “ELDERLY

18          “SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs  
19 under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence  
20 of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years  
21 and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director  
22 shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular,  
23 part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

1                                   “PILOT PROJECTS

2           “SEC. 127. ~~(a)~~ The Director may provide financial  
3 assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects  
4 which are designed to develop new approaches to further the  
5 objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by  
6 public agencies or private organizations.

7           “~~(b)~~ The Director shall undertake pilot projects de-  
8 signed to encourage the maximum participation of private  
9 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and  
10 training programs under this part.

11           “~~(c)~~ Before the Director may approve a pilot project,  
12 he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from  
13 the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the  
14 project will be undertaken.

15                                   “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

16           “SEC. 128. The Director may provide ~~(directly or~~  
17 ~~through contracts or other appropriate arrangements)~~ tech-  
18 nical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective opera-  
19 tion of programs under this part. He may also make arrange-  
20 ments for the training of instructors and other personnel  
21 needed to carry out work and training programs under this  
22 part and part D of this title. He shall give special considera-  
23 tion to the problems of rural areas.



1                   “ROLE OF THE STATES

2           “SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance  
3 to appropriate State agencies to—

4           “(1) provide technical assistance and training, as  
5 authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon  
6 service to rural areas and for this purpose preference  
7 shall be given to the State agency which administers  
8 programs assisted by section 231;

9           “(2) assist in coordinating State activities related  
10 to this part;

11           “(3) operate work and training programs in com-  
12 munities which have not yet established an acceptable  
13 prime sponsor; and

14           “(4) provide work and training opportunities on  
15 State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That  
16 these opportunities shall be made available to partici-  
17 pants in community work and training programs.

18           “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

19           “SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for  
20 any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the  
21 Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the  
22 purpose of carrying out section 123(a)-(5); but not more

1 than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal  
2 year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the  
3 remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the  
4 provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria  
5 designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance  
6 among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall con-  
7 sider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population,  
8 unemployment, and family income levels.

9 "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

10 "SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program  
11 or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part  
12 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program  
13 or activity, including costs of administration. The Director  
14 may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percent-  
15 age if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing ob-  
16 jective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary  
17 in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal con-  
18 tributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, includ-  
19 ing but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in  
20 any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contribu-  
21 tions under this title exceeding its requirements under this  
22 section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for  
23 such contributions under section 224(e).



1           ~~“PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION~~

2           ~~“SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the devel-~~  
3   ~~opment and implementation of a program data system con-~~  
4   ~~sistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal~~  
5   ~~programs. Such data shall be published periodically.~~

6           ~~“(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing eval-~~  
7   ~~uation of the programs under this part, including their effec-~~  
8   ~~tiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related~~  
9   ~~programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the de-~~  
10   ~~livery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the~~  
11   ~~opinions of participants about the strengths and weak-~~  
12   ~~nesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include com-~~  
13   ~~parisons with proper control groups composed of persons~~  
14   ~~who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek~~  
15   ~~to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of~~  
16   ~~work and training programs authorized by this Act and by~~  
17   ~~other Acts, including the Manpower Development and~~  
18   ~~Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract~~  
19   ~~for independent evaluations of such programs or individual~~  
20   ~~projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included~~  
21   ~~in the report required by section 608.~~

22           ~~“(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards~~  
23   ~~for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the~~

1 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered  
2 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial as-  
3 sistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129."

4 SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

5 SEC. 103. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportu-  
6 nity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

7 "PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

8 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

9 "SEC. 150. The purpose of this part is to establish  
10 special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of  
11 the critical problems existing in particular communities or  
12 neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other  
13 subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having  
14 especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and  
15 within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to  
16 eligible urban areas; and (2) are of sufficient size and scope  
17 to have an appreciable impact in such communities and  
18 neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency,  
19 chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

20 "ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

21 "SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide finan-  
22 cial assistance to public agencies or private organizations  
23 for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs  
24 which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part.  
25 Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each



1 is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact  
2 on the area served. Such programs may include—

3 “(1) economic and business development pro-  
4 grams, including programs which provide financial and  
5 other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas  
6 served so as to provide employment opportunities for  
7 residents of those areas; and programs such as those  
8 described in title IV of this Act for small businesses  
9 in or owned by residents of such areas;

10 “(2) community development activities which  
11 create new training and employment opportunities and  
12 which contribute to an improved living environment;  
13 and

14 “(3) manpower training programs for unemployed  
15 or low-income persons which support and complement  
16 economic, business, and community development pro-  
17 grams, including without limitation activities such as  
18 those described in part B of this title.

19 “REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

20 “SEC. 152. (a) The Director shall not provide finan-  
21 cial assistance for any program or component project under  
22 this part unless he determines that—

23 “(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the  
24 maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

1           “(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the  
2           development of entrepreneurial and management skills  
3           and the ownership or participation in ownership of as-  
4           sisted businesses by residents of the area served;

5           “(3) projects will be planned and carried out with  
6           the maximum participation of local businessmen by their  
7           inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory coun-  
8           cils, or through other appropriate means;

9           “(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated  
10          with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration  
11          Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and  
12          with other relevant plans for physical and human re-  
13          sources of the areas served;

14          “(5) the requirements of subsections 122(f) and  
15          124(a) of this Act have been met; and

16          “(6) preference will be given to the residents of  
17          the areas served in filling jobs and training oppor-  
18          tunities.

19          “(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not  
20          be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from  
21          one location to another if such relocation would result in an  
22          increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

23          “(c) The level of financial assistance for related pur-  
24          poses under this Act to the area served by a special impact



1 program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds  
2 authorized by this part.

3 “(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal  
4 year for programs authorized under this title, the Director  
5 shall reserve not less than 8 per centum for the purpose  
6 of carrying out this part.

7 “APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

8 “SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban  
9 Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take  
10 all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under  
11 title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for  
12 business location and expansion purposes is made available  
13 as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

14 “(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall  
15 be deemed ‘redevelopment areas’ within the meaning of  
16 section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Develop-  
17 ment Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the  
18 provisions of title II of that Act.

19 “(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be  
20 necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation  
21 with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies,  
22 so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Fed-  
23 eral Government or in connection with programs aided with

1 Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the  
2 purposes of this part.

3 "EVALUATION

4 "SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made  
5 under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation  
6 of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of  
7 this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public  
8 or private organizations as the Director may designate, and  
9 up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid  
10 from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of  
11 such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the  
12 Director's findings and recommendations concerning the pro-  
13 gram, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

14 "FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

15 "SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out  
16 pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the  
17 cost of such program, including costs of administration, un-  
18 less the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted  
19 and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for  
20 such determinations, that assistance in excess of such per-  
21 centage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this  
22 part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind,  
23 fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equip-  
24 ment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment  
25 is required under a contract with a private organization



1 (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share  
 2 thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital invest-  
 3 ment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.

#### 4 COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

5 SEC. 104. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of  
 6 1964 is amended to read as follows:

### 7 ~~"TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY~~ 8 ~~ACTION PROGRAMS~~

#### 9 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

10 "SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to assist com-  
 11 munities in opening opportunities which enable low-income  
 12 persons to achieve self-sufficiency.

#### 13 "COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

14 "SEC. 202. (a) To achieve this purpose, communities  
 15 shall be encouraged and aided to plan and conduct com-  
 16 munity action programs designed to—

17 "(1) provide services and assistance, including in-  
 18 novative approaches, which enable low-income persons  
 19 to achieve economic independence, to improve their  
 20 living conditions, and to increase their participation in  
 21 community activities;

22 "(2) stimulate agencies and institutions which pro-  
 23 vide services and assistance to low-income persons to  
 24 expand, modify, and improve their programs so as to  
 25 serve such persons more effectively; and

1           “(3) mobilize, utilize, and coordinate all relevant  
2       Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all  
3       available private resources in a comprehensive program  
4       which opens opportunities to low-income persons.

5       “(b) There shall be maximum feasible participation of  
6 residents of the areas and members of the groups served in  
7 the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of all  
8 components of a community action program. There shall be  
9 maximum emphasis upon local initiative and responsibility.

10 ~~“PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND DELEGATE~~  
11 ~~AGENCIES~~

12       “ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

13 "SEC. 210. The Director shall encourage the formation  
14 of community action agencies. A community action agency  
15 may be either a public or private nonprofit agency. In order  
16 to merit financial assistance under this title, a community ac-  
17 tion agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of  
18 planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a com-  
19 munity action program, and, to the extent permitted by  
20 relevant law, be capable of mobilizing all Federal, State, and  
21 local public resources, as well as all available private re-  
22 sources. It shall serve as the prime sponsor for all financial  
23 assistance provided to its community under sections 220  
24 and 221 (except as otherwise provided in sections 220(c)  
25 and 221(a)). It shall have adequate authority (1) to



1 administer funds received under this title and from other  
 2 public and private sources; ~~(2)~~ to transfer and delegate such  
 3 funds to other agencies; and ~~(3)~~ to contract with public or  
 4 private organizations. It shall conform to such other criteria  
 5 as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions  
 6 of this title.

#### 7 "COMMUNITIES

8 "SEC. 211. For the purpose of this title, a community  
 9 may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an  
 10 Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irre-  
 11 spective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which pro-  
 12 vides a suitable organizational base and possesses the com-  
 13 monality of interest needed for a community action program.  
 14 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal  
 15 agencies responsible for programs relating to work and train-  
 16 ing programs, physical and economic development, housing,  
 17 education, health, and other community services to encour-  
 18 age the establishment of coterminous or complementary  
 19 boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and  
 20 community action programs assisted under this title.

#### 21 "STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

22 "SEC. 212. A statewide or regional agency may be a  
 23 community action agency for the purpose of planning, con-  
 24 ducting, administering and evaluating programs in a number

1 of rural areas or small communities until a satisfactory com-  
2 munity agency is established. Such an agency must operate  
3 in a manner consistent with sections 201 and 202, including  
4 the participation and representation requirements of sec-  
5 tion 213.

6 "GOVERNING BOARD

7 "SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be  
8 established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing,  
9 and effective community participation in all phases of the  
10 community action program for which it is responsible, and  
11 to assure that the program, as developed and implemented,  
12 is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each  
13 such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board  
14 whose members shall, if he or they so desire, include the  
15 chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the  
16 failure of any such official to serve, a person or persons  
17 may be designated by such official and other appropriate  
18 public officials or their representatives, and representatives  
19 of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assist-  
20 ance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of busi-  
21 ness, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests  
22 in the community.

23 "(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board  
24 shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas  
25 and members of the groups served. Each community action



1 agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate rep-  
 2 resentation is provided ~~(1)~~ to poor persons living in neigh-  
 3 borhoods where poverty is concentrated, and ~~(2)~~ to other  
 4 poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living  
 5 outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing  
 6 board selected to represent specific geographic areas must  
 7 reside in the area they represent.

8     ~~“(c)~~ The Director shall require community action agen-  
 9 cies to establish procedures under which community agencies  
 10 and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves  
 11 inadequately represented on the governing board may peti-  
 12 tion for adequate representation.

13     ~~“POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BOARD~~

14     ~~“SEC. 214. (a)~~ The governing board of a community  
 15 action agency shall be empowered to—

16         ~~“(1)~~ establish adequate personnel policies and fis-  
 17 cal controls;

18         ~~“(2)~~ approve overall plans, adopt and enforce pro-  
 19 gram policies, and approve all proposals for financial  
 20 assistance under this title; and

21         ~~“(3)~~ provide for periodic evaluation of the effective-  
 22 ness of the community action program and its com-  
 23 ponents.

24     ~~“(b)~~ Each community action agency shall provide for  
 25 reasonable public access to books, records and other informa-

1 tion and for opportunity for public hearing at the request of  
2 local groups.

3       “(c) The Director shall promulgate such standards or  
4 rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings,  
5 quorums, procedures, establishment of committees and simi-  
6 lar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that com-  
7 munity action boards provide a continuing and effective  
8 mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in  
9 programs assisted under this title and that all groups or  
10 elements represented on those boards have a full and fair  
11 opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those  
12 programs.

13                       “~~DELEGATE AGENCIES~~

14       “~~SEC. 215. (a) Each community action agency shall be~~  
15 encouraged to make use of delegate agencies to carry out  
16 components of the community action program. Such agencies  
17 shall consist of ~~(1)~~ neighborhood based organizations formed  
18 to carry out programs under this Act, which shall be encour-  
19 aged to have at least one-half of the governing board com-  
20 posed of residents of the area or members of the groups  
21 served, or ~~(2)~~ other delegate agencies which shall be re-  
22 quired to establish effective procedures by which such persons  
23 will be enabled to influence the character of programs, affect-  
24 ing their interests. A delegate agency may be a public  
25 agency or private organization. Each delegate agency must



1 be capable of conducting the program or programs, shall  
2 have adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls, shall  
3 provide for reasonable public access to books, records, and  
4 other information, and shall cooperate in the evaluation of  
5 programs.

6 “(b) The community action agency shall encourage the  
7 establishment of housing development and services organi-  
8 zations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income  
9 families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the  
10 technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is  
11 required to help low-income families and individuals more  
12 effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required  
13 to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more  
14 effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and  
15 local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs.  
16 Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit  
17 housing development corporations. Such corporations may  
18 themselves become sponsors of housing under existing pro-  
19 grams of specialized housing agencies, but under no circum-  
20 stances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate  
21 the long-term capital financing functions of programs now  
22 administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing  
23 development and service organizations shall coordinate their  
24 efforts with other community action agency efforts so that

1 any programs undertaken under authority of this subsection  
 2 shall be closely related to other community action programs.

3       “PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY  
 4       ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

5       “GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

6       “SEC. 220. (a) The Director may provide financial as-  
 7 sistence to community action agencies for the planning, con-  
 8 duct, administration and evaluation of community action  
 9 programs and components. These components may involve  
 10 national emphasis program activities as described in section  
 11 221 and, without limitation, other activities and supporting  
 12 facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly  
 13 poor—

14           “(1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;

15           “(2) to attain an adequate education;

16           “(3) to make better use of available income;

17           “(4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and  
 18 a suitable living environment;

19           “(5) to undertake family planning, consistent  
 20 with personal and family goals, religious and moral  
 21 convictions;

22           “(6) to obtain services for the prevention of  
 23 narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of  
 24 narcotic addicts and alcoholics;

25           “(7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans



1 or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and  
2 family needs, including the need for health services,  
3 nutritious food, housing, and employment-related as-  
4 sistance;

5 “(8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and  
6 family problems which block the achievement of self-  
7 sufficiency;

8 “(9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs  
9 of the community; and

10 “(10) to make more frequent and effective use of  
11 other programs related to the purposes of this title.

12 He may also provide financial assistance to other public or  
13 private non-profit agencies to aid them in planning for the  
14 establishment of a community action agency.

15 “(b) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as  
16 a condition of assistance, that each community action agency  
17 has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of  
18 the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds pro-  
19 vided under this part. Such systematic approach shall en-  
20 compass a planning and implementation process which seeks  
21 to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the com-  
22 munity, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and  
23 private resources, establishes program priorities, links pro-  
24 gram components with one another and with other relevant  
25 programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may,

1 however, extend the time for such requirement to take into  
2 account the length of time a program has been in operation.  
3 He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation  
4 of other Federal agencies in support of the development and  
5 implementation of plans under this subsection.

6 “(c) The Director may and is encouraged to provide  
7 financial assistance to a public agency or private organization  
8 other than a community action agency to carry out one or  
9 more component programs under this section and section 221  
10 when he determines, after soliciting and considering com-  
11 ments of the community action agency, if any, that such  
12 assistance would enhance program participation or accept-  
13 ance on the part of persons served and would serve the pur-  
14 pose of this title.

15 “(d) At least 50 per centum of the funds authorized  
16 and appropriated for this title shall be utilized to finance  
17 component programs under this section and section 221  
18 which are locally selected to respond to particular com-  
19 munity needs.

20 “(e) In order to promote local responsibility and ini-  
21 tiative, the Director shall not establish binding national  
22 priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall re-  
23 view each application for financial assistance on its merits.  
24 Before extending financial assistance to a new community  
25 action agency under this section and under section 221, and



1 in determining the amount of and conditions on which such  
2 assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the  
3 extent and nature of poverty in the community and the  
4 probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective  
5 program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance  
6 to a previously existing community action agency, he shall  
7 consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such  
8 agency.

9 "NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS

10 "SEC. 221. (a) The Director may reserve funds and  
11 provide financial assistance for national emphasis programs  
12 designed to deal with needs of the poor which are common  
13 to a number of communities. Except as otherwise provided in  
14 subsections (b)(2) and (b)(5) and section 220(c), such  
15 financial assistance shall be provided through community  
16 action agencies, unless (1) the community action agency  
17 chooses not to undertake that responsibility, or (2) the com-  
18 munity action agency fails to demonstrate affirmatively its  
19 capability to undertake this responsibility, or (3) there is no  
20 community action agency in the area. Community action  
21 agencies shall be encouraged to make maximum use of dele-  
22 gate agencies to operate such programs.

23 "(b) Among the national emphasis programs shall be  
24 the following:

25 "(1) A program to be known as Headstart focused

1 upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory  
2 school attendance which will provide such comprehensive  
3 health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as  
4 the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full  
5 potential, together with appropriate activities to encourage  
6 the participation of parents of such children and permit the  
7 effective use of parent services.

8 “(2) A program to be known as Follow Through  
9 focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elemen-  
10 tary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart  
11 or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive  
12 services and parent participation activities as described in  
13 paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the con-  
14 tinued development of children to their full potential. Funds  
15 for such program shall be transferred directly from the  
16 Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.  
17 Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by  
18 the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the  
19 Director directly to local educational agencies except as  
20 otherwise provided by such agreements.

21 “(3) A ‘legal services program’ to further the cause of  
22 justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the  
23 assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing  
24 legal advice, legal representation, counseling education, and  
25 other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice



1 and representations shall be carried on in a way that assures  
2 maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with  
3 the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall  
4 make arrangements under which the State bar association  
5 and the local bar association in the community to be served  
6 by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall  
7 be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to sub-  
8 mit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the  
9 proposed project before such project is approved or funded,  
10 and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommenda-  
11 tions on the operations of such project, if approved and  
12 funded.

13 “(4) A ‘comprehensive health services program’. This  
14 shall include—

15 “(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying  
16 out comprehensive health services projects focused upon  
17 the needs of urban and rural areas having high concen-  
18 trations or proportions of poverty and marked inade-  
19 quacy of health services for the poor. These projects  
20 shall be designed—

21 “(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible  
22 use of existing agencies and resources, the provision  
23 of comprehensive health services, such as preventive  
24 medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family  
25 planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism pre-

1           vention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and  
2           followup services, together with necessary related  
3           facilities and services; and

4           “(ii) to assure that these services are made  
5           readily accessible to low-income residents of such  
6           areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to  
7           their needs and with their participation and wherever  
8           possible are combined with, or included within, ar-  
9           rangements for providing employment, education,  
10          social, or other assistance needed by the families  
11          and individuals served: *Provided, however, That*  
12          such services may be made available on an emer-  
13          gency basis or pending a determination of eligibility  
14          to all residents of such areas.

15          Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall  
16          be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants  
17          to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and  
18          may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of projects.  
19          Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit  
20          and consider the comments and recommendations of the  
21          principal local medical associations in the area and shall  
22          consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health  
23          agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure  
24          that the program will be carried on under competent  
25          professional supervision and that existing agencies pro-



1     viding related services are furnished all assistance needed  
2     to permit them to plan for participation in the program  
3     and for the necessary continuation of those related serv-  
4     ices; and

5         “(B) programs to provide financial assistance to  
6     public or private agencies for projects designed to de-  
7     velop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health  
8     services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both  
9     prospective and practicing health professionals to direct  
10    their talents and energies toward providing health serv-  
11    ices for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this  
12    paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or ar-  
13    range for training and study in the field of health serv-  
14    ices for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by  
15    him, the Director may arrange for the payment of  
16    stipends and allowances (including travel and subsist-  
17    ence expenses) for persons undergoing such training  
18    and study and for their dependents. The Director and  
19    the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall  
20    achieve effective coordination of programs and projects  
21    authorized under this section with other related  
22    activities.

23         “(5) A program to be known as Upward Bound de-  
24    signed to generate skills and motivation necessary for suc-  
25    cess in education beyond high school among young people

1 from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary  
2 school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to  
3 assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher  
4 education and one or more secondary schools. They must in-  
5 clude a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking,  
6 effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for  
7 post-secondary educational success, necessary health services  
8 and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the  
9 Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assist-  
10 ance for such projects may be provided directly to institu-  
11 tions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely  
12 coordinated with activities of community action agencies  
13 and with the Higher Education Act of 1965.

14       “(6) A program to be known as Project Find designed  
15 to identify and meet the needs of poor persons above the  
16 age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: effective  
17 referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing,  
18 legal and consumer assistance, recreation, and other services;  
19 stimulation of additional services and programs to remedy  
20 gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and pro-  
21 grams; provision of new employment and volunteer op-  
22 portunities; increased participation in community activities  
23 and programs; modification of existing procedures and eligi-  
24 bility requirements to facilitate greater use of and participa-  
25 tion in public services by the older poor; development of



1 all-season recreation centers; and such other activities and  
 2 services as the Director may determine are necessary or  
 3 specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor.

4       “(7) A ‘family planning program’ to provide assist-  
 5 ance and services to low-income persons in the field of vol-  
 6 untary family planning, including the provision of infor-  
 7 mation, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and  
 8 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall co-  
 9 ordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concern-  
 10 ing, family planning projects within their respective juris-  
 11 dictions in order to assure the maximum availability of  
 12 services and in order best to meet the varying needs of dif-  
 13 ferent communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and  
 14 Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Services  
 15 officers available to the Director in carrying out this  
 16 program.

17       “(e) Consistent with, and subject, to the provisions of  
 18 section 232, programs under this section may include related  
 19 training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allo-  
 20 cated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the  
 21 manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to  
 22 training, research, and technical assistance activities.

23                       “RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

24       “SEC. 222. In the conduct of all component programs  
 25 under this part, residents of the area and members of the

1 groups served shall be provided maximum employment op-  
2 portunity, including opportunity for further occupational  
3 training and career advancement. The Director shall encour-  
4 age the employment of persons fifty-five years and older as  
5 regular, part-time and short-term staff in component  
6 programs.

7 "NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

8 "SEC. 223. The Director shall encourage the develop-  
9 ment of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effec-  
10 tiveness of needed services in such fields as health, educa-  
11 tion, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic  
12 development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services,  
13 and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate  
14 framework) as to promote maximum participation of neigh-  
15 borhood residents in center planning, policymaking, adminis-  
16 tration, and operation. In addition to providing such services  
17 as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available,  
18 such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs  
19 as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community devel-  
20 opment activities as may be necessary or appropriate to best  
21 assure a system under which existing programs are extended  
22 to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are  
23 responsive and relevant to the range of community, family,  
24 and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighbor-  
25 hood needs and conditions.



## 1     “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

2     “SEC. 224. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or  
3 allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-  
4 tion of community action programs pursuant to section 220  
5 and for national emphasis programs referred to in section  
6 221(a), and which are not subject to any other provision  
7 governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot  
8 not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,  
9 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,  
10 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.  
11 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of these  
12 sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and  
13 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be  
14 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest  
15 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on  
16 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance  
17 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the  
18 average number of unemployed persons in each State as  
19 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of  
20 related children living with families with incomes of less  
21 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That  
22 part of any State allotment which the Director determines  
23 will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during  
24 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, to other States, in

1 proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate  
2 adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to  
3 any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among  
4 the other States.

5       “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-  
6 ment of funds for any national emphasis program referred to  
7 in section 221(a) except Headstart. This allotment may be  
8 made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsec-  
9 tion (a), or it may be made in accordance with criteria  
10 which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of  
11 funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the  
12 needs or problems at which the program is directed, except  
13 that in no event may more than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of the funds  
14 for any one program be used in any one State.

15       “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial  
16 assistance extended to a community action agency or other  
17 agency pursuant to sections 220 and 221 shall not exceed  
18 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted pro-  
19 grams or activities. The Director may, however, approve  
20 assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines, in  
21 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,  
22 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes  
23 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in  
24 kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,  
25 equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community



1 provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceed-  
2 ing its requirements under this section, such excess may be  
3 used to meet its requirements for such contributions under  
4 section 131.

5       “(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under  
6 sections 220 and 221, unless the Director satisfies himself  
7 ~~(1)~~ that the services to be provided under such program  
8 will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services  
9 previously provided without Federal assistance, ~~(2)~~ that,  
10 to the extent that in-school educational services previously  
11 provided with or without Federal assistance can be expanded  
12 and adapted to meet more effectively ~~(A)~~ the needs of the  
13 poor within the community and ~~(B)~~ the purposes of the  
14 assistance to be extended under this title, the agency provid-  
15 ing such services shall be utilized, and ~~(3)~~ that funds or  
16 other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the  
17 needs of the poor within the community will not be di-  
18 minished in order to provide any contributions required  
19 under subsection ~~(c)~~ or otherwise qualify for assistance  
20 under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding  
21 sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director  
22 may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for  
23 determinations covering situations where a strict applica-  
24 tion of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship

1 or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be  
2 achieved.

3 ~~"PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES~~

4 ~~"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING~~

5 ~~"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or~~  
6 ~~through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-~~  
7 ~~ance to communities in planning, conducting, administering,~~  
8 ~~and evaluating programs under this title, and (2) training~~  
9 ~~of specialized or other personnel which are needed to achieve~~  
10 ~~the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiv-~~  
11 ~~ing financial assistance under this title, the Director may~~  
12 ~~make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist~~  
13 ~~and advise it in the performance of functions related to the~~  
14 ~~assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be~~  
15 ~~a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.~~

16 ~~"STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE—SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO~~  
17 ~~GOVERNORS~~

18 ~~"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial as-~~  
19 ~~sistance to appropriate State agencies to enable those agen-~~  
20 ~~cies—~~

21 ~~"(1) to provide technical assistance to communi-~~  
22 ~~ties and local agencies in developing and carrying out~~  
23 ~~programs under this title;~~

24 ~~"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related~~  
25 ~~to this title;~~



1           ~~“(3)~~ to advise and assist the Director in develop-  
2       ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-  
3       tion of States and State agencies in programs under this  
4       title; and

5           ~~“(4)~~ to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-  
6       nomic Opportunity Council established by section 631  
7       of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in  
8       identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-  
9       ministrative requirements that operate to impede State  
10      level coordination of programs related to this title, and  
11      in developing methods or recommendations for overcom-  
12      ing those problems.

13          ~~“(b)~~ In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the  
14      Director shall give preference to programs or activities which  
15      are administered or coordinated by the agencies assisted pur-  
16      suant to subsection ~~(a)~~, or which have been developed and  
17      will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

18          ~~“(c)~~ In order to promote coordination in the use of  
19      funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State  
20      agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States  
21      or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of  
22      the United States for purposes of providing financial assist-  
23      ance to community action agencies or other local agencies  
24      in connection with specific projects or types of projects in-

1 involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds  
2 under this title.

3 “(d) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I  
4 and title II no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other as-  
5 sistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local  
6 public agency or any private institution or organization for  
7 the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-  
8 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed  
9 contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been  
10 submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has  
11 not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of  
12 such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered  
13 by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with  
14 the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part.  
15 This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agree-  
16 ments, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of  
17 higher education in existence on the date of the approval of  
18 this Act.

19 “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROJECTS .

20 “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may provide financial  
21 assistance for pilot projects conducted by public agencies or  
22 private organizations which are designed to assist in the  
23 development of new approaches that will aid in furthering  
24 the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide



1 financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes  
2 of this title.

3 “(b) Before approving any contract or grant for a pilot  
4 project in a community which has a community action  
5 agency, the Director shall solicit and consider the views of  
6 that agency on the proposed project.

7 “(c) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot  
8 projects (1) which aid elderly persons to achieve greater  
9 self-sufficiency, (2) which focus upon the problems of rural  
10 poverty, (3) which are designed to develop new techniques  
11 and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction  
12 or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, and (4) which are de-  
13 signed to encourage the participation of private organizations,  
14 other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this  
15 title.

16 “(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or  
17 through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot  
18 projects designed to assure a more effective use of human  
19 and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migra-  
20 tion from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity,  
21 thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers.  
22 Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with  
23 other federally assisted programs, particularly programs au-

1   thorized under the Public Works and Economic Develop-  
2   ment Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

3       “(e) The Director shall establish an overall plan to gov-  
4   ern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the  
5   use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall  
6   set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities  
7   among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director  
8   shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of  
9   minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects  
10   and determining whether the findings resulting from any re-  
11   search or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more  
12   programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part  
13   of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate  
14   annual report, the Director shall submit a description for  
15   each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section,  
16   of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived  
17   from those activities, together with a statement indicating  
18   the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which  
19   the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to  
20   be realized.

21       “(f) Not more than 15 per centum of the sums appro-  
22   priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be  
23   used for the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any  
24   other provision of law, of the sums appropriated pursuant  
25   to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$50,-



1 000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under  
2 subsection (d) of this section.

3 "EVALUATION

4 "SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the con-  
5 tinuing evaluation of programs under this part, including their  
6 effectiveness in achieving stated goals their impact on re-  
7 lated programs and their structure and mechanism for the  
8 delivery of services and including, where appropriate, com-  
9 parison with proper control groups composed of persons  
10 who have not participated in such programs. He may, for  
11 this purpose contract for independent evaluations of those  
12 programs or individual projects. He shall also arrange for  
13 obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths  
14 and weaknesses of the programs. The results of such evalua-  
15 tion shall be included in the report required by section 608.

16 "(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards  
17 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the  
18 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered  
19 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assist-  
20 ance provided by sections 220, 221, 230, and 231.

21 "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS—

22 "RURAL AREAS

23 "SEC. 240. (a) The Director shall establish criteria de-  
24 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under  
25 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.

1 In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative  
2 number in the States or areas therein of: ~~(1)~~ low-income  
3 families, particularly those with children; ~~(2)~~ unemployed  
4 persons; ~~(3)~~ persons receiving cash or other assistance on  
5 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;  
6 ~~(4)~~ school dropouts; ~~(5)~~ adults with less than an eighth-  
7 grade education; ~~(6)~~ persons rejected for military service;  
8 and ~~(7)~~ persons living in urban places compared to the  
9 number living in rural places as determined by the latest  
10 reports of the Bureau of the Census.

11 “~~(b)~~ To assure that rural areas are able to utilize their  
12 full and equitable share of assistance, the Director shall un-  
13 dertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural  
14 community action programs. He shall describe these efforts  
15 and their results in the report required by section 608.

16 “FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

17 “SEC. 241. The Director shall prescribe regulations to  
18 assure that programs under this title are carried on subject  
19 to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and  
20 rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be  
21 necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effec-  
22 tive use of funds. These regulations shall include provisions  
23 governing matters relating to partisan political activities and  
24 elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act.



## "AUDITS

2        "SEC. 242. (a) Within three months after the effective  
3        date of the first grant or contract of assistance with an or-  
4        ganization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be  
5        made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the  
6        adequacy of the accounting system and internal manage-  
7        ment controls.

“(b) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

~~"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS~~

21           “SEC. 243. The following special limitations shall apply,  
22   as indicated, to programs under this title.

23                   ~~“(1) Financial assistance under this title may in-~~  
24                   clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for at-

1       tendance at meetings of any community action agency  
2       governing board, neighborhood council or committee;  
3       as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum  
4       feasible participation of members of groups and residents  
5       of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this  
6       title; and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses  
7       connected with those meetings; but those funds (or  
8       matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay  
9       allowances in the case of any individual who is a Fed-  
10      eral, State, or local government employee, or an em-  
11      ployee of a community action agency; or for payment of  
12      an allowance to any individual for attendance at more  
13      than two meetings a month.

14           “(2) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-  
15      nomic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,  
16      council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,  
17      contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a pro-  
18      gram receiving financial assistance under this title; but  
19      this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serv-  
20      ing on a board, council, or committee which does not  
21      have any authority or powers in connection with a pro-  
22      gram assisted under this title.

23           “(3) In granting financial assistance for projects  
24      or activities in the field of family planning, the Director  
25      shall assure that family planning services, including the



dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

“(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

“(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

“(4) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general or curricular aid to education in any school or school system other than for special health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular

1 services designed to encourage successful participation in  
2 school.

3 “(5) In extending assistance under this title the  
4 Director shall give special consideration to programs  
5 which make maximum use of existing schools, com-  
6 munity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities  
7 during times they are not in use for their primary  
8 purpose.

9 “(6) In extending assistance under this title for  
10 supplemental educational services of the type not pro-  
11 hibited by paragraph (4) of this section, the Director  
12 shall make maximum use of the services of the Commis-  
13 sioner of Education, and of State and local educational  
14 agencies.

15 “(7) No financial assistance shall be extended  
16 under this title in any case in which the Director deter-  
17 mines that the costs of developing and administering all  
18 of the programs assisted under this title carried on by  
19 or under the supervision of any community action agency  
20 exceed 15 per centum of the total costs, including non-  
21 Federal contributions to such costs, of such programs.  
22 The Director, after consultation with the Director of the  
23 Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation,  
24 criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and  
25 administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs  
26 of such programs. In any case in which the Director



determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 per centum of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 244. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

SEC. 105. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read "PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM", and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read "LOANS TO FAMILIES".

1       (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as  
2 follows:

3                               “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

4       “SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some  
5 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-  
6 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-  
7 ing their income and living standards.”

8       (c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by insert-  
9 ing the word “principal” after the word “aggregate”.

10       (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI  
11 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as  
12 section 306, and amended by striking out “titles III of this  
13 Act” in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu  
14 thereof “this part”.

15       (e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read  
16 as follows:

17       “PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEA-  
18       SONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR  
19       FAMILIES

20                               “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

21       “SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant  
22 and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve  
23 their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a  
24 productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly com-  
25 plex and technological society.



1                                   “FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

2           “SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial as-  
3   sistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit  
4   institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out  
5   programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

6           “(b) Programs assisted under this part may include  
7   projects or activities—

8               “(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and  
9   seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day  
10   care for children, education, health services, improved  
11   housing and sanitation (including the provision and  
12   maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and  
13   sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation,  
14   and consumer training and counseling;

15               “(2) to promote increased community acceptance  
16   or migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families;  
17   and

18               “(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-  
19   workers and members of their families as appropriate  
20   through education and training to meet the changing  
21   demands in agricultural employment brought about by  
22   technological advancement and to take advantage of  
23   opportunities available to improve their well-being and  
24   self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent em-

1       ployment or by participating in available Government  
2       training programs.

3                   ~~“LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE~~

4       ~~“SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under~~  
5       this part unless the Director determines that the applicant  
6       will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

7       ~~“(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures~~  
8       or requirements to assure that programs under this part are  
9       carried on in coordination with other programs or activities  
10      providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

11                  ~~“TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION~~

12      ~~“SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or~~  
13      through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such tech-  
14      nical assistance or training of personnel as may be required  
15      to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

16      ~~“(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evalua-~~  
17      tion of projects under this title and may, through grants or  
18      contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose.  
19      The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall  
20      be summarized in the report required by section 608.”

21                  ~~AMENDMENT TO PART D OF TITLE III—INDEMNITY~~

22                               ~~PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS~~

23      ~~SEC. 106. Section 331(c) of the Economic Opportunity~~  
24      Act is amended by striking out “1967.” and inserting in  
25      lieu thereof “1968.”



## 1        AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND

## 2                                INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

3        SEC. 107. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportu-  
4 nity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “enterprises;”  
5 and inserting in lieu thereof “enterprises, with special atten-  
6 tion to small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of  
7 high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals  
8 or (2) owned by low-income individuals;”.

9        (b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—

10                (1) striking out “employment of the long-term  
11 unemployed” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu  
12 thereof “the preservation or establishment of small busi-  
13 ness concerns located in urban areas of high concentra-  
14 tion of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned  
15 by low-income individuals”;

16                (2) striking out the period at the end of the next  
17 to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon;  
18 and

19                (3) inserting immediately preceding the last sen-  
20 tence, “*Provided, however,* That any management  
21 training program so approved must be of sufficient scope  
22 and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the  
23 individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and man-  
24 agerial self-sufficiency.”

1       ~~(c)~~ Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out  
2 the first subsection ~~(b)~~.

3       ~~(d)~~ Title IV of such Act is amended by—

4           ~~(1)~~ renumbering section 405 to read “407” and  
5 inserting in such subsection “and the Secretary of Com-  
6 merce” immediately following the word “Administra-  
7 tion”;

8           ~~(2)~~ striking out section 404; and

9           ~~(3)~~ inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to  
10 read as follows:

11           “DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

12       “SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business  
13 Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary  
14 to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum  
15 of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part  
16 are allotted to small business concerns located in urban  
17 areas identified by the Director as having high concentra-  
18 tions of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small  
19 business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Ad-  
20 ministrator of the Small Business Administration and the  
21 Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as  
22 it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to  
23 be assisted under this part, and such definition need not  
24 correspond to the definition of low income as used else-  
25 where in this Act.



1           “LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

2           “SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended  
3 pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small  
4 Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce de-  
5 termines that the assistance will be used in relocating es-  
6 tablishments from one area to another if such relocation  
7 would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of  
8 original location.

9           “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

10          “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is author-  
11 ized to provide financial assistance to public or private orga-  
12 nizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed  
13 to provide technical and management assistance to individu-  
14 als or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402,  
15 with special attention to small business concerns located  
16 in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-  
17 income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

18          “(b) Financial assistance under this section may be  
19 provided for projects, including without limitation—

20           “(1) planning and research, including feasibility  
21 studies and market research;

22           “(2) the identification and development of new  
23 business opportunities, and the stimulation of new pri-  
24 vate capital resources through the use of guarantees,  
25 pooling agreements, or otherwise;

1           “(3) the furnishing of centralized services with  
2       regard to public services and government programs,  
3       including programs authorized under section 402;

4           “(4) the establishment and strengthening of busi-  
5       ness service agencies, including trade associations and  
6       cooperatives;

7           “(5) the encouragement of the placement of sub-  
8       contracts by major businesses with small business con-  
9       cerns located in urban areas of high concentration of  
10      unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-  
11      income individuals, including the provision of incen-  
12      tives and assistance to such major businesses so that they  
13      will aid in the training and upgrading of potential sub-  
14      contractors or other small business concerns; and

15          “(6) the furnishing of business counseling, man-  
16      agement training, and legal and other related services,  
17      with special emphasis on the development of manage-  
18      ment training programs using the resources of the busi-  
19      ness community, including the development of manage-  
20      ment training opportunities in existing businesses, and  
21      with emphasis in all cases upon providing management  
22      training of sufficient scope and duration to develop en-  
23      trepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the  
24      part of the individuals served.

25          “(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference



1 to projects which promote the ownership, participation in  
2 ownership, or management of small business concerns by  
3 residents of urban areas of high concentration of unem-  
4 ployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are  
5 planned and carried out with the participation of local  
6 businessmen.

7 “(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section  
8 shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to  
9 the individuals and small business concerns served.

10 “(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps  
11 as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and  
12 cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments  
13 and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits  
14 made by the Federal Government or in connection with pro-  
15 grams aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way  
16 as to further the purposes of this title.

17 “(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the  
18 continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the  
19 results of such evaluation together with recommendations  
20 shall be included in the report required by section 608.”

21 DAY CARE PROJECTS

22 SEC. 108. (a) Title V of the Economic Opportunity  
23 Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part  
24 at the end thereof:

1                   “PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

2                   “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

3           “SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day  
4 care for children from low-income families or from urban  
5 and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions  
6 of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or  
7 relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to con-  
8 tinue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employ-  
9 ment.

10           “GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

11       “SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to make  
12 grants to appropriate public agencies and private orga-  
13 nizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost  
14 of projects under which children from low-income families  
15 or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or  
16 proportions of low-income persons may receive day care.  
17 Such day care projects shall provide health, education,  
18 social and such other supportive services as may be needed.  
19 Projects costs payable under this part may include costs  
20 of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial  
21 assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction  
22 with or to supplement day care projects under the Social  
23 Security Act or other relevant statutes.

24       “(b) The Director may require a family which is not  
25 a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in



1 part, for the day care services provided under this program  
 2 where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through  
 3 employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment  
 4 appropriate.

5 “(c) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the  
 6 Director shall give preference to projects providing day  
 7 care for children from low-income families or from urban  
 8 and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of  
 9 low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to  
 10 accept employment or to undertake vocational training or  
 11 basic education under this and other Acts.

12 “(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Edu-  
 13 cation, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordi-  
 14 nate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day  
 15 care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a com-  
 16 mon set of program standards and regulations, and mecha-  
 17 nisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The  
 18 Director shall give preference to applicants which show evi-  
 19 dence of coordination and cooperation between their projects  
 20 and other day care programs in the areas which they will  
 21 serve.

22 “(e) Each project to which payments are made here-  
 23 under shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evalua-  
 24 tion shall be conducted by such agency or independent pub-  
 25 lic or private organization as the Director shall designate,

1 with a view to determining, among other things, the extent  
2 to which the day care provided may have increased the em-  
3 ployment of parents and relatives of the children served,  
4 the extent to which such day care may have reduced the  
5 costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which  
6 such children have received health and educational bene-  
7 fits, and the extent to which the project has been coordi-  
8 nated with other day care activities in the area served. Up  
9 to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid  
10 by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes  
11 of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a  
12 report on the program described in this part, shall be in-  
13 cluded in the report required by section 608.

14 "TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE  
15 RECIPIENTS IN DAY CARE PROJECTS

16 "SEC. 523. (a) The Director, the Secretary of Labor,  
17 and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall  
18 take all necessary steps in the operation of vocational train-  
19 ing, work experience, and basic education programs under  
20 their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income indi-  
21 viduals in day care projects under this part.

22 "(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the  
23 Director shall give preference to projects in which unem-  
24 ployed or low-income individuals are to be employed includ-



1 ing individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance  
2 under the Social Security Act.

3 ~~“DURATION OF PROGRAMS~~

4 ~~“SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs~~  
5 ~~provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June~~  
6 ~~30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years.”~~

7 ~~(b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity~~  
8 ~~Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:~~

9 ~~“TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND~~  
10 ~~DAY CARE PROGRAMS”~~

11 ~~(c) Title V of such Act is further amended by insert-~~  
12 ~~ing after the heading thereof the following:~~

13 ~~“PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING~~  
14 ~~PROGRAMS”~~

15 ~~(d) Sections 501, 502, 503, 504, and 505 of such Act~~  
16 ~~are amended by striking out “this title” wherever it appears~~  
17 ~~therein and inserting in lieu thereof “this part”.~~

18 ~~AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND~~  
19 ~~COORDINATION~~

20 ~~SEC. 109. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Oppor-~~  
21 ~~tunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “four” in~~  
22 ~~the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “five”.~~

23 ~~(b) Section 604 of such Act is amended to read as~~  
24 ~~follows:~~

1                   “APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

2           “SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to  
3 assure that—

4           “~~(1)~~ special notice of and an opportunity for a  
5 timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided  
6 for an agency or organization which would like to serve  
7 as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose  
8 application to the prime sponsor or community action  
9 agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or  
10 has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed  
11 reasonable by the Director;

12           “~~(2)~~ financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and  
13 III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with  
14 applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency  
15 situations, nor shall an application for refunding under  
16 sections 123, 220, 221, or 312 be denied, unless the  
17 recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and  
18 opportunity to show cause why such action should not  
19 be taken; and

20           “~~(3)~~ financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and  
21 III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with  
22 applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient  
23 agency has been afforded reasonable notice and oppor-  
24 tunity for a full and fair hearing.”



1       (e) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as  
2 follows:

3                               “DEFINITIONS

4       “SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

5               “(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Com-  
6 monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,  
7 Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for  
8 purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning  
9 of ‘State’ shall also include the Trust Territory of the  
10 Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 224  
11 of this Act this term means only a State or the District  
12 of Columbia. The term ‘United States’ when used in  
13 a geographical sense includes all those places named in  
14 the previous sentence, and all other places continental  
15 or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United  
16 States;

17               “(2) the term ‘financial assistance’ when used in  
18 titles, I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance  
19 advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does  
20 not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or  
21 goods or services; and

22               “(3) the term ‘permanent resident of the United  
23 States’ when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any  
24 native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United

1 States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-  
2 sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of  
3 sections 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any  
4 person admitted as a conditional entrant under section  
5 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

6 (d) Section 610 of such Act is amended to read as  
7 follows:

8 “PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

9 “SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever  
10 feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be con-  
11 sidered in the development, conduct, and administration of  
12 programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out  
13 such investigations and studies, including consultations with  
14 appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary  
15 to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the  
16 elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs  
17 providing employment opportunities, public service oppor-  
18 tunities, education and other services and activities which  
19 assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) main-  
20 tain a constant review of all programs under this Act to  
21 assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate  
22 consideration; (3) initiate and maintain interagency liaison  
23 with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a  
24 coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly  
25 poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President



1 and the Congress such programs requiring additional author-  
2 ity and the necessary legislation to provide such authority.  
3 The Director shall describe the ways in which this section has  
4 been implemented in the annual report required by section  
5 608."

6 (e) Section 610-1 of such Act is renumbered section  
7 611 and subsection (a) of such section is amended by insert-  
8 ing the words "a substantial number of the" immediately  
9 before the word "persons" the second and third time that  
10 word appears.

11 (f) Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as  
12 follows:

13 "JOINT FUNDING

14 "SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the  
15 President where funds are advanced for a single project by  
16 more than one Federal agency to a community action agency  
17 or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal  
18 agency may be designated to act for all in administering the  
19 funds advanced. In such cases a single local share require-  
20 ment may be established according to the proportion of funds  
21 advanced by each agency and any such agency may waive  
22 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by  
23 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-  
24 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-  
25 istering agency does not impose.

1       ~~(g)~~ Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as  
2 follows:

3                               ~~“TRANSFER OF FUNDS~~

4       ~~“SEC. 616.~~ Notwithstanding any limitation on appro-  
5 priations for any program or activity under this Act or any  
6 Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity,  
7 not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or  
8 allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling  
9 the Director to carry out any such program or activity under  
10 the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the  
11 purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity  
12 under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing  
13 the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity  
14 by more than 10 per centum.”

15       ~~(h)~~ Title VI of such Act is amended by—

16               ~~(1)~~ adding the following new section after section  
17 618:

18                               ~~“RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS~~

19       ~~“SEC. 619.~~ Pursuant to section 602~~(d)~~, the Director  
20 shall delegate his functions under section 221~~(b)~~~~(2)~~ to the  
21 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such func-  
22 tions shall be carried out through the Office of Education  
23 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.”;

24               ~~(2)~~ striking out the heading ~~“PART B—COORDI-~~



NATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS" and sections 611, 613, and 614; and

(3) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to read as follows:

"PART B—COORDINATION

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, provides for an information center, and prescribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to promote better coordination among all programs related to this Act, with a view to making those programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal resources in the solution of specific problems, and generally improving cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of this Act.

"ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 631. (a) There is established, in the Executive Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council'), which shall be

1 composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal  
2 departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and  
3 such other officials of the Federal Government as the Presi-  
4 dent may from time to time designate. The President shall  
5 designate one of the members of the Council to serve as  
6 chairman. Each member shall designate an alternative to sit  
7 in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

8 “(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to  
9 assist the President in—

10 “(1) providing for the coordination of Federal pro-  
11 grams and activities related to this Act;

12 “(2) developing basic policies and setting priorities  
13 with respect to such programs and activities;

14 “(3) resolving differences arising among Federal  
15 departments and agencies with respect to such programs  
16 and activities; and

17 “(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out  
18 of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the  
19 objectives of this Act.

20 “(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secre-  
21 tary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to  
22 appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may  
23 be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties.  
24 Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may



1 be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide  
2 temporary assistance.

3 “(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities  
4 of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the  
5 Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a separate  
6 report to the Congress.

7 “(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to  
8 carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall reserve  
9 such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the  
10 purposes of this section.

11 “RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

12 “SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this  
13 Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the anti-  
14 poverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

15 “(1) undertake special studies of specific coordination  
16 problems at the request of the President or the  
17 Council, or on his own initiative;

18 “(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities  
19 under this Act, and consult with interested agencies  
20 and groups, including State agencies described in section  
21 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council,  
22 with a view to identifying coordination problems that  
23 may warrant consideration by the Council or the President  
24 and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate

1       action for overcoming those problems, either through the  
2       Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with  
3       other Federal, State, or local agencies; and

4           ~~“(3)~~ prepare a five-year national poverty action  
5       plan showing estimates of Federal and other govern-  
6       mental expenditures, and, where feasible, the contri-  
7       butions of the private sector, needed to eliminate  
8       poverty in this country within alternative periods of  
9       time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds  
10      necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized  
11      by this and other Acts, and any new programs which  
12      may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country,  
13      and it shall include recommendations for such new  
14      programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress  
15      and updated on an annual basis.

16           “COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

17      “SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering pro-  
18      grams related to this Act shall—

19           ~~“(1)~~ cooperate with the Director and with the  
20      Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities;  
21      and

22           ~~“(2)~~ carry out their programs and exercise their  
23      functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions  
24      and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted  
25      by other applicable law.



1       “(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Fed-  
2       eral agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and  
3       other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their  
4       responsibilities under this Act.

5       “(c) The President may direct that particular programs  
6       and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal  
7       agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent  
8       with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support  
9       of programs authorized under this Act.

10       “COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

11       “SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close  
12       unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effec-  
13       tive administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest  
14       extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this  
15       Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where  
16       appropriate other related programs or projects, and be in-  
17       cluded within or otherwise carried on in combination with  
18       community action programs. In the case of other programs  
19       related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies respon-  
20       sible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by  
21       law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in  
22       a manner which encourages combinations with other related  
23       projects and activities, where appropriate, and with commu-  
24       nity action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council  
25       shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make

1 a continuing review of the operation of this section with a  
2 view to ~~(1)~~ determining particular groups of programs  
3 which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target  
4 groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or  
5 closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and  
6 making recommendations accordingly to the President or  
7 appropriate Federal officials; ~~(2)~~ evaluating Federal agency  
8 procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or  
9 recommending additional or common procedures, as appro-  
10 priate; and ~~(3)~~ determining whether, and to what extent,  
11 consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and  
12 making recommendations respecting such consolidations to  
13 the Director and the President.

14 "INFORMATION CENTER

15 "SEC. 635. ~~(a)~~ The Director shall establish and oper-  
16 ate an information center for the purpose of insuring that  
17 maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this  
18 Act and that information concerning these programs and  
19 other relevant information is readily available to public  
20 officials and other interested persons. The Director shall  
21 collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute informa-  
22 tion as described above, either free of charge or by sale at  
23 cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's  
24 account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrange-  
25 ments and pay for any printing and binding without regard



1 to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In con-  
2 nection with operation of the center, the Director may carry  
3 on research or studies concerning the improvement of in-  
4 formation systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the  
5 adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on  
6 the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal  
7 information systems, and methods by which data may be  
8 made more readily available to State and local officials or  
9 used to further coordination objectives.

10       “(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a  
11 current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to in-  
12 dividual and community improvement. He may also make  
13 grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this  
14 Act to States and communities to establish information  
15 service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribu-  
16 tion of information required to further the purposes of this  
17 Act.

18       “(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are  
19 kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and  
20 that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director  
21 shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to  
22 State and local agencies of all current information, including  
23 administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required  
24 by those agencies for the effective performance of their  
25 responsibilities.

1                                   “PROHIBITION

2           “SEC. 636. ~~(a)~~ In order to assure that existing Federal  
3 agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying  
4 out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry  
5 out this Act shall be used to establish any new department  
6 or office when the intended function is being performed by  
7 an existing department or office.

8           “(b) No financial assistance shall be extended under  
9 this Act for the purposes of voter registration.

10                               “SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

11           “SEC. 637. ~~(a)~~ It shall be the responsibility of the  
12 Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health,  
13 Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other depart-  
14 ments and agencies concerned, acting through such pro-  
15 cedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to  
16 provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and  
17 appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all  
18 programs and activities within the executive branch of the  
19 Government relating to the training of individuals for the  
20 purpose of improving or restoring employability.

21           “(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agree-  
22 ments as may be necessary or appropriate ~~(which may in-~~  
23 ~~clude arrangements for reimbursement)~~, shall—

24                       ~~(1)~~ be responsible for assuring that the Federal-  
25 State employment service provides and develop its



1 capacity for providing maximum support for the pro-  
 2 grams described in subsection (a); and

3 “(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the  
 4 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Di-  
 5 rector of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the  
 6 head of any other Federal agency administering a train-  
 7 ing program, such employment information as will facil-  
 8 itate the placement of individuals being trained.

#### 9 “DEFINITIONS

10 “SEC. 638. As used in this part, ‘programs related to  
 11 this Act’ and ‘coordination’ shall include the programs and  
 12 actions described in this section:

13 “(1) ‘Programs related to this Act’ include pro-  
 14 grams under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted  
 15 programs which have objectives which are, in whole  
 16 or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of  
 17 this Act, or which provide resources which may be  
 18 used in combination with resources under this Act to  
 19 assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

20 “(2) ‘Coordination’ includes, but is not limited to—

21 “(A) actions to improve the common effective-  
 22 ness of programs in reaching and serving the poor,  
 23 such as actions: to extend services to new areas,  
 24 provide them in a common place, or structure them  
 25 so that they are more readily accepted or widely

1 utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that  
2 may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary  
3 hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited  
4 education or other special handicaps; to establish  
5 common eligibility standards among programs serv-  
6 ing substantially similar groups or operating in the  
7 same areas; or to develop methods of operation or  
8 administration that will provide new employment  
9 incentives or opportunities for the poor;

10 “(B) actions to promote better use at the State  
11 or local level of Federal assistance available under  
12 diverse programs, such as actions to establish pro-  
13 cedures for cooperation among State or local agencies  
14 seeking assistance from different Federal sources  
15 with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication  
16 and service gaps and promoting common or comple-  
17 mentary priorities; or to modify or improve tech-  
18 nical or administrative requirements imposed by  
19 different Federal agencies that may operate to  
20 increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local  
21 agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imag-  
22 inative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their  
23 cooperation with one another;

24 “(C) actions to promote simplification and ef-  
25 ficiencies through the joint or combined use of



1 Federal resources, such as actions to develop new  
2 methods of processing requests for assistance or  
3 granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies  
4 more generally to use resources jointly in support of  
5 common objectives; to establish common priorities  
6 for purposes of program planning, research and  
7 demonstration activities; and to effect combinations  
8 among or redirect Federal programs or activities for  
9 the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

10 “(D) actions to improve communication and  
11 general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen  
12 ties among regional offices of different Federal agen-  
13 cies and among such offices and other regional agen-  
14 cies or organizations; to develop and improve proce-  
15 dures by which Federal agencies may act together  
16 in promulgating or making available items of in-  
17 formation, including information as to the avail-  
18 ability and allocation of funds, which are closely re-  
19 lated to one another for purposes of State or local  
20 planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures  
21 by which State and local agencies may be afforded  
22 new opportunities to participate in Federal policy  
23 decisions, including decisions on recommended leg-  
24 islation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently  
25 and effectively.”

1                                   AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

2           SEC. 110. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity  
3 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

4   ~~"TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CER-~~  
5                   TAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

6                                   ~~"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE~~

7           ~~"SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide in-~~  
8   ~~centives to welfare recipients to participate in programs~~  
9   ~~which are designed to enable them to become self-support-~~  
10 ~~ing, and to complete such programs and become self-support-~~  
11 ~~ing within a reasonable period of time.~~

12                                   ~~"STATE PLANS~~

13           ~~"SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I,~~  
14 ~~IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a~~  
15 ~~State plan approved under any such title shall include pro-~~  
16 ~~visions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.~~

17                                   ~~"DEFINITIONS~~

18           ~~"SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—~~

19           ~~"(a) 'Public assistance' shall mean any aid or assist-~~  
20 ~~ance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I,~~  
21 ~~IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.~~

22           ~~"(b) 'Trainee' shall mean (1) any person enrolled in~~  
23 ~~any program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or~~  
24 ~~employed in any such program as a resident nonprofessional~~  
25 ~~or in any other combined work-and-training capacity, (2)~~



1 any participant in any program assisted under the Emer-  
 2 gency Employment Act of 1967, or ~~(3)~~ any person who is  
 3 in training to become a VISTA volunteer and who has been  
 4 designated a volunteer trainee or intern.

5 “~~(c)~~ ‘Qualifying income’ shall means ~~(1)~~ any amount  
 6 paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a pro-  
 7 gram described in paragraph ~~(1)~~ of section 123(a) of  
 8 this Act ~~(relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs~~  
 9 ~~for youth attending school)~~; ~~(2)~~ any amount paid under  
 10 this Act or the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 as  
 11 wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee  
 12 during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and  
 13 ~~(3)~~ the net income derived, during the first eighteen months  
 14 following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of  
 15 this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or  
 16 nonagricultural enterprise.

17 “~~(d)~~ ‘Poverty line’ shall mean an amount of monthly  
 18 income determined by the Director, representing an approxi-  
 19 mation of the minimum level of income which is necessary  
 20 to support a family of given size so that it can live out of  
 21 poverty.

#### 22 “ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

23 “SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations  
 24 prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Wel-  
 25 fare, no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any

1 trainee or VISTA volunteer shall be regarded as income or  
 2 resources of any other individual under a State plan ap-  
 3 proved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX except to  
 4 the extent that the payment is made available to or used  
 5 for the benefit of such other individual.

6 ~~“AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE~~

7 ~~“SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable~~  
 8 ~~for any month to any person having qualifying income shall~~  
 9 ~~be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State~~  
 10 ~~plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount deter-~~  
 11 ~~mined under subsection (b).~~

12 ~~“(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable~~  
 13 ~~for any month to any person who receives qualifying income~~  
 14 ~~shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:~~

15 ~~“(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding~~  
 16 ~~assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the~~  
 17 ~~State plan as if the qualifying income had not been re-~~  
 18 ~~ceived (and without any provision for expenses con-~~  
 19 ~~nected with earning the qualifying income).~~

20 ~~“(2) If the qualifying income, when added to other~~  
 21 ~~income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-~~  
 22 ~~mined under clause (1), is insufficient to provide a total~~  
 23 ~~income in excess of the monthly poverty line, the public~~  
 24 ~~assistance payable (other than assistance for medical~~  
 25 ~~care) shall be the amount determined under clause (1).~~



1       ~~“(3) If the qualifying income, when added to other~~  
2       income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-  
3       mined under clause ~~(1)~~, exceeds the monthly poverty  
4       line, the public assistance payable ~~(other than assistance~~  
5       for medical care) shall be the amount determined under  
6       clause ~~(1)~~, reduced by a percentage of the excess. Such  
7       percentage shall be determined so that public assistance  
8       would be terminated if the qualifying income, when  
9       added to the other income of the recipient, exceeded the  
10      poverty line by 25 per centum or more: *Provided, how-*  
11      *ever,* That such percentage shall in no event be larger  
12      than  $66\frac{2}{3}$  per centum.

13       ~~“(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided~~  
14      in accordance with the State plan. In States where  
15      the plan provides that assistance for medical care de-  
16      pends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such  
17      eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this  
18      subsection.

19       ~~“(e) If more than one member of a family receives~~  
20      income, the income of all members of the family shall be  
21      aggregated in making the computations under subsections  
22      ~~(b) (2) and (b) (3)~~. The foregoing sentence shall not apply  
23      in cases in which its application would be inconsistent with  
24      section 704.

1                                   “SAVINGS PROVISION

2           “SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section  
3   705 become effective in his State, a trainee's public assist-  
4   ance is being computed in accordance with the prior version  
5   of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1)  
6   his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he com-  
7   pletes his participation in the particular program in which  
8   he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he  
9   receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance  
10  shall be determined in accordance with section 705.”

11           (b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets  
12  the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Oppor-  
13  tunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made  
14  by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State  
15  is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or  
16  XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to  
17  January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall  
18  funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any  
19  action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the  
20  State from complying with the requirements of such amend-  
21  ment until the first day of the fourth month after the State  
22  legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this  
23  Act.



## VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 111. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

~~"TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE  
PROGRAMS~~

~~"VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA~~

~~"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE~~

~~"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps~~

1 of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-  
2 advancement.

3       “PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

4       “AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

5       “SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and  
6 train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and  
7 upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private  
8 nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to  
9 work—

10       “(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or  
11 related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migra-  
12 tory workers and their families, or of residents of the  
13 District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,  
14 Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the  
15 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

16       “(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally  
17 ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit  
18 mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in  
19 their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

20       “(3) in connection with programs or activities au-  
21 thorized, supported, or of a character eligible for  
22 assistance under this Act.

23       “(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section  
24 shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions  
25 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special



1 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups  
2 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as  
3 the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part  
4 shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without  
5 the consent of the Governor. The assignment of such volun-  
6 teers in any State shall be terminated by the Director when  
7 so requested by the Governor of such State not later than  
8 thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Gover-  
9 nor and Director after such request has been made by the  
10 Governor to the Director.

11 "TERMS OF SERVICE

12 "SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-  
13 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating  
14 poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a  
15 commitment to live among and at the economic level of the  
16 people served, and to remain available for service without  
17 regard to regular working hours, at all times during their  
18 term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

19 "(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for  
20 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-  
21 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are  
22 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as  
23 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than  
24 two months where he determines that this more limited  
25 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

1       “(e) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-  
2 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by  
3 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001  
4 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with  
5 respect to that oath or affirmation.

6               “SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

7       “SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to  
8 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on  
9 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month  
10 during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide  
11 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons  
12 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance  
13 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated  
14 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.  
15 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel  
16 (including travel to and from the place of training), and  
17 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,  
18 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other  
19 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their  
20 needs.

21       “(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of  
22 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances  
23 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,  
24 or any portion thereof, to on behalf of a volunteer. In the  
25 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount



1 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the  
2 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5  
3 U.S.C. 5582).

4 “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-  
5 tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent  
6 volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience  
7 which they have derived from their training and service in  
8 the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty  
9 as members of the helping professions.

10 “PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER  
11 PROGRAMS

12 “COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

13 “SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs  
14 designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-  
15 pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for  
16 shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment  
17 under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-  
18 ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination  
19 of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or  
20 arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,  
21 or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are  
22 undertaken in connection with these programs. These  
23 projects may include, without limitation, activities designed  
24 (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-

1 pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted  
2 under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs  
3 designed to aid youth or promote child development; ~~(2)~~  
4 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,  
5 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for  
6 the development or betterment of urban and rural neighbor-  
7 hoods or areas having especially large concentrations or pro-  
8 portions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping  
9 residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the com-  
10 petence necessary to take advantage of public and private  
11 resources which would not otherwise be available or used for  
12 those programs; and ~~(3)~~ to assist existing national and local  
13 agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain  
14 volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized  
15 short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies  
16 serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas  
17 of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical  
18 needs.

19 “~~(b)~~ Persons serving as volunteers under this section  
20 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such  
21 other support or allowances as the Director determines, pur-  
22 suant to regulations, are required because of unusual or  
23 special circumstances affecting the project.

24 “~~(c)~~ The services of any person, if otherwise allowable  
25 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-



1 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act,  
2 shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the  
3 Director under this section in providing for or assisting  
4 in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such  
5 person.

6 "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

7 "SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or  
8 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs  
9 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-  
10 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer  
11 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not  
12 to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated  
13 from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal  
14 year may be used for programs under this section.

15 "DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT

16 CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

17 "SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct,  
18 or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for the  
19 conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four  
20 areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and in  
21 not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding  
22 fiscal years, under which—

23 "(1) volunteers under part A, and members of  
24 the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section,  
25 provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-

1 five with intensive education, training, and counseling  
2 for at least a six-month period prior to their release  
3 from confinement and for at least a six month period  
4 thereafter;

5 “(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers  
6 are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal  
7 year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hun-  
8 dred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during  
9 each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

10 “(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on  
11 a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section,  
12 members of the Teacher Corps who have been re-  
13 cruited and trained by one or more institutions of  
14 higher education; and

15 “(4) not more than forty such members are fur-  
16 nished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year  
17 ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such  
18 members are so furnished during each of the two suc-  
19 ceeding fiscal years.

20 “(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for pur-  
21 poses of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall  
22 be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per  
23 week for each dependent. Such members who are experi-  
24 enced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by  
25 the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of



1 the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without  
2 regard to the provisions of section 513(e) of the Higher  
3 Education Act of 1965.

4           “PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

5           “COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

6           “SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to  
7 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title  
8 with one another, with community action programs, and  
9 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-  
10 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,  
11 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-  
12 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in  
13 providing necessary support to programs under part B,  
14 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or  
15 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A  
16 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director  
17 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,  
18 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related  
19 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging  
20 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and  
21 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures  
22 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-  
23 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant  
24 to this part.

1                   “PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

2           “SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall  
3 take necessary steps, including the development of special  
4 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest partici-  
5 pation of older persons as volunteers in the various pro-  
6 grams and activities authorized under this title and, because  
7 of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty  
8 group, shall encourage the development of a variety of  
9 volunteer services to older persons, including special projects,  
10 to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

11                   “APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

12           “SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),  
13 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal  
14 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws  
15 relating to Federal employment.

16           (b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance  
17 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services  
18 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter  
19 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-  
20 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-  
21 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same  
22 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a)  
23 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of  
24 the computation described in 116(a)(2)(B) the monthly  
25 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under



1 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5,  
2 United States Code.

3 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

4 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations  
5 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities  
6 which would not otherwise be performed and which will  
7 not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair  
8 existing contracts for service.

9 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to  
10 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest  
11 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of  
12 volunteer programs.

13 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are  
14 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any  
15 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any  
16 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such  
17 agency or organization.

18 "(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section  
19 or under section 821 shall provide such information concern-  
20 ing their qualifications, including their ability to perform  
21 their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall  
22 prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the  
23 extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director  
24 requires under Part A of this title. The Director may fix  
25 such procedures for the selection and approval of persons

1 who are low income residents of the area to be served by the  
 2 project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines  
 3 will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title.

4 "DURATION OF PROGRAM

5 "SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs  
 6 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June  
 7 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each  
 8 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the  
 9 Congress may authorize by law."

10 AMENDMENT TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND  
 11 TRAINING ACT

12 SEC. 112. Section 203(e) of the Manpower Develop-  
 13 ment and Training Act of 1962 is amended to strike out "at  
 14 a rate not in excess of \$20 a week" in the second sentence,  
 15 and insert in lieu thereof "at a rate which shall not exceed  
 16 the average weekly gross unemployment compensation pay-  
 17 ment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of  
 18 total unemployment in the State making such payments dur-  
 19 ing the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which  
 20 such data are available,".

21 TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

22 SEC. 113. (a) Part C of title I of the Economic Oppor-  
 23 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by renumbering the section  
 24 numbers to read 141 through 146, respectively.



1       ~~(b)~~ Part E of title I of such Act is amended by renum-  
2       bering section 141 to read 161.

3       ~~(c)~~ Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is  
4       amended by inserting after "Executive Secretary of the Na-  
5       tional Aeronautics and Space Council," the following: "of  
6       the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity  
7       Council,".

8       TITLE II—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION  
9       BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

10                               INVESTIGATION

11       SEC. 201. The Comptroller General of the United States  
12       ~~(hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller Gen-~~  
13       ~~eral)~~ is authorized and directed to make an investigation in  
14       sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole  
15       or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act,  
16       in order to determine—

17               ~~(1)~~ the efficiency of the administration of such pro-  
18       grams and activities by the Office of Economic Oppor-  
19       tunity and by local public and private agencies carrying  
20       out such programs and activities; and

21               ~~(2)~~ the extent to which such programs and activ-  
22       ities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part  
23       or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 an-  
24       thorizing such programs or activities.

## REPORTS

SEC. 202. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit his final report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1969. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation as he deems advisable.

## POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

10        SEC. 203. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the  
11 authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the  
12 General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying  
13 out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such  
14 testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he  
15 deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller  
16 General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses  
17 appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated  
18 officer.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.



1     ~~(c)~~ The Comptroller General is authorized—

2             ~~(1)~~ to appoint and fix the compensation of such  
3     staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to  
4     the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing  
5     appointments in the competitive service, and without  
6     regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter  
7     III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification  
8     and General Schedule pay rates, and

9             ~~(2)~~ to procure temporary and intermittent services  
10    to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of  
11    title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed  
12    \$50 a day for individuals.

13    ~~(d)~~ The Comptroller General is authorized to enter  
14    into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms,  
15    institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or  
16    surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities  
17    necessary to the discharge of his duties under his title.

18                     AUTHORIZATION

19    SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
20    priated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the  
21    provisions of this title.

22    *That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity*  
23    *Amendments of 1967".*

1                    *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS*

2            *SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under*  
3 *the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C*  
4 *of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be ap-*  
5 *propriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum*  
6 *of \$2,060,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of*  
7 *section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made*  
8 *available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$874,000,000*  
9 *for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of*  
10 *such Act, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out*  
11 *title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title*  
12 *III, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V,*  
13 *\$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and*  
14 *\$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII. For*  
15 *the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic*  
16 *Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of*  
17 *such Act) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for*  
18 *the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums as may*  
19 *be necessary, so long as such appropriation does not exceed*  
20 *the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year*  
21 *ending June 30, 1968.*



1 *TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC*  
2 *OPPORTUNITY ACT*

3 *JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS*

4 *SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity*  
5 *Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:*

6 *“PART A—JOB CORPS*

7 *“STATEMENT OF PURPOSE*

8 *“SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-*  
9 *income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth*  
10 *standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-*  
11 *rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of resi-*  
12 *dential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will*  
13 *participate in intensive programs of education, vocational*  
14 *training, work experience, counseling, and other activities,*  
15 *and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibili-*  
16 *ties incident to the operation and continuing development of*  
17 *the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who*  
18 *need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program,*  
19 *operated in a group setting, to become more responsible,*  
20 *employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way*  
21 *that contributes, where feasible, to the development of Na-*

1 tional, State, and community resources, and to the development  
 2 and dissemination of techniques for working with the dis-  
 3 advantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private  
 4 institutions and agencies.

5 "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

6 "SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office  
 7 of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

8 "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

9 "SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a  
 10 young man or woman must be a person who—

11 "(1) is a permanent resident of the United States  
 12 who has attained age fourteen but not attained age  
 13 twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

14 "(2) is a low-income individual or member of a  
 15 low-income family who requires additional education,  
 16 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance  
 17 in order to secure and hold meaningful employment,  
 18 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify  
 19 for other training programs suitable to his needs, or sat-  
 20 isfy Armed Forces requirements;

21 "(3) is currently living in an environment so char-  
 22 acterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife,  
 23 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially im-  
 24 pair his prospects for successful participation in any  
 25 other program providing needed training, education, or  
 26 assistance;



“(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and

“(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

*“SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL  
PROVISIONS*

*“SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and*

1 organizations, including court, probation, parole, law enforce-  
2 ment, education, welfare, and medical authorities and ad-  
3 visers. They shall also provide for—

4 “(1) an interview with each applicant for the pur-  
5 pose of—

6 “(A) determining whether his educational and  
7 vocational needs can best be met through the Job  
8 Corps or any alternative program in his home  
9 community;

10 “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent  
11 data relating to his background, needs, and interests  
12 for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-  
13 tential assignment; and

14 “(C) giving the applicant a full understanding  
15 of the Job Corps program and making clear what  
16 will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event  
17 of his acceptance.

18 “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-  
19 quiry concerning the applicant's background for the  
20 effective development and, as appropriate, clarification  
21 of information concerning his age, citizenship, school  
22 and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,  
23 family income, environment, and other matters related  
24 to a determination of his eligibility.

25 “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-  
26 dividual or organization solely as compensation for the



1 service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment  
2 in the Job Corps.

3 “(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to  
4 assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an  
5 appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas,  
6 taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who  
7 reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential  
8 facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide  
9 geographic dispersion.

10 “SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

11 “SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an  
12 enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable  
13 expectation that he can participate successfully in group  
14 situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not  
15 likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent  
16 other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program  
17 or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline  
18 and satisfactory relationships between any center to which  
19 he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that  
20 he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which  
21 he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to  
22 observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has  
23 a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or  
24 property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addition, or  
25 other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain  
26 a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows

1 such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is  
2 reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical  
3 to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the op-  
4 portunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to over-  
5 come his problem.

6       “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-  
7 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or  
8 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision  
9 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually  
10 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not  
11 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director  
12 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and  
13 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-  
14 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-  
15 ments.

16                   “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

17       “SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the  
18 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director  
19 may authorize in special cases.

20       “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve  
21 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military  
22 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

23       “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of  
24 Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent  
25 resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) must  
26 take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following



1 form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith  
2 and allegiance to the United States of America and will  
3 support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United  
4 States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The  
5 provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code,  
6 shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

7       “(d) After the Director has determined whether an  
8 enrollee is to be assigned to a men's training center, a con-  
9 servation center, or a women's training center, the center to  
10 which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the ap-  
11 propriate type which is closest to the enrollee's home, except  
12 that the Director, on an individual basis, may waive this re-  
13 quirement when overriding considerations justify such ac-  
14 tion. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the  
15 enrollee's home shall be carefully limited to situations in  
16 which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable  
17 opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections  
18 of the country to participate in the program, to prevent  
19 undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to  
20 provide an assignment which adequately meets the educa-  
21 tional or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for ef-  
22 ficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

23                       “JOB CORPS CENTERS

24       “SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with  
25 Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for

1 *the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These*  
2 *centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character*  
3 *and shall be designed and operated so as to provide en-*  
4 *rollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, voca-*  
5 *tional training, work experience (either in direct program*  
6 *activities or through arrangements with employers), counsel-*  
7 *ing, and other services appropriate to their needs. The cen-*  
8 *ters shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian*  
9 *Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas*  
10 *and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance,*  
11 *programs of work experience focused upon activities to con-*  
12 *serve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public*  
13 *recreational areas or to assist in developing community proj-*  
14 *ects in the public interest. They shall also include men's and*  
15 *women's training centers to be located in either urban or*  
16 *rural areas and to provide activities which shall include train-*  
17 *ing and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be*  
18 *expected to participate successfully in training for specific*  
19 *types of skilled or semiskilled employment.*

20       “(b) *To the extent feasible, men's and women's train-*  
21 *ing centers shall offer education and vocational training op-*  
22 *portunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresi-*  
23 *dential basis to participants in programs described in part B*  
24 *of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimburs-*  
25 *able basis or through such other arrangements as the Direc-*  
26 *tor may specify.*



1                   “PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

2           “SEC. 108. (a) *Each Job Corps center shall be oper-*  
3 *ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-*  
4 *nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational*  
5 *training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-*  
6 *tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and*  
7 *counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-*  
8 *gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to*  
9 *assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with*  
10 *problems he may encounter in his home community or in*  
11 *adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing*  
12 *his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-*  
13 *term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours*  
14 *a week. Center programs shall include required participa-*  
15 *tion in center maintenance support and related work activity*  
16 *as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense*  
17 *of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.*

18           “(b) *To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-*  
19 *range for enrollee education and vocational training through*  
20 *local public or private educational agencies, vocational educa-*  
21 *tional institutions, or technical institutes where these institu-*  
22 *tions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and*  
23 *substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could*  
24 *provide through other means.*

25           “(c) *Arrangements for education shall, to the extent*

1 *feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain*  
2 *the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;*  
3 *and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of*  
4 *Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to*  
5 *be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their*  
6 *services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's*  
7 *level of educational attainment.*

8       “(d) *The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure*  
9 *that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do*  
10 *not displace presently employed workers or impair existing*  
11 *contracts for service and will be coordinated with other*  
12 *work-experience programs in the community.*

13                       “ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

14       “SEC. 109. (a) *Enrollees may be provided with such*  
15 *living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, sub-*  
16 *sistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational*  
17 *services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services,*  
18 *and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or*  
19 *appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allow-*  
20 *ances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the*  
21 *Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or*  
22 *from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from*  
23 *places of termination to their homes.*

24       “(b) *The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-*  
25 *ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of*  
26 *emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs*



1 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed  
2 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

3       “(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee,  
4 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to  
5 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the  
6 Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment  
7 allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program  
8 at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as deter-  
9 mined by the Director. The Director may, from time to  
10 time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions  
11 of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems neces-  
12 sary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by  
13 that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regula-  
14 tions, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allow-  
15 ance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the  
16 Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his  
17 period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment  
18 allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions  
19 of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

20       “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may  
21 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an  
22 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory  
23 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-  
24 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any  
25 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-

1   rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the  
2   payment of an equal amount by the Director.

3                               “STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

4       “SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of  
5   conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently  
6   enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,  
7   dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations  
8   shall be made in every instance where it is determined that  
9   retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,  
10   will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct  
11   and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other  
12   enrollees.

13       “(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-  
14   ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual direc-  
15   tors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to  
16   take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees  
17   including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps,  
18   subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority,  
19   as provided under regulations set by the Director.

20                               “COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

21       “SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall  
22   cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually  
23   beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and sur-  
24   rounding or nearby communities. These activities shall in-  
25   clude the establishment of community advisory councils to  
26   provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common prob-



1 lems and for planning programs of mutual interest. When-  
2 ever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and  
3 coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth  
4 participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged  
5 and where feasible separate youth councils may be estab-  
6 lished, to be composed of representative enrollees and rep-  
7 resentative young people from the communities. The  
8 Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary  
9 action to assure that each center is operated in a manner  
10 consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far  
11 as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving  
12 community officials appropriate advance notice of changes  
13 in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or  
14 be of interest to the community; (2) affording the commu-  
15 nity a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to  
16 it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of  
17 passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and  
18 rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies,  
19 including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work  
20 with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the  
21 fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or  
22 projects for community improvement or betterment, with  
23 adequate advance consultation with business, labor, profes-  
24 sional, and other interested community groups and organiza-  
25 tions; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events  
26 in which enrollees and local residents may participate to-

1   gether; (6) providing community residents with oppor-  
2   tunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instruc-  
3   tors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the  
4   community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career  
5   opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) pro-  
6   moting interchanges of information and techniques among,  
7   and cooperative projects involving, the center and community  
8   schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young  
9   people.

10                   “COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

11       “SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the  
12   counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to  
13   follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

14       “(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee  
15   prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabil-  
16   ities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for  
17   which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or  
18   shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In  
19   placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United  
20   States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

21       “(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements  
22   to determine the status and progress of terminees and to  
23   assure that their needs for further education, training, and  
24   counseling may be met.

25       “(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy  
26   of his pertinent records, including data derived from his



1 *counseling and testing, other than confidential information,*  
2 *shall be made available immediately to the Department of*  
3 *Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.*

4       “(e) *The Director shall, to the extent feasible in ac-*  
5 *cordance with section 611(d) of this Act, arrange for the*  
6 *readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of*  
7 *this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection*  
8 *(d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have*  
9 *not already found employment) at the public employment*  
10 *service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee,*  
11 *if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office*  
12 *to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated*  
13 *an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make*  
14 *arrangements by which public employment service officers*  
15 *will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are*  
16 *thus paid at such offices including information as to—*

17       “(1) *the number of former enrollees who have*  
18 *declined the offices’ help in finding a job;*

19       “(2) *the number who were successfully placed in*  
20 *jobs without further education or training;*

21       “(3) *the number who were found to require further*  
22 *training before being placed in jobs and the types of*  
23 *training programs in which they participated; and*

24       “(4) *the number who were found to require further*  
25 *remedial or basic education in order to qualify for train-*  
26 *ing programs, together with information as to the types*

1 of programs for which such former enrollees were found  
2 unqualified for enrollment.

3 *If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of*  
4 *any other public or private organization or agency in lieu*  
5 *of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that*  
6 *organization or agency to make the payment of the readjust-*  
7 *ment allowance and maintain the same types of records re-*  
8 *garding former enrollees as are herein specified for mainte-*  
9 *nance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish*  
10 *copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case*  
11 *of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to*  
12 *the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the*  
13 *Director shall maintain records providing pertinent place-*  
14 *ment and follow-up information.*

15 "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL  
16 PROJECTS

17      “SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the care-  
18      ful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program,  
19      directly or by contracting for independent evaluations,  
20      with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as prac-  
21      ticable, and providing information needed to assess the  
22      effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods  
23      of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to de-  
24      termine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of res-  
25      idential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use  
26      of facilities combining residential and nonresidential com-



1 ponents, from the use of centers with large as opposed to  
2 small enrollments, and from the use of different types of  
3 program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of  
4 higher learning, boards of education, and private corpo-  
5 rations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with  
6 proper control groups composed of persons who have not  
7 participated in the program. In carrying out such evalua-  
8 tions, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions  
9 of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the  
10 program and shall consult with other agencies and officials  
11 in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps  
12 techniques with those used in other programs, and shall  
13 endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other  
14 Government and private agencies specific information con-  
15 cerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment  
16 status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community  
17 life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar infor-  
18 mation directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals fol-  
19 lowing their completion of the Job Corps program. The  
20 results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be  
21 summarized in the report required by section 608.

22 “(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or  
23 contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration proj-  
24 ects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the  
25 better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjust-

1    *ment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduc-*  
2    *tion in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transpor-*  
3    *tation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater*  
4    *efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under*  
5    *this part. These projects shall include one or more projects*  
6    *providing youths with education, training, and other sup-*  
7    *portive services on a combined residential and nonresidential*  
8    *basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake*  
9    *one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who*  
10    *have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons*  
11    *or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or*  
12    *other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection*  
13    *shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other*  
14    *Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related*  
15    *programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as*  
16    *described in part B of this title, in the communities*  
17    *where the projects will be carried out. They may be under-*  
18    *taken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted pro-*  
19    *grams, including programs under part B of this title, and*  
20    *funds otherwise available for activities under those programs*  
21    *shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned,*  
22    *be available to projects under this section to the extent they*  
23    *include the same or substantially similar activities. The*  
24    *Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds*  
25    *would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under*



1 *this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility*  
2 *and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by*  
3 *section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the*  
4 *Congress concerning the actions taken under this section,*  
5 *including a full description of progress made in connection*  
6 *with combined residential and nonresidential projects.*

7       “(c) *In order to determine whether upgraded voca-*  
8 *tional education schools could eliminate or substantially re-*  
9 *duce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how*  
10 *communities could make maximum utilization of existing*  
11 *educational and training facilities, the Director, in coopera-*  
12 *tion with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into*  
13 *one or more agreements with State educational agencies to*  
14 *pay the cost of establishing and operating model community*  
15 *vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities*  
16 *shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high*  
17 *dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a*  
18 *need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill*  
19 *center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it*  
20 *contains provisions designed to assure that—*

21               “(1) *a job survey be made of the area;*

22               “(2) *the training program of the school and skill*  
23 *center reflect the job market needs as projected by the*  
24 *survey;*

25               “(3) *an advisory committee composed of repre-*

1        *sentatives of business, labor, education, and community*  
2        *leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to*  
3        *make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;*

4            *"(4) arrangements have been worked out with*  
5        *schools in the area and the administrator of the skill*  
6        *center for maximum utilization of the center both during*  
7        *and after school hours; and*

8            *"(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as*  
9        *the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem*  
10       *necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will*  
11       *be provided.*

12            *"ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES*

13        *"SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory*  
14        *committees or boards in connection with the operation of the*  
15        *Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, when-*  
16        *ever he determines that the availability of outside advice and*  
17        *counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in*  
18        *identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program*  
19        *or center development, or in strengthening relationships be-*  
20        *tween the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups*  
21        *engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall*  
22        *be considered as limiting the functions of the National Ad-*  
23        *visory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this*  
24        *Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the*  
25        *Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment*



1 *through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Coun-*  
2 *cil of one or more boards or committees under this section.*

3 *“PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES*

4 *“SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action*  
5 *to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job*  
6 *Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation*  
7 *with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to*  
8 *the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-*  
9 *rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-*  
10 *ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and*  
11 *coordination with State-operated programs.*

12 *“(b) The Director may enter into agreements with*  
13 *States to assist in the operation or administration of State-*  
14 *operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.*  
15 *The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all*  
16 *of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.*

17 *“(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility*  
18 *designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-*  
19 *lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-*  
20 *posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and*  
21 *such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days*  
22 *of such submission.*

23 *“APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW*

24 *“SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-*  
25 *vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees*

1 *in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees*  
2 *and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to*  
3 *Federal employment, including those regarding hours of*  
4 *work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment com-*  
5 *pensation, and Federal employee benefits:*

6       “(1) *For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of*  
7 *1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security*  
8 *Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-*  
9 *ployees of the United States and any service performed by*  
10 *an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed*  
11 *in the employ of the United States.*

12       “(2) *For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of*  
13 *title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation*  
14 *to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be*  
15 *deemed civil employees of the United States within the*  
16 *meaning of the term ‘employee’ as defined in section 8101 of*  
17 *title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-*  
18 *chapter shall apply except as follows:*

19               “(A) *The term ‘performance of duty’ shall not*  
20 *include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or*  
21 *her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an*  
22 *activity (including an activity while on pass or during*  
23 *travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or*  
24 *under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps:*

25               “(B) *In computing compensation benefits for dis-*  
26 *ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be*



1        *deemed that received under the entrance salary for a*  
2        *grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of*  
3        *title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and*

4            *“(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to*  
5        *accrue until the day following the date on which the*  
6        *injured enrollee is terminated.*

7        *“(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions*  
8        *in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered*  
9        *employees of the Government.*

10        *“(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to*  
11        *persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job*  
12        *Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and*  
13        *it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United*  
14        *States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not*  
15        *exceeding \$500.*

16        *“(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-*  
17        *tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements*  
18        *made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not*  
19        *be counted in computing strength under any law limiting*  
20        *the strength of such services or in computing the percentage*  
21        *authorized by law for any grade therein.*

22            **“SPECIAL LIMITATIONS**

23        *“SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds*  
24        *made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year*  
25        *ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the*

1 *residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five*  
2 *thousand enrollees.*

3       “(b) *The Director shall take necessary action to insure*  
4 *that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job*  
5 *Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum*  
6 *shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps*  
7 *to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women en-*  
8 *rollees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1)*  
9 *efficiency and economy in the operation of the program,*  
10 *(2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeco-*  
11 *nomie, educational, and training needs of the population to*  
12 *be served.*

13       “(c) *The Director shall take necessary action to insure*  
14 *that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the direct*  
15 *operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in*  
16 *operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,500*  
17 *per residential enrollee, or \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee.*

18       “(d) *The Director shall take necessary action to insure*  
19 *that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced*  
20 *or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-*  
21 *tion of any conservation or training center shall become the*  
22 *property of the United States.*

23       “POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

24       “SEC. 118. (a) *No officer or employee of the executive*  
25 *branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry*



1 concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee  
2 or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures  
3 concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such  
4 membership in political parties or organizations as consti-  
5 tutes by law a disqualification for Government employment.  
6 No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or prom-  
7 ised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal  
8 Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps,  
9 or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his  
10 political affiliation or beliefs, excepts as may be specifically  
11 authorized or required by law.

12 “(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall  
13 take any active part in political management or in political  
14 campaigns, either partisan or nonpartisan, or in voter regis-  
15 tration drives, except as may be provided by or pursuant to  
16 statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use  
17 his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering  
18 with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such  
19 persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and  
20 to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all  
21 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, en-  
22 rollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political  
23 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation  
24 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

1       “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-  
 2 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-  
 3 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for  
 4 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,  
 5 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as  
 6 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.”

#### 7                               WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

8       SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Op-  
 9 portunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B of  
 10 such title and amended to read as follows:

11   “PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

12                               “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

13       “SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful  
 14 work and training opportunities, together with related serv-  
 15 ices and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to  
 16 continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed  
 17 or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and  
 18 hold regular competitive employment, with maximum oppor-  
 19 tunities for local initiative in developing programs which  
 20 respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis  
 21 upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs  
 22 using both public and private resources to overcome the  
 23 complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in  
 24 urban and rural areas having high concentrations or propor-  
 25 tions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.



1 "COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE  
2 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

3 "SEC. 121. (a) *The Director shall designate or recog-*  
4 *nize community program areas for the purpose of planning*  
5 *and conducting comprehensive community work and training*  
6 *programs.*

7 "(b) *For the purpose of this title, a community may be*  
8 *a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an Indian res-*  
9 *ervation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of*  
10 *boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suit-*  
11 *able organizational base and possesses the commonality of*  
12 *interest needed for a comprehensive work and training pro-*  
13 *gram. The Director shall consult with the heads of other*  
14 *Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to com-*  
15 *munity action, manpower services, physical and economic*  
16 *development, housing, education, health, and other commu-*  
17 *nity services to encourage the establishment of coterminous*  
18 *or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among*  
19 *those programs and comprehensive work and training pro-*  
20 *grams assisted under this title.*

21 "(c) *A comprehensive work and training program must*  
22 *seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of serv-*  
23 *ices which will enable them to obtain and hold employment.*  
24 *It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and*  
25 *implementation including the linkage of relevant compo-*

1    *nent programs authorized by this Act with one another and*  
2    *with other appropriate public and private programs and*  
3    *activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.*

4            *“PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES*

5            *“SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the*  
6    *Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency*  
7    *which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under*  
8    *section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123*  
9    *(c)). This agency must be capable of planning, adminis-*  
10   *tering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work*  
11   *and training program.*

12           *“(b) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation*  
13   *of employers and labor organizations in the planning and*  
14   *conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.*

15           *“(c) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make*  
16   *use of public and private organizations as delegate*  
17   *agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work*  
18   *and training program, including without limitation agencies*  
19   *governed with the participation of the poor and other residents*  
20   *of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational in-*  
21   *stitutions, the public employment service, the public welfare*  
22   *agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training*  
23   *institutions, and other capable public and private organiza-*  
24   *tions.*

25           *“(d) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall*



1 provide for participation of residents of the area and mem-  
2 bers of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and  
3 evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program  
4 and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum  
5 employment opportunity in the conduct of component pro-  
6 grams, including opportunity for further occupational train-  
7 ing and career advancement.

8 “(e) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure  
9 that programs under this part have adequate internal admin-  
10 istrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel stand-  
11 ards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be  
12 necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

13 “ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

14 “SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial as-  
15 sistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work  
16 and training programs or components of such programs,  
17 including the following:

18 “(1) programs to provide part-time employment,  
19 on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-  
20 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth  
21 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-  
22 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are in  
23 need of the earnings to permit them to resume or main-  
24 tain attendance in school;

25 “(2) programs to provide unemployed, underem-

1        *ployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over)*  
2        *with useful work and training (which must include*  
3        *sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job*  
4        *training) designed to assist those persons to develop*  
5        *their maximum occupational potential and to obtain*  
6        *regular competitive employment;*

7            *“(3) special programs which involve work ac-*  
8        *tivities directed to the needs of those chronically un-*  
9        *employed poor who have poor employment prospects*  
10       *and are unable, because of age, lack of employment op-*  
11       *portunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employ-*  
12       *ment or training assistance under other programs, and*  
13       *which, in addition to other services provided, will*  
14       *enable such persons to participate in projects for the*  
15       *betterment or beautification of the community or area*  
16       *served by the program, including without limitation*  
17       *activities which will contribute to the management, con-*  
18       *servation, or development of natural resources, recrea-*  
19       *tional areas, Federal, State, and local government parks*  
20       *highways, and other lands;*

21            *“(4) special programs which provide unemployed*  
22        *or low-income persons with jobs leading to career oppor-*  
23        *tunities, including new types of careers, in programs*  
24        *designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or*  
25        *cultural condition of the community or area served in*



1     *fields including without limitation health, education, wel-*  
2     *fare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety,*  
3     *which provide maximum prospects for advancement and*  
4     *continued employment without Federal assistance, which*  
5     *give promise of contributing to the broader adoption*  
6     *of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of*  
7     *providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide*  
8     *opportunities for further occupational training to facili-*  
9     *tate career advancement;*

10         *“(5) special programs which concentrate work and*  
11     *training resources in urban and rural areas having large*  
12     *concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed*  
13     *persons, and within those rural areas having substantial*  
14     *outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately*  
15     *focused to assure that work and training opportunities*  
16     *are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons*  
17     *who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such*  
18     *opportunities, and which are supported by specific com-*  
19     *mitments of cooperation from private and public*  
20     *employers;*

21         *“(6) supportive and follow-up services to supple-*  
22     *ment work and training programs under this or other*  
23     *Acts including health services, counseling, day care for*  
24     *children, transportation assistance, and other special*

1        *services necessary to assist individuals to achieve suc-*  
2        *cess in work and training programs and in employment;*

3            *“(7) employment centers and mobile employment*  
4        *service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and*  
5        *placement services, conveniently located in urban neigh-*  
6        *borhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the*  
7        *most disadvantaged;*

8            *“(8) programs to provide incentives to private*  
9        *employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train*  
10       *or employ unemployed or low-income persons, includ-*  
11       *ing arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to*  
12       *employers for unusual training costs for a limited*  
13       *period when an employee might not be fully pro-*  
14       *ductive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other*  
15       *supportive services, payment of all or part of employer*  
16       *costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas*  
17       *of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed*  
18       *or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers*  
19       *to provide employees resident in such areas with trans-*  
20       *portation to and from work or to reimburse such em-*  
21       *ployees for such transportation: Provided, That in*  
22       *making such reimbursements to employers the Director*  
23       *shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall*  
24       *not be less than the minimum wage which would be*  
25       *applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Stand-*



ards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

“(9) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

“(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

“(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if

1 *any, that such assistance would enhance program effective-*  
2 *ness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would*  
3 *serve the purposes of this title. In the case of programs under*  
4 *subsection (a)(1) of this section, financial assistance may*  
5 *be provided directly to local or State educational agencies*  
6 *pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secre-*  
7 *tary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs*  
8 *under direct grants or contracts.*

9 "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

10 "SEC. 124. (a) *The Director shall not provide financial*  
11 *assistance for any program under this part unless he de-*  
12 *termines, in accordance with such regulations as he may*  
13 *prescribe, that—*

14 "(1) *no participant will be employed on projects*  
15 *involving political parties, or the construction, opera-*  
16 *tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is*  
17 *used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place*  
18 *for religious worship;*

19 "(2) *the program will not result in the displace-*  
20 *ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts*  
21 *for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for*  
22 *other funds in connection with work that would other-*  
23 *wise be performed;*

24 "(3) *the rates of pay for time spent in work-*  
25 *training and education, and other conditions of employ-*



ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

“(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

“(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

“(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

“(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

#### “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

“SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration

1 family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and  
2 other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be  
3 from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare  
4 payments.

5 “(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the  
6 United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

7 “(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-  
8 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law  
9 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to  
10 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment  
11 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

12 “ELDERLY

13 “SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs  
14 under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence  
15 of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years  
16 and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director  
17 shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular,  
18 part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

19 “PILOT PROJECTS

20 “SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial  
21 assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects  
22 which are designed to develop new approaches to further the  
23 objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by  
24 public agencies or private organizations.

25 “(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects de-



1 signed to encourage the maximum participation of private  
2 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and  
3 training programs under this part.

4 “(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project,  
5 he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from  
6 the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the  
7 project will be undertaken.

8 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

9 “SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or  
10 through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) tech-  
11 nical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective opera-  
12 tion of programs under this part. He may also make arrange-  
13 ments for the training of instructors and other personnel  
14 needed to carry out work and training programs under this  
15 part. He shall give special consideration to the problems of  
16 rural areas.

17 “ROLE OF THE STATES

18 “SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance  
19 to appropriate State agencies to—

20 “(1) provide technical assistance and training, as  
21 authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon  
22 service to rural areas and for this purpose preference  
23 shall be given to the State agency which administers  
24 programs assisted by section 231;

1           “(2) assist in coordinating State activities related  
2       to this part;

3           “(3) operate work and training programs in com-  
4       munities which have not yet established an acceptable  
5       prime sponsor; and

6           “(4) provide work and training opportunities on  
7       State projects and in State agencies: Provided, That  
8       these opportunities shall be made available to partici-  
9       pants in community work and training programs.

10           “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

11           “SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for  
12       any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the  
13       Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the  
14       purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5); but not more  
15       than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal  
16       year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the  
17       remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the  
18       provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria  
19       designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance  
20       among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall con-  
21       sider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population,  
22       unemployment, and family income levels.

23           “LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

24           “SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program  
25       or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part



1 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program  
2 or activity, including costs of administration. The Director  
3 may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percent-  
4 age if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing ob-  
5 jective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary  
6 in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal con-  
7 tributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, includ-  
8 ing but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in  
9 any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contribu-  
10 tions under this title exceeding its requirements under this  
11 section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for  
12 such contributions under section 223(c).

13 "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

14 "SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the devel-  
15 opment and implementation of a program data system con-  
16 sistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal  
17 programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

18 "(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing eval-  
19 uation of the programs under this part, including their effec-  
20 tiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related  
21 programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the de-  
22 livery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the  
23 opinions of participants about the strengths and weak-  
24 nesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include com-  
25 parisons with proper control groups composed of persons

1 who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek  
2 to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of  
3 work and training programs authorized by this Act and by  
4 other Acts, including the Manpower Development and  
5 Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract  
6 for independent evaluations of such programs or individual  
7 projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included  
8 in the report required by section 608.

9       “(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards  
10 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the  
11 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered  
12 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial as-  
13 sistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129.”

14                   COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

15       SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of  
16 1964 is amended to read as follows:

17       “TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY  
18                   ACTION PROGRAMS

19                   “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

20       “SEC. 201. This title provides for community action  
21 agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes  
22 the functions of community action agencies and author-  
23 izes financial assistance to community action programs and  
24 related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimu-  
25 late a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and



1 *Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income*  
2 *families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and*  
3 *urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations*  
4 *and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully*  
5 *self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as meth-*  
6 *ods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of*  
7 *individual and family self-sufficiency—*

8       “(1) the strengthening of community capabilities  
9       for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other  
10       assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that  
11       this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, orga-  
12       nizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be  
13       made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

14       “(2) the better organization of a range of services  
15       related to the needs of the poor, so that these services  
16       may be made more effective and efficient in helping  
17       families and individuals to overcome particular problems  
18       in a way that takes account of, and supports their prog-  
19       ress in overcoming, related problems;

20       “(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evalua-  
21       tion, of new types of services and innovative approaches  
22       in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increas-  
23       ingly effective methods of employing available resources;

24       “(4) the development and implementation of all  
25       programs and projects designed to serve the poor or

1        *low-income areas with the maximum feasible participa-*  
2        *tion of residents of the areas and members of the groups*  
3        *served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of*  
4        *capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those*  
5        *programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and*  
6        *widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and*

7        *“(5) the broadening of the resource base of pro-*  
8        *grams directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to*  
9        *secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public*  
10       *officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood*  
11       *organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role*  
12       *for business, labor, and professional groups able to pro-*  
13       *vide employment opportunities or otherwise influence*  
14       *the quantity and quality of services of concern to the*  
15       *poor.*

16       *“It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and*  
17       *the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide*  
18       *for basic education, health care, vocational training, and*  
19       *employment opportunities in rural America to enable the*  
20       *poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and be-*  
21       *come self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this*  
22       *title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to*  
23       *encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch*  
24       *as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such*  
25       *migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor*



1 *and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums*  
2 *and ghettos of our Nation's cities.*

*"PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND  
PROGRAMS*

5 "DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES;  
6 COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

7       “SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a  
8 State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or  
9 duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such  
10 political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency  
11 or organization which has been designated by a State or such  
12 a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions,  
13 which—

14           “(1) has power to enter into contracts with public  
15           and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist  
16           in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

17           “(2) is designated as a community action agency  
18       by the Director.

19 *A community action program is a community based and*  
20 *operated program—*

21 “(1) which includes or is designed to include a suf-  
22 ficient number of projects or components to provide, in  
23 sum, a range of services and activities having a measur-  
24 able and potentially major impact on causes of poverty

1        *in the community or those areas of the community*  
2        *where poverty is a particularly acute problem;*

3            *“(2) which has been developed, and which or-*  
4        *ganizes and combines its component projects and activi-*  
5        *ties, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the*  
6        *purposes of this title; and*

7            *“(3) which conforms to such other supplementary*  
8        *criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with*  
9        *the provisions of this title.*

10        *“(b) Components of a community action program may*  
11        *be administered by the community action agency, where*  
12        *consistent with sound and efficient management and appli-*  
13        *cable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects*  
14        *eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from*  
15        *other public or private sources; and they may be either*  
16        *specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant*  
17        *to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program*  
18        *providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which*  
19        *will help in meeting those needs.*

20        *“(c) The community for which a community action*  
21        *agency is designated to carry on a community action pro-*  
22        *gram may be a city, county, multicity, multicounty, or*  
23        *other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neigh-*  
24        *borhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries cor-*  
25        *respond with those of any political subdivision); but it must*



1 *in any event provide the organizational base and possess the*  
2 *commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective*  
3 *program conforming to the requirements of this section.*

4       “(d) *The Director may provide financial assistance to a*  
5 *public or private nonprofit agency as a community action*  
6 *agency other than a community action agency designated*  
7 *under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in*  
8 *this title where he determines that the community action*  
9 *agency serving the community has failed, after having a*  
10 *reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory*  
11 *plan for a community action program which meets the cri-*  
12 *teria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the*  
13 *State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination*  
14 *of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the com-*  
15 *munity action agency for such community or to designate*  
16 *a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so*  
17 *designated by the Director.*

18       “(e) *No political subdivision of a State shall be included*  
19 *in the community action program of a State, or of any politi-*  
20 *cal subdivision or combination thereof, if the elected or duly*  
21 *appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so*  
22 *included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private*  
23 *nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be*  
24 *eligible for designation as a community action agency on the*  
25 *same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.*

1       “(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government  
2 of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political  
3 subdivision of a State.

4       “COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

5       “SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is  
6 a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combina-  
7 tion of political subdivisions, shall administer its program  
8 through a community action board which shall meet the  
9 requirements of subsection (b). Each community action  
10 agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or  
11 organization designated by a State or political subdivision  
12 of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an  
13 agency designated by the Director under section 210(d),  
14 shall have a governing board which shall meet the require-  
15 ments of subsection (b).

16       “(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall  
17 consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so  
18 constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board  
19 are public officials, including the chief elected official or  
20 officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such  
21 officials reasonably available for such service is less than  
22 one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-  
23 third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with  
24 democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that  
25 they are representative of the poor in the area served, and



1 (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members  
2 of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or  
3 other major groups and interests in the community. Each  
4 member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic  
5 area within a community must reside in the area he repre-  
6 sents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this  
7 subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board  
8 for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total  
9 of six years.

10 “(c) Where a community action agency places responsi-  
11 bility for policy determinations with respect to the character,  
12 extent, and administration of programs to be carried on in  
13 a particular geographic area within the community in a sub-  
14 sidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places  
15 substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an  
16 agency in making such policy determinations affecting par-  
17 ticular areas, such subsidiary board, council, or similar  
18 agency shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

19 “(d) The Director shall promulgate such standards or  
20 rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quo-  
21 rums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total  
22 membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and  
23 similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that  
24 boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a con-  
25 tinuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, com-

1 munity involvement in programs assisted under this title  
2 and that all groups or elements represented on those boards  
3 have a full and fair opportunity to participate in deci-  
4 sions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall  
5 not preclude any such board from appointing an executive  
6 committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the com-  
7 position of the board, to transact the board's business be-  
8 tween its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such  
9 committee or group shall be established by the board.

“(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

16 "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY  
17 ACTION AGENCIES

18       “SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall respon-  
19       sibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and adminis-  
20       tering a community action program, a community action  
21       agency must have authority under its charter or applicable  
22       law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds  
23       and contributions from private or local public sources which  
24       may be used in support of a community action program, and  
25       funds under any Federal or State assistance program pur-



1 suant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the  
2 case may be) organized in accordance with this part could  
3 act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate  
4 for inclusion in a community action program. A community  
5 action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so  
6 received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject  
7 to the powers of its governing board and its overall program  
8 responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate  
9 powers must include the power to make transfers and dele-  
10 gations covering component projects in all cases where this  
11 will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise  
12 further program objectives.

13 “(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its over-  
14 all responsibility for a community action program, a commu-  
15 nity action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this  
16 title, at least the following functions:

17 “(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating  
18 the program, including actions to develop information  
19 as to the problems and causes of poverty in the com-  
20 munity, determine how much and how effectively as-  
21 sistance is being provided to deal with those problems  
22 and causes, and establish priorities among projects, ac-  
23 tivities and areas as needed for the best and most effi-  
24 cient use of resources.

25 “(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities

1       *related to the community action program to plan for,*  
2       *secure and administer assistance available under this title*  
3       *or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis;*  
4       *providing planning or technical assistance to those agen-*  
5       *cies; and generally, in cooperation with community*  
6       *agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve*  
7       *existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-*  
8       *to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing*  
9       *resources on the most needy, and providing additional*  
10       *opportunities to low-income individuals for regular em-*  
11       *ployment or participation in the programs or activities*  
12       *for which those community agencies and officials are*  
13       *responsible.*

14       “(3) *Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive*  
15       *to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met,*  
16       *with particular emphasis on providing central or com-*  
17       *mon services that can be drawn upon by a variety of*  
18       *related programs, developing new approaches or new*  
19       *types of services that can be incorporated into other*  
20       *programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or*  
21       *modification of those programs.*

22       “(4) *Establishing effective procedures by which the*  
23       *poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to*  
24       *influence the character of programs affecting their in-*  
25       *terests, providing for their regular participation in the*



1       *implementation of those programs, and providing tech-*  
2       *nical and other support needed to enable the poor and*  
3       *neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf*  
4       *available assistance from public and private sources.*

5           “(5) *Joining with and encouraging business, labor,*  
6       *and other private groups and organizations to undertake,*  
7       *together with public officials and agencies, activities in*  
8       *support of the community action program which will re-*  
9       *sult in the additional use of private resources and capa-*  
10       *bilities, with a view to such things as developing new*  
11       *employment opportunities, stimulating investment that*  
12       *will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty*  
13       *among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and*  
14       *providing methods by which residents of those areas*  
15       *can work with private groups, firms, and institutions*  
16       *in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.*

17           “ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

18       “SEC. 213. (a) *Each community action agency shall*  
19       *observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage*  
20       *other agencies participating in a community action program*  
21       *to observe, standards of organization, management and*  
22       *administration which will assure, so far as reasonably pos-*  
23       *sible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner*  
24       *consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective*  
25       *of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of*

1 any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family  
2 favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish  
3 or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include  
4 rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed  
5 by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community  
6 action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access  
7 to information, including but not limited to public hearings  
8 at the request of appropriate community groups and reason-  
9 able public access to books and records of the agency or  
10 other agencies engaged in program activities or operations  
11 involving the use of authority or funds for which it is  
12 responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt  
13 for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising author-  
14 ity for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish  
15 specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel  
16 and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to  
17 assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties  
18 with competence and integrity are employed and that em-  
19 ployees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures  
20 calculated to improve agency performance and effective-  
21 ness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of inter-  
22 ests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf  
23 of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any  
24 case preclude employees from participating, in connection



1 with the performance of their duties, in any form of picket-  
2 ing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation  
3 of law.

4       “(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations  
5 to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regula-  
6 tions governing matters relating to partisan or nonpartisan  
7 political activities and elections referred to in section  
8 603(b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on  
9 all agencies carrying on community action program  
10 activities with financial assistance under this title. He  
11 may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified  
12 requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating  
13 in rural areas. These special requirements shall not,  
14 however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts  
15 of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political  
16 purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of cus-  
17 tomary practices or rules among agencies in the community.  
18 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal  
19 agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to  
20 activities which may be included in community action pro-  
21 grams for the purpose of securing maximum consistency  
22 between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those  
23 agencies and those prescribed under this section.

1 "EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND  
2 PROGRAMS

3 "SEC. 214. (a) In determining whether, in what  
4 amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assist-  
5 ance to a new community action program, the Director shall  
6 consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community  
7 and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an  
8 efficient and effective program in full conformity to the pur-  
9 poses of this title. In renewing or supplementing that finan-  
10 cial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carry-  
11 ing on such a program, consistent with needs and with due  
12 allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller com-  
13 munities, and the efficiency with which the agency has dis-  
14 charged its specific functions and duties to this end. The  
15 Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall  
16 effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance  
17 with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall  
18 consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering:  
19 the number and incomes of persons or families served and  
20 seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the  
21 extent to which those persons and families have been aided in  
22 establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those  
23 goals; the extent to which resources have been committed  
24 which are over and above the contributions required by this  
25 title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources



1 of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to  
 2 which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor  
 3 and area representatives, have actively participated in the  
 4 formulation and implementation of the program in question;  
 5 the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements  
 6 among agencies operating different components and related  
 7 agencies in the community; and the extent to which activi-  
 8 ties or approaches initiated as part of the program have been  
 9 incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

10 “(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by  
 11 him or by community action agencies, the Director may pro-  
 12 vide for, or require community action agencies to provide for,  
 13 independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also  
 14 require a community action agency to establish an inde-  
 15 pendent group or committee to provide evaluation and ad-  
 16 visory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

17 *“PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY*  
 18 *ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES*

19 *“DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS*

20 *“SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assist-*  
 21 *ance to community action agencies to assist them in develop-*  
 22 *ing community action programs in accordance with this title.*  
 23 *He may also provide financial assistance to other public or*  
 24 *private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the*  
 25 *establishment of a community action agency or participa-*

1 *tion in a community action program, including assistance to*  
2 *local governments in connection with planning activities*  
3 *and organizational changes to support or improve the effec-*  
4 *tiveness of such programs.*

5 *“GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO*  
6 *COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS*

7 *“SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of*  
8 *community action programs, the Director may provide gen-*  
9 *eral financial assistance to those programs in accordance*  
10 *with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be*  
11 *used, as approved by the Director, by community action*  
12 *agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning,*  
13 *coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsi-*  
14 *bilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be*  
15 *used for the development and operation of approved pro-*  
16 *gram components which are necessary for a fully effective*  
17 *program and for which assistance is not available, as needed,*  
18 *from other sources. These component projects may involve,*  
19 *without limitation, activities providing services, together*  
20 *with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families*  
21 *and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment;*  
22 *to make better use of available income in connection with*  
23 *efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills*  
24 *needed for employment, family self-help, or successful par-*  
25 *ticipation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain hous-*



1    *ing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake*  
2    *family planning consistent with personal and family goals,*  
3    *religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent*  
4    *and effective use of programs available to help in overcom-*  
5    *ing specific problems. Components providing these or other*  
6    *services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-*  
7    *income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly,*  
8    *the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance,*  
9    *but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family*  
10    *participation and progress.*

11        *“(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose*  
12    *project or program involving activities otherwise eligible*  
13    *under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income*  
14    *families and individuals in a community, and no community*  
15    *action agency has been designated for that community pur-*  
16    *suant to section 210, or where a community action agency*  
17    *gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly*  
18    *through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization,*  
19    *he may extend financial assistance for that project or program*  
20    *to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is ca-*  
21    *pable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective*  
22    *manner consistent with the purpose of this title.*

23        *“(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or*  
24    *regulations governing applications for assistance under this*  
25    *section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each*

1 applicant to secure the views of local public officials and  
2 agencies in the community having a direct or substantial in-  
3 terest in the application and to resolve all issues of coopera-  
4 tion and possible duplication prior to its submission.

5 "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

6 "SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet  
7 or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor  
8 which are common to a number of communities, the Director  
9 may develop and carry on special programs under this  
10 section. This authority shall be used only where the Direc-  
11 tor determines that the objectives sought could not be effec-  
12 tively achieved through the use of authorities under sections  
13 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects  
14 based on models developed and promulgated by him. It  
15 shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1)  
16 involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely  
17 coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve  
18 significant new combinations of resources or new and inno-  
19 vative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will,  
20 within the limits of the type of assistance or activities con-  
21 templated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of  
22 this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate  
23 to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director  
24 may provide financial assistance to public or private non-  
25 profit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such



1 special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will  
2 encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted  
3 projects in community action programs, with a view to mini-  
4 mizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the  
5 use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons  
6 or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing  
7 from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in  
8 promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs  
9 under this section shall include those described in the follow-  
10 ing paragraphs:

11       “(1) A program to be known as ‘Project Head-  
12 start’ focused upon children who have not reached the  
13 age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will  
14 provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, educa-  
15 tion, social, and other services as the Director finds will  
16 aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B)  
17 will provide for direct participation of the parents of  
18 such children in the development, conduct, and overall  
19 program direction at the local level.

20       “(2) A program to be known as ‘Follow Through’  
21 focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or ele-  
22 mentary school who were previously enrolled in Head-  
23 start or similar programs and designed to provide com-  
24 prehensive services and parent participation activities as  
25 described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds

1        *will aid in the continued development of children to their*  
2        *full potential.*

3            “(3) A ‘Legal Services’ program to provide legal  
4        *advice and legal representation to persons when they*  
5        *are unable to afford the services of a private attorney,*  
6        *together with legal research and information, as appro-*  
7        *priate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal in-*  
8        *stitutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the*  
9        *cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Proj-*  
10       *ects involving legal advice and representation shall be*  
11       *carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a law-*  
12       *yer-client relationship consistent with the best standards*  
13       *of the legal profession. The Director shall establish*  
14       *procedures to assure that the principal local bar associa-*  
15       *tions in the area to be served by any proposed project*  
16       *for legal advice and representation are afforded an ade-*  
17       *quate opportunity to submit comments and recommenda-*  
18       *tions on the proposal before it is approved or funded.*

19            “(4) A ‘Comprehensive Health Services’ program  
20        *to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive*  
21        *health services projects focused upon the needs of urban*  
22        *and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and*  
23        *a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor.*  
24        *These projects shall be designed—*

25            “(A) to make possible, with maximum fea-



1        *sible use of existing agencies and resources, the pro-*  
2        *vision of comprehensive health services, including*  
3        *but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic,*  
4        *treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and*  
5        *follow-up services, together with necessary related*  
6        *facilities and services, except in rural areas where*  
7        *the lack of even elemental health services and per-*  
8        *sonnel may require simpler, less comprehensive serv-*  
9        *ices to be established first; and*

10        *“(B) to assure that these services are made*  
11        *readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are*  
12        *furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs*  
13        *and with their participation and wherever possible*  
14        *are combined with, or included within, arrangements*  
15        *for providing employment, education, social, or*  
16        *other assistance needed by the families and individ-*  
17        *uals served.*

18        *Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall*  
19        *be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants*  
20        *to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and*  
21        *may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of proj-*  
22        *ects. Before approving any project, the Director shall*  
23        *consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health*  
24        *agencies and take such steps as may be required to*

1       *assure that the program will be carried on under com-*  
2       *petent professional supervision and that existing agencies*  
3       *providing related services are furnished all assistance*  
4       *needed to permit them to plan for participation in the*  
5       *program and for the necessary continuation of those*  
6       *related services.*

7           “(5) A program to be known as ‘Upward Bound’  
8       *designed to generate skills and motivation necessary*  
9       *for success in education beyond high school among*  
10       *young people from low-income backgrounds and inade-*  
11       *quate secondary school preparation. Projects must*  
12       *include arrangements to assure cooperation among one*  
13       *or more institutions of higher education and one or more*  
14       *secondary schools. They must include a curriculum*  
15       *designed to develop the critical thinking, effective ex-*  
16       *pression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-*  
17       *secondary education success, necessary health services*  
18       *and such recreational and cultural and group activities*  
19       *as the Director determines may be appropriate.*

20           “(6) A program to be known as ‘Emergency Food  
21       *and Medical Services’ designed to provide on a temporary*  
22       *emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical serv-*  
23       *ices as may be necessary to counteract conditions of*  
24       *starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director*  
25       *shall arrange with other Federal and State agencies or*



officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.

“(7) A ‘Day Care’ program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise attain objectives related to the purposes of this Act. Projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed, together with necessary related facilities and services. Preference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under this Act and to other children whose parents have especially critical needs for day care service which could not be secured under any other program. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards

1        *and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the*  
2        *State and local levels.*

3                *“(8) A ‘Family Planning’ program to provide as-*  
4        *sistance and services to low-income persons in the field of*  
5        *voluntary family planning, including the provision of in-*  
6        *formation, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director*  
7        *and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare*  
8        *shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of informa-*  
9        *tion concerning, family planning projects within their*  
10       *respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum*  
11       *availability of services and in order best to meet the*  
12       *varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of*  
13       *Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services*  
14       *of Public Health Service officers available to the Direc-*  
15       *tor in carrying out this program.*

16                *“(9) A program to be known as ‘Senior Oppor-*  
17       *tunities and Services’ designed to identify and meet the*  
18       *needs of older, poor persons above the age of 55 in one*  
19       *or more of the following areas: development and pro-*  
20       *vision of new employment and volunteer services; effec-*  
21       *tive referral to existing health, welfare, employment,*  
22       *housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and*  
23       *recreational and other services; stimulation and creation*  
24       *of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and*  
25       *deficiencies in presently existing services and programs;*



1     *modification of existing procedures, eligibility require-*  
2     *ments and program structures to facilitate the greater*  
3     *use of, and participation in, public services by the older*  
4     *poor; development of all-season recreation and service*  
5     *centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such*  
6     *other activities and services as the Director may deter-*  
7     *mine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the*  
8     *needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-*  
9     *sufficiency. In administering this program the Director*  
10    *shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services*  
11    *of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agree-*  
12    *ments with the Secretary of Health, Education, and*  
13    *Welfare.*

14    “(b) In developing programs under subsection (a),  
15    *the Director shall give priority to programs involving serv-*  
16    *ices or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one*  
17    *or more community action programs, or in connection with*  
18    *other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private.*  
19    *The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State*  
20    *agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection*  
21    *(a), programs which will supplement or improve programs*  
22    *for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate,*  
23    *he shall provide for the operation of programs under sub-*  
24    *section (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to*  
25    *delegations of authority or suitable agreements.*

1       “(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include es-  
2       sential training, research, and technical assistance directly  
3       related to program development and implementation, and  
4       funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in  
5       the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect  
6       to training, research, and technical assistance activities

7       “(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing  
8       evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this  
9       section, including their impact in terms of the needs or prob-  
10      lems at which they are directed, and their relationship to  
11      and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he  
12      shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appro-  
13      priate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever fea-  
14      sible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a  
15      National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together  
16      with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if  
17      any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected  
18      in the annual report of the Director.

19      “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

20      “SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or  
21      allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-  
22      tion of community action programs pursuant to sections 220  
23      and 221, and for special program projects referred to in sec-  
24      tion 222(a), and which are not subject to any other pro-  
25      vision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall



1 allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,  
2 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,  
3 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.  
4 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of  
5 those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and  
6 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be  
7 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest  
8 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on  
9 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance  
10 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the  
11 average number of unemployed persons in each State as  
12 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of  
13 related children living with families with incomes of less  
14 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That  
15 part of any State's allotment which the Director determines  
16 will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during  
17 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to  
18 the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to  
19 assure that any amount so made available to any State in  
20 excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other  
21 States.

22       “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-  
23 ment of funds for any special program referred to in section  
24 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with  
25 the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made

1 in accordance with other criteria which he determines will  
2 assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the rela-  
3 tive incidence in each State of the needs or problems at  
4 which the program is directed, except that in no event may  
5 more than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per centum of the funds for any one program  
6 be used in any one State.

7 “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial  
8 assistance extended to a community action agency or other  
9 agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the  
10 period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per  
11 centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or  
12 activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum  
13 of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assist-  
14 ance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in  
15 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,  
16 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes  
17 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or  
18 in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,  
19 equipment, or services, except that at least one-half of the  
20 non-Federal contribution shall be in cash.

21 “(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under  
22 sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies  
23 himself (1) that the services to be provided under such pro-  
24 gram will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, serv-  
25 ices previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2)



1 *that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed*  
2 *to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not*  
3 *be diminished in order to provide any contributions required*  
4 *under subsection (c) or otherwise to qualify for assistance*  
5 *under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding*  
6 *sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director*  
7 *may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for*  
8 *determinations covering situations where a strict application*  
9 *of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or*  
10 *otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be*  
11 *achieved.*

12 *“PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES*

13 *“TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING*

14 *“SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or*  
15 *through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-*  
16 *ance to communities in developing, conducting, and adminis-*  
17 *tering programs under this title, and (2) training for special-*  
18 *ized or other personnel which is needed in connection with*  
19 *those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes*  
20 *of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial*  
21 *assistance under this title, the Director may make special*  
22 *assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise*  
23 *it in the performance of functions related to the assisted*  
24 *activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period*  
25 *of more than two years in the case of any agency.*

1                   “STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

2           “SEC. 231. (a) *The Director may provide financial*  
3 *assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with*  
4 *State law, to enable those agencies—*

5           “*(1) to provide technical assistance to communities*  
6 *and local agencies in developing and carrying out pro-*  
7 *grams under this title;*

8           “*(2) to assist in coordinating State activities re-*  
9 *lated to this title;*

10           “*(3) to advise and assist the Director in develop-*  
11 *ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-*  
12 *tion of States and State agencies in programs under this*  
13 *title; and*

14           “*(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-*  
15 *nomic Opportunity Council established by section 604*  
16 *of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in*  
17 *identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-*  
18 *ministrative requirements that operate to impede State*  
19 *level coordination of programs related to this title, and*  
20 *in developing methods or recommendations for over-*  
21 *coming those problems.*

22           “*(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies,*  
23 *the Director shall give preference to programs or activities*  
24 *which are administered or coordinated by the agencies desig-*  
25 *nated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been de-*



1 veloped and will be carried on with the assistance of those  
2 agencies.

3           “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

4           “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide  
5 financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects con-  
6 ducted by public or private agencies which are designed to  
7 test or assist in the development of new approaches or  
8 methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or  
9 otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may  
10 also contract or provide financial assistance for research per-  
11 taining to the purposes of this title.

12           “(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to  
13 govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and  
14 the use of all research authority under this title. The plan  
15 shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities  
16 among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director  
17 shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose  
18 of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects  
19 and determining whether the findings resulting from any  
20 research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or  
21 more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As  
22 part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a  
23 separate annual report, the Director shall submit a descrip-  
24 tion for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this

1 section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings  
 2 derived from those activities, together with a statement indi-  
 3 cating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in  
 4 which the benefits of those activities and findings are ex-  
 5 pected to be realized.

6 “(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appro-  
 7 priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall  
 8 be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

9 “PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

10 “ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

11 “SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant  
 12 directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the  
 13 administration of the provisions of this title. One such  
 14 assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for  
 15 Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for  
 16 assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or  
 17 projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended.  
 18 The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant  
 19 Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be  
 20 responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance  
 21 to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor  
 22 are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such  
 23 additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing re-  
 24 sponsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.



## 1                   “RURAL AREAS

2           “SEC. 241. (a) *In exercising authority under this title,*  
3 *the Director shall take necessary steps to further the exten-*  
4 *sion of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with*  
5 *the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents,*  
6 *and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical*  
7 *competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These*  
8 *steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1)*  
9 *the development under section 222(a) of programs partic-*  
10 *ularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the*  
11 *establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program*  
12 *of research and pilot project activities specifically focused*  
13 *upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective*  
14 *use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow*  
15 *the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic*  
16 *opportunity; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as*  
17 *to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to*  
18 *aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be ap-*  
19 *propriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs*  
20 *which are related to this title but which are not generally*  
21 *utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special*  
22 *or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components,*  
23 *and model programs for use in rural areas.*

24           “(b) *In order to further implement the policy described*

1 in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria de-  
2 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under  
3 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.  
4 In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative  
5 numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income  
6 families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed  
7 persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on  
8 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;  
9 (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-  
10 grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military  
11 service.

12 “(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title,  
13 the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in  
14 rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any  
15 project for which assistance to community action agencies is  
16 authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish  
17 a community action agency within a reasonable period of  
18 time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such  
19 conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote  
20 adherence to the purposes of this title and the early estab-  
21 lishment of a community action agency in the area.

22 “(d) The Director shall encourage the development of  
23 programs for the interchange of personnel, for the under-  
24 taking of common or related projects, and other methods of  
25 cooperation between urban and rural communities, with par-



1 *ticular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where*  
2 *it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and be-*  
3 *tween larger urban communities with concentrations of low-*  
4 *income persons and families and rural areas in which sub-*  
5 *stantial numbers of those persons and families have recently*  
6 *resided.*

7 *“COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE*  
8 *FUNDS*

9 *“SEC. 242. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall*  
10 *cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibili-*  
11 *ties under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law,*  
12 *exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of*  
13 *the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appro-*  
14 *priate for inclusion in community action programs. The*  
15 *Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice,*  
16 *information, or assistance, including the establishment of*  
17 *working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific*  
18 *problems of coordination arising under programs authorized*  
19 *in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated*  
20 *pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local*  
21 *programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist*  
22 *particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of*  
23 *diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range*  
24 *plans where justified by prior progress.*

25 *“(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Presi-*

1 dent, where funds are advanced for a single project by more  
2 than one Federal agency to a community action agency or  
3 other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency  
4 may be designated to act for all in administering the funds  
5 advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement  
6 may be established according to the proportion of funds  
7 advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive  
8 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by  
9 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-  
10 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-  
11 istering agency does not impose.

12 “(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of  
13 funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State  
14 agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States  
15 or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents  
16 of the United States for purposes of providing financial as-  
17 sistance to community action agencies or other local agencies  
18 in connection with specific projects or programs involving  
19 the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this  
20 title.

21 “SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

22 “SEC. 243. In carrying out the provisions of this title,  
23 no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall  
24 be made with, or provided to, any State or local public  
25 agency or any private institution or organization for the



1 purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-  
2 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-  
3 posed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance  
4 has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such  
5 plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty  
6 days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been  
7 reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully  
8 consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the  
9 purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply  
10 to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance  
11 to any institution of higher education in existence on the  
12 date of the approval of this Act.

13 "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

14 "SEC. 244. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency  
15 receiving financial assistance under this title until it has sub-  
16 mitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted  
17 agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for per-  
18 formance of any major portion of the assisted program) have  
19 established an accounting system with internal controls ade-  
20 quate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and relia-  
21 bility of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency  
22 and encourage compliance with prescribed management poli-  
23 cies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting  
24 requirements as the Director may establish. The statement  
25 may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly

1 *licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency,*  
2 *the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsi-*  
3 *bility for providing required financial services to that agency.*

4       “(b) *Within three months after the effective date of a*  
5 *grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or*  
6 *agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a pre-*  
7 *liminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy*  
8 *of the accounting system and internal controls established*  
9 *thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement*  
10 *referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the comple-*  
11 *tion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis*  
12 *of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether*  
13 *the accounting systems and internal controls meet those*  
14 *standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or con-*  
15 *tract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall*  
16 *be given not more than six months within which to establish*  
17 *the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of*  
18 *failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall*  
19 *be terminated by the Director.*

20       “(c) *At least once annually the Director shall make or*  
21 *cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assist-*  
22 *ance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such*  
23 *audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings*  
24 *and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures*



1 incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance,  
2 the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by  
3 appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate  
4 increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of  
5 any grant or contract with the same agency or organization  
6 which is then in effect or which is entered into within  
7 twelve months after the date of disallowance.

8 “(d) The Director shall establish such other require-  
9 ments and take such actions as he may deem necessary and  
10 appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and  
11 to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the  
12 effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with  
13 programs assisted under this title. These requirements and  
14 actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that  
15 the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial  
16 assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its  
17 approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to  
18 promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or  
19 components of programs receiving financial assistance under  
20 this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming  
21 and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

22 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

23 “SEC. 245. The following special limitations shall apply,  
24 as indicated, to programs under this title.

1           “(1) *Financial assistance under this title may in-*  
2       *clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attend-*  
3       *ance at meetings of any community action agency gov-*  
4       *erning board, neighborhood council or committee, as*  
5       *appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum fea-*  
6       *sible participation of members of groups and residents of*  
7       *areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title,*  
8       *and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses con-*  
9       *nected with those meetings; but those funds (or match-*  
10      *ing non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allow-*  
11      *ances in the case of any individual who is a Federal,*  
12      *State, or local government employee, or an employee of*  
13      *a community action agency, or for payment of an allow-*  
14      *ance to any individual for attendance at more than two*  
15      *meetings a month.*

16           “(2) *The Director shall issue necessary rules or*  
17      *regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carry-*  
18      *ing out community action program activities receiving*  
19      *financial assistance under this title is compensated from*  
20      *funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per*  
21      *annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee*  
22      *at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be*  
23      *considered in determining whether the non-Federal con-*  
24      *tributions requirements of section 223 have been com-*  
25      *plied with; the Director may, however, provide in those*



1     *rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where,*  
2     *because of the need for specialized or professional skills*  
3     *or prevailing local wage levels, application of the fore-*  
4     *going restriction would greatly impair program effec-*  
5     *tiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes*  
6     *sought to be achieved.*

7             *“(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-*  
8     *nomie Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,*  
9     *council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,*  
10    *contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a*  
11    *program receiving financial assistance under this title;*  
12    *but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from*  
13    *serving on a board, council, or committee which does*  
14    *not have any authority or powers in connection with a*  
15    *program assisted under this title.*

16            *“(4) In granting financial assistance for projects*  
17    *or activities in the field of family planning, the Director*  
18    *shall assure that family planning services, including the*  
19    *dissemination of family planning information and medi-*  
20    *cal assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-*  
21    *income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility*  
22    *for assistance under this title which have been established*  
23    *by the assisted agency and who desire such information,*  
24    *assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in*  
25    *connection with any such financial assistance, that—*

1           “(A) no individual will be provided with any  
2           information, medical supervision, or supplies which  
3           that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or  
4           her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

5           “(B) no individual will be provided with any  
6           medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has  
7           voluntarily requested such medical supervision or  
8           supplies.

9           *The use of family planning services assisted under this*  
10          *title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services*  
11          *from or participation in any other programs under this*  
12          *Act.*

13          “(5) No financial assistance shall be extended un-  
14          der this title to provide general aid to elementary or  
15          secondary education in any school or school system;  
16          but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, reme-  
17          dial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

18          “(6) In extending assistance under this title the  
19          Director shall give special consideration to programs  
20          which make maximum use of existing schools, commu-  
21          nity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities dur-  
22          ing times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

23          “LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

24          “SEC. 246. The Director, after consultation with the  
25          Civil Service Commission, shall issue such regulations, or



1 impose such requirements, as may be necessary or appropriate  
2 to insure that programs assisted under this title are not car-  
3 ried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the  
4 provision of services, or the employment or assignment of  
5 personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identifi-  
6 cation of such programs with (1) any partisan political activ-  
7 ity or any other political activity associated with a candidate,  
8 or contending faction or group, in any election for public or  
9 party office, or (2) any activity to provide voters or prospec-  
10 tive voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance  
11 in connection with any such election, or any voter registration  
12 activity. Rules or regulations under this section shall provide  
13 for enforcement procedures, which shall include provision  
14 for summary suspension of assistance or other action neces-  
15 sary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis.

16 "DURATION OF PROGRAM

17 "SEC. 247. The Director shall carry out the programs  
18 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June  
19 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each  
20 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as  
21 the Congress may authorize by law."

22 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

23 SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity  
24 Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately

1 under the title heading a new part heading to read "*PART*  
2 *A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM*", and (2) striking out the  
3 heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu  
4 thereof a new heading to read "*LOANS TO FAMILIES*".

5 (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as  
6 follows:

7 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

8 "SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some  
9 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-  
10 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-  
11 ing their income and living standards."

12 (c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended (1) by  
13 inserting the word "principal" after the word "aggregate",  
14 and (2) by inserting after "families" the following: ", and,  
15 in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement  
16 of their living or housing conditions".

17 (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI  
18 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as  
19 section 306, and amended by striking out "titles III of this  
20 Act" in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu  
21 thereof "this part".



1        *AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND*2                    *INVESTMENT INCENTIVES*

3        *SEC. 105. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportu-*  
4 *nity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “enterprises;”*  
5 *and inserting in lieu thereof “enterprises, with special atten-*  
6 *tion to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural*  
7 *areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income*  
8 *individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals;”.*

9        *(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—*

10            *(1) striking out “employment of the long-term*  
11 *unemployed” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu*  
12 *thereof “the preservation or establishment of small busi-*  
13 *ness concerns located in urban or rural areas with*  
14 *high proportions of unemployed or low-income individu-*  
15 *als or owned by low-income individuals”;*

16            *(2) striking out the period at the end of the next*  
17 *to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon;*  
18 *and*

19            *(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sen-*  
20 *tence, “Provided, however, That any management*  
21 *training program so approved must be of sufficient scope*

1        *and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the*  
 2        *individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and man-*  
 3        *agerial self-sufficiency.”*

4        *(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out*  
 5        *the first subsection (b), and by adding at the end of the*  
 6        *second subsection (b) the following: “To insure an equitable*  
 7        *distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between*  
 8        *\$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administra-*  
 9        *tor is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and*  
 10       *delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall*  
 11       *determine necessary.”*

12       *(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—*

13                *(1) renumbering section 405 to read “407” and*  
 14                *inserting in such section “and the Secretary of Commerce”*  
 15                *immediately following the word “Administration”;*

16                *(2) striking out section 404; and*

17                *(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to*  
 18                *read as follows:*

19                *“DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE*

20                *“SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business*  
 21        *Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary*  
 22        *to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum*  
 23        *of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part*  
 24        *are allotted to small business concerns located in urban*



1 areas identified by the Director as having high concentra-  
2 tions of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small  
3 business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Ad-  
4 ministrator of the Small Business Administration and the  
5 Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as  
6 it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to  
7 be assisted under this part, and such definition need not  
8 correspond to the definition of low income as used else-  
9 where in this Act.

10 "LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

11 "SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended  
12 pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small  
13 Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce de-  
14 termines that the assistance will be used in relocating es-  
15 tablishments from one area to another if such relocation  
16 would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of  
17 original location.

18 "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

19 "SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is author-  
20 ized to provide financial assistance to public or private orga-  
21 nizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed  
22 to provide technical and management assistance to individu-  
23 als or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402,  
24 with special attention to small business concerns located

1 *in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-*  
2 *income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.*

3 “(b) *Financial assistance under this section may be*  
4 *provided for projects, including without limitation—*

5 “(1) *planning and research, including feasibility*  
6 *studies and market research;*

7 “(2) *the identification and development of new*  
8 *business opportunities, and the stimulation of new pri-*  
9 *vate capital resources through the use of guarantees,*  
10 *pooling arrangements, or otherwise;*

11 “(3) *the furnishing of centralized services with*  
12 *regard to public services and government programs,*  
13 *including programs authorized under section 402;*

14 “(4) *the establishment and strengthening of busi-*  
15 *ness service agencies, including trade associations and*  
16 *cooperatives;*

17 “(5) *the encouragement of the placement of sub-*  
18 *contracts by major businesses with small business con-*  
19 *cerns located in urban areas of high concentration of*  
20 *unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-*  
21 *income individuals, including the provision of incen-*  
22 *tives and assistance to such major businesses so that*  
23 *they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential*  
24 *subcontractors or other small business concerns; and*

25 “(6) *the furnishing of business counseling, man-*



1      agement training, and legal and other related services,  
2      with special emphasis on the development of manage-  
3      ment training programs using the resources of the busi-  
4      ness community, including the development of manage-  
5      ment training opportunities in existing businesses, and  
6      with emphasis in all cases upon providing management  
7      training of sufficient scope and duration to develop en-  
8      trepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part  
9      of the individuals served.

10     “(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference  
11     to projects which promote the ownership, participation in  
12     ownership, or management of small business concerns by  
13     residents of urban areas of high concentration of unem-  
14     ployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which  
15     are planned and carried out with the participation of local  
16     businessmen.

17     “(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section  
18     shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to  
19     the individuals and small business concerns served.

20     “(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps  
21     as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and  
22     cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments  
23     and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits  
24     made by the Federal Government or in connection with

1 programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a  
2 way as to further the purposes of this title.

3 “(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the  
4 continuing evaluation of programs under this section and  
5 the results of such evaluation together with recommendations  
6 shall be included in the report required by section 608.”

7 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND  
8 COORDINATION

9 SEC. 106. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Oppor-  
10 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “four” in  
11 the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “six”.

12 (b) Section 603(b) of such Act is amended (1) by  
13 striking out “authorized” and inserting in lieu thereof “di-  
14 rected”, (2) by inserting “or nonpartisan” after “partisan”,  
15 and (3) by inserting before the period at the end thereof  
16 the following: “: Provided, That the Director may issue such  
17 regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person  
18 seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort  
19 to become a registered voter according to the laws of the  
20 State of his residence”.

21 (c) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as  
22 follows:

23 “DEFINITIONS

24 “SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

25 “(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Com-



1        *monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,*  
2        *Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for*  
3        *purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning*  
4        *of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the*  
5        *Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223*  
6        *of this Act this term means only a State or the District*  
7        *of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in*  
8        *a geographical sense includes all those places named in*  
9        *the previous sentence, and all other places continental*  
10       *or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United*  
11       *States;*

12        “(2) the term ‘financial assistance’ when used in  
13        *titles I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by*  
14        *grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the*  
15        *procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services;*  
16        *and*

17        “(3) the term ‘permanent resident of the United  
18        *States’ when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any*  
19        *native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United*  
20        *States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-*  
21        *sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of*  
22        *section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any*  
23        *person admitted as a conditional entrant under section*  
24        *203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”*

25        (d) Section 610 of such Act is amended by striking

1 out "carry out such investigations and studies, including con-  
 2 sultation with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may  
 3 be necessary" and inserting in lieu thereof "work in co-  
 4 operation with the Director of the Administration on Aging".

5 (e) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is amended by strik-  
 6 ing out "part A of title II" and inserting in lieu thereof  
 7 "title II".

8 (f) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by in-  
 9 serting after section 610-1 the following new section:

10 "LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE

11 VOLUNTARILY POOR

12 "SEC. 610-2. The Director shall take such action as may  
 13 be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligi-  
 14 bility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty,  
 15 such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria  
 16 if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good  
 17 cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his  
 18 health, age, education, and ability."

19 AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

20 SEC. 107. Section 701(b) of the Economic Opportunity  
 21 Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out "July 1, 1965"  
 22 and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1968", and (2) by  
 23 inserting before the period at the end thereof the following:  
 24 "; nor shall funds be withheld from any such State by reason  
 25 of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which pre-



1 vents the State from complying with the requirements of  
 2 such subsection, until the first day of the fourth month after  
 3 the State legislature next adjourns following the effective  
 4 date of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967".

#### 5 VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

6 SEC. 108. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act  
 7 of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### 8 "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER

#### 9 SERVICE PROGRAMS

#### 10 "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

#### 11 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

12 "SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-  
 13 time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-  
 14 term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer  
 15 programs, together with other powers and responsibilities  
 16 designed to assist in the development and coordination of  
 17 volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and  
 18 supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and  
 19 enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups,  
 20 including elderly and retired Americans, to perform mean-  
 21 ingful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or  
 22 short-term programs in their home or nearby communities,  
 23 and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban  
 24 communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant work-  
 25 ers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions,

1 *and situations where the application of human talent and*  
 2 *dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps*  
 3 *of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-*  
 4 *advancement.*

5       *“PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS*

6       *“AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS*

7       *“SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and*  
 8 *train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and*  
 9 *upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private*  
 10 *nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to*  
 11 *work—*

12       *“(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or*  
 13 *related needs of Indians living on reservations, of mi-*  
 14 *gratory workers and their families, or of residents of*  
 15 *the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto*  
 16 *Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or*  
 17 *the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;*

18       *“(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally*  
 19 *ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit*  
 20 *mental health or mental retardation facilities; and*

21       *“(3) in connection with programs or activities*  
 22 *authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for*  
 23 *assistance under this Act.*

24       *“(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section*  
 25 *shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions*



1 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special  
2 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups  
3 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as  
4 the Director may determine, including work assignments  
5 in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under  
6 this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State  
7 without the consent of the Governor.

8 "TERMS OF SERVICE

9 "SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-  
10 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating  
11 poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among  
12 and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain  
13 available for service without regard to regular working hours,  
14 at all times during their term of service, except for author-  
15 ized periods of leave.

16 "(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for  
17 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-  
18 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are  
19 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as  
20 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than  
21 two months where he determines that this more limited  
22 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

23 "(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-  
24 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by  
25 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001

1 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with  
2 respect to that oath or affirmation.

3 "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

4 "SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to  
5 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on  
6 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month  
7 during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide  
8 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons  
9 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance  
10 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated  
11 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.  
12 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel  
13 (including travel to and from the place of training), and  
14 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,  
15 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other  
16 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their  
17 needs.

18 "(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of  
19 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances  
20 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,  
21 or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the  
22 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount  
23 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the  
24 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5  
25 U.S.C. 5582).



1       “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-  
2       tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent  
3       volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience  
4       which they have derived from their training and service in  
5       the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty  
6       as members of the helping professions.

7       *"PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER*  
8                     *PROGRAMS*

## 9 "COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

10       “SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs  
11   designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-  
12   pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for  
13   shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment  
14   under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-  
15   ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination  
16   of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or  
17   arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,  
18   or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are  
19   undertaken in connection with these programs. These  
20   projects may include, without limitation, activities designed  
21   (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-  
22   pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted  
23   under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs  
24   designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2)

1 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,  
2 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for  
3 the development or betterment of urban and rural neighbor-  
4 hoods or areas having especially large concentrations or pro-  
5 portions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping  
6 residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the  
7 competence necessary to take advantage of public and  
8 private resources which would not otherwise be available or  
9 used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national  
10 and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to  
11 obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide spe-  
12 cialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on  
13 agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, oper-  
14 ating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having  
15 similar critical needs.

16 “(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section  
17 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such  
18 other support or allowances as the Director determines,  
19 pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual  
20 or special circumstances affecting the project.

21 “(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable  
22 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-  
23 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal  
24 Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions  
25 of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting



1 in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such  
2 person.

3 "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

4 "SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or  
5 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs  
6 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-  
7 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer  
8 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title.  
9 Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or  
10 allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for  
11 any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

12 "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

14 "SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to  
15 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title  
16 with one another, with community action programs, and  
17 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-  
18 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,  
19 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-  
20 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in  
21 providing necessary support to programs under part B  
22 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or  
23 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A  
24 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director  
25 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,

1 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related  
2 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging  
3 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and  
4 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures  
5 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-  
6 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to  
7 this part.

8 "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

9 "SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall  
10 take necessary steps, including the development of special  
11 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest partici-  
12 pation of older persons and older persons membership groups  
13 as volunteers and participant agencies in the various pro-  
14 grams and activities authorized under this title and, because  
15 of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty  
16 group, shall encourage the development of a variety of  
17 volunteer services to older persons, including special projects,  
18 to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

19 "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

20 "SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),  
21 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal  
22 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws  
23 relating to Federal employment.

24 "(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance  
25 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services



1 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter  
2 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-  
3 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-  
4 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same  
5 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a)  
6 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of  
7 the computation described in 116(a)(2)(B) the monthly  
8 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under  
9 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5,  
10 United States Code.

11 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

12 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations  
13 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities  
14 which would not otherwise be performed and which will not  
15 result in the displacement of employed workers or impair  
16 existing contracts for service.

17 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to  
18 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest  
19 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of  
20 volunteer programs.

21 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are  
22 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any  
23 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any  
24 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such  
25 agency or organization.

1                               “DURATION OF PROGRAM

2           “SEC. 835. *The Director shall carry out the programs*  
3 *provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June*  
4 *30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each*  
5 *such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the*  
6 *Congress may authorize by law.”*

7                               TITLE II—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

8           SEC. 201. (a) *Whoever, being an officer, director,*  
9 *agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any*  
10 *agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic*  
11 *Opportunity Act of 1964 embezzles, willfully misapplies,*  
12 *steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds,*  
13 *assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or con-*  
14 *tract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity*  
15 *Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or*  
16 *imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the*  
17 *amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by*  
18 *fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more*  
19 *than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.*

20           (b) *Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any*  
21 *person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal*  
22 *to renew a contract of employment in connection with a*  
23 *grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Oppor-*  
24 *tunity Act of 1964 induces any person to give up any*  
25 *money or thing of any value to any person (including such*



1 grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or  
2 imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

3                   *TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE*

4       *SEC. 301. The amendments made by this Act shall be*  
5 *in effect immediately upon its enactment, except as provided*  
6 *in this section. Until June 30, 1968, the provisions of*  
7 *section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964*  
8 *as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act*  
9 *shall apply to community action agencies in existence and*  
10 *funded prior to the enactment of this Act, except that in*  
11 *any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency*  
12 *prior to June 30, 1968, adequate provision shall be made*  
13 *for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and*  
14 *funds to any community action agency designated pursuant*  
15 *to sections 210 or 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act*  
16 *of 1964 as amended by this Act.*

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes."

Passed the Senate October 5, 1967.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

*Secretary.*

90TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

**S. 2388**

Union, and ordered to be printed

---

---

## AN ACT

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

---

---

OCTOBER 9, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

OCTOBER 27, 1967

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed









# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 3, 1967  
For actions of November 2, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 178

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....13	Farm center.....52	Patents.....60
Air pollution.....14	Farm program.....26	Personnel...12,16,32,42,63
Animal care.....37	Fees and charges.....41	Poverty.....5,15,48
Appropriations.....43	Flood insurance.....4,29	Public works.....12
Banking.....19,53	Foreign aid.....12	Reclamation.....35
Budget.....64	Foreign trade.....2,20,39	Recreation.....1,33
Buildings.....51	Forestry.....2,17,62	Regulatory agencies.....56
Butter.....9	Incentive awards.....16	Research.....37,40
Civil rights.....11	Interest rates.....36	Rural areas.....32,49
Commodity reserves.....34	Intergovernmental	Senior citizens.....54
Congressional reform...24	relations.....12	Small business.....25,59
Consumer credit.....30,57	Leave.....42	Social security.....12
Containers.....58	Legislative program....12	Taxation.....50
Cotton-seed oil.....20	Library services.....7,27	Textile imports.....39
County committees.....63	Loans.....36	Time.....45
Economy.....6,21,28	Log exports.....2	Tobacco.....55
Education.....46	Manpower.....16	Water pollution.....10,44
Electrification.....38,61	Meat inspection.....3,22	Watersheds.....8,18
Employment.....12,32	Mexican Americans.....31	Wheat producers.....47
Export-Import Bank.....19	Natural resources.....23	Wilderness areas.....1

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 7

### SENATE

1. RECREATION. Passed as reported S. 1321, to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness, and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area. pp. S15755-9
2. FORESTRY. Sen. Hatfield recommended a limitation on log exports to Japan from the Pacific Northwest and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S15733-5

3. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Mondale urged a strong meat inspection program to include all meat sold to the public and criticized certain meatpacking industry official for "initiation of a political slush fund" in an effort to help "friendly" Congressmen. pp. S15742-3
4. FLOOD INSURANCE. Conferees were appointed on S. 1985, to provide for a national program of flood insurance. House conferees have been appointed. pp. S15771-5
5. POVERTY. Sen. Javits urged passage of the poverty bill and early appropriations to carry out this program. pp. S15754-5
6. ECONOMY. Sen. Proxmire continued his discussion on the current record of economic expansion and inserted an article on this subject. p. S15731
7. LIBRARY SERVICES. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13048, to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act (S. Rept. 716). p. S15709
8. WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment S. 2514, to grant the consent of Congress to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District Compact (S. Rept. 720). p. S15709
9. BUTTER. Sen. McGovern was added as a cosponsor to S. 2527, to encourage the movement of butter into domestic commercial markets. p. S15712
10. POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 1341, the proposed Clean Lakes Act of 1967, and S. 1870, to authorize appropriations for mine area acid pollution control demonstration projects. p. D990
11. CIVIL RIGHTS. The Daily Digest states that H. R. 2516, the civil rights bill, was reported with amendment following adjournment (S. Rept. 721). p. D988
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority leader announced the legislative program for next week which includes: Mon., S. 830, age discrimination in employment; Tues., S. 699, to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation. Also, it is anticipated that some time next week the conference report on the public works appropriation bill, the foreign aid authorization bill, and the social security bill will be considered. p. S15779
13. ADJOURNED until Mon., Nov. 6. p. S15779

HOUSE

14. AIR POLLUTION. Passed with amendment, S. 780, to improve and expand programs designed to eliminate air pollutants. pp. H14393-453, H14470-1
15. POVERTY. The Rules Committee reported a rule for the consideration of S. 2388, the poverty bill. p. H14529  
Several Representatives discussed pro and con the poverty program. pp. H14392, H14458-60, H14481-3, H14485-91, H14509-10, H14514-18
16. PERSONNEL. Received from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a report on the Government Employees' Incentive Awards Act (H. Rept. 885), and a report



## CONSIDERATION OF S. 2388

---

NOVEMBER 2, 1967.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 966]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 966, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○





## House Calendar No. 149

90TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 966

[Report No. 884]

---

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 2, 1967

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;  
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

## RESOLUTION

1       *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it  
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into  
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the  
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide  
5 an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds  
6 for the continued operation of economic opportunity pro-  
7 grams, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and  
8 for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill  
9 are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be  
10 confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed six  
11 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman  
12 and ranking minority member of the Committee on Educa-

tion and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.





90TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 966

[Report No. 884]

---

## RESOLUTION

---

Providing for consideration of S. 2388 to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. MADDEN

---

NOVEMBER 2, 1967

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 6, 1967  
For actions of November 3, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 179

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12	Farm Bureau.....13	Poverty.....1,11
Animal drugs.....11	Federal employees.....2	Product safety.....11
Appropriations.....17	Flood control.....6	Small business.....3
Commodity reserve.....10	Job Corps.....9	Spending.....4
Consumer affairs.....8,14	Legislative program.....11	Tariffs.....5
Credit unions.....2	Meat inspection.....7,15	Vegetable oil.....5
Education.....4	Payroll allotments.....2	
Employment.....16	Peanuts.....11	

HIGHLIGHT: House adopted resolution for consideration of poverty bill.

### HOUSE

1. POVERTY. Adopted, 262-39, a resolution for the consideration of S. 2388, the poverty bill. pp. H14531-39

Rep. Thompson, N. J., urged passage of the poverty bill. p. H14580

2. CREDIT UNIONS. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6157, to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotments; and H. R. 13489, amended, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, and dividend provisions. p. D994

3. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Conte commended the Small Business Administration system and urged its continuance as an independent agency. p. H14546

4. SPENDING. Rep. Gude urged "in light of the present deficit and the need to establish priorities in Federal spending," that educational needs receive top priority in any future supplemental appropriations. p. H14550  
Rep. Wyman criticized Government "overspending...year after year," urged "prudent fiscal policies," and inserted a supporting editorial. pp. H14565-6  
Rep. Ashbrook inserted a Wall Street Journal editorial, "Prescription for Paralysis," referring to the findings of the Tax Foundation's study, "Growth Trends of New Federal Programs: 1955-68." p. H14566
5. VEGETABLE OIL. Rep. Findley inserted a copy of a wire he sent this Department asking "that you reconsider your decision of October 30, 1967 in which you decided recommending that the President use Section XXII Authority to raise tariffs on imports of Soviet vegetable oil" by a firm which is expected to unload 20 million pounds of Soviet oil this weekend in New Orleans. pp. H14563-4
6. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. DeLa Garza commended the action program agreed upon by President Johnson and President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico to complete flood control projects in the Rio Grande Valley and other actions that would give "priority attention to a program of social and economic rehabilitation of the lower Rio Grande Valley." p. H14585
7. MEAT INSPECTION. Rep. Foley inserted Rep. Poage's statement describing in chronological order the events connected with the proposed "solicitation" of election funds by a meatpacker. pp. H14571-3
8. CONSUMER AFFAIRS. Rep. Rosenthal expressed gratitude that the "moral case for consumer protection continues to be made" and inserted an article by a member of the President's Consumer Advisory Council. p. H14573  
Rep. Howard inserted the text of the remarks of the President at the Consumer Assembly. pp. H14577-8
9. JOB CORPS. Rep. Mink inserted an article, "Job Corps Does Good Job on Kauai." pp. H14576-7
10. COMMODITY RESERVE. Rep. Foley expressed regret "that a majority of the members of the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture chose to defeat" the commodity reserve bill and inserted a statement by Dr. Schnittker following the defeat of the legislation, a copy of his testimony and several newspaper articles. pp. H14578-80
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following program: Mon., the Consent Calendar, the poverty bill, and the following suspensions: Peanut acreage allotment bill, Product Safety Commission bill, animal drug bill, Tues. the poverty bill, which will continue through the balance of the week or until the bill is concluded. p. H14540
12. ADJOURNED until Mon., Nov. 6. p. H14586

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. FARM BUREAU. Extension of remarks of Rep. Resnick criticizing "giant cooperatives--usually affiliated with the Farm Bureau--which have been victimizing the American farmer by issuing patronage dividends", and stating many cooperatives --certainly a large majority--are truly farmer controlled and farmer owned." p. A5412





Please return to  
Division of Legislative Reporting  
Office of Budget and Finance

United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1967

No. 179

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, November 6, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.*—Luke 11: 28.

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee for the coming of another day and for the opportunity it provides to work with Thee in the service of our country. May the hours glow with the glory of Thy presence and in everything we do may we be mindful of Thy good spirit.

We come to Thee with real regrets and high hopes, each one of us with a prayer of our own. If we are weary, strengthen us; if we are worried, grant us a peace that calms anxiety; if we are wayward in thought and deed, steady us; if we are wavering in our allegiance to high ideals, be Thou our rock and our fortress; if we are forever seeking our own way, help us to see that there may be other ways and above all to see Thy way.

Enable us to meet the tasks of this day with unwavering strength and unwearying endurance. May we continue our work with an integrity of spirit and a steadfastness of purpose, to Thy glory and for the good of our Nation. In the name of Christ, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 2, 1967.

The Clerk began the reading of the Journal.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 360]

Abbutt	Fuqua	Nix
Adair	Gardner	Ottinger
Andrews, Ala.	Gathings	Passman
Ashley	Glamo	Pettis
Aspinall	Gubser	Philbin
Barrett	Gurney	Pickle
Berry	Haley	Poage
Bingham	Hallock	Pool
Boggs	Halpern	Pryor
Bray	Hammer-	Rarick
Broomfield	schmidt	Resnick
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Harsha	Ruppe
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	St. Germain
Burleson	Hathaway	St. Onge
Button	Heckler, Mass.	Sandman
Casey	Helstoski	Selden
Celler	Herlong	Sikes
Chamberlain	Horton	Smith, Iowa
Clerk	Hull	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Ichord	Snyder
Corman	Jarman	Springer
Cowger	Jones, Mo.	Steed
Culver	Jones, N.C.	Taft
Cunningham	Karthe	Teague, Tex.
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Daddario	Kluczynski	Tieman
Dawson	Kuykendall	Tunney
Denney	Leggett	Utt
Derwinski	Lloyd	Waggonner
Diggs	Long, La.	Waldie
Dow	McEwen	Walker
Dulski	McMillan	Watkins
Eckhardt	Mathias, Calif.	Watson
Esch	Mathias, Md.	Watts
Eshleman	Meeds	Wiggins
Everett	Meskill	Williams, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Michel	Williams, Pa.
Farbstein	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Fino	Morgan	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Morris, N. Mex.	Wilson,
Ford,	Mosher	Charles H.
William D.	Multer	Winn
Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyder
Fraser	Myers	
Fulton, Tenn.	Nelsen	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 298 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### THE JOURNAL

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with further reading of the Journal?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with further reading of the Journal.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the rollcall just disclosed the presence of a quorum.

The motion was agreed to.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 966 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 966

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity

H 14531



Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader the program for this afternoon, the measures which it is anticipated will be brought up.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the only legislative business this afternoon is the pending resolution which the gentleman from Indiana has called up.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 966) calls up for debate and amendment S. 2388, properly known as the poverty relief legislation, or officially the Economic Opportunity Act. Chairman PERKINS and members of the Health, Education, and Labor Committee are to be commended for the 26 days of public hearings and the many days in executive session in the task of assembling this legislation and the accompanying report.

On Monday, and Tuesday—city elections—general debate is scheduled, and on Wednesday the House will consider amendments and a rollcall vote on this legislation.

I do hope that these days of debate will be on a high level, eliminating false charges and exaggerated criticism of this much-needed and necessary legislation.

A nationwide, complex organization to conduct the many offices and personnel

required to successfully administer this vast national program cannot be streamlined to perfection in the short time that it has been in operation. No doubt there have been mistakes made by various officials, supervisors, and OEO personnel, but I am satisfied that the top officials are doing everything possible to correct and eliminate some of these mistakes and errors of organization.

#### JOB TRAINING

In the hearings yesterday by the Rules Committee, one of our colleagues in criticizing some of the various branches of the so-called poverty administration, stated that amendments would be offered to this bill for the purpose of giving private enterprise the responsibility to create and expand jobs for the unemployed and training for the uneducated or inexperienced American youth who have not had the opportunities to learn a trade requiring skill or some of the construction "craft" jobs. At the committee hearings yesterday I called attention to the impossibility of this succeeding, owing to the fact that industry, business, and private enterprise are not equipped to carry out the many functions that the EOA program is gradually and successfully solving in order to improve and expand our future economy.

As an example, I called the committee's attention to the situation existing in the great industries of the Calumet region of Indiana, which I represent. The three major steel mills, a half dozen oil refineries, and several hundred other factories and free enterprise institutions have, during the last 15 or 20 years, installed modern laborsaving machinery which enables an industry to put out twice the production with but 25 percent of labor required 15 or 20 years ago. For instance a retired employee of United States Steel in Gary said that in one department where he worked in 1945 approximately 700 people were employed. Today, by reason of the installation of modern, scientific, electrical, pushbutton machinery, almost twice the amount of steel is being produced with only approximately 100 employees. The same situation applies to thousands of factories and mills throughout America. The problem that this Congress and our Government must try to solve is to provide employment and income for millions of part-time or unemployed families. They must have food, clothing, and education.

Two weeks ago the newspapers over the Nation carried a report that the population in the United States reached 200 million persons. Older folks remember 1915 when great publicity was given to the fact that our country reached the 100 million mark in population. This same article predicts that the next 100 million will arrive not 50 years from now, but approximately 22 years from now. Surveys have been made revealing that 71 percent of our population is now living in urban centers. If the prophecy of this newspaper article is correct, 22 years from now the cities and urban centers will have 71 million more people added to the present population of approximately 210 million people confined to our metropolitan areas. Unless

the Government supervises and enacts legislation along the lines of the so-called Equal Opportunity Act, which we are considering today, this Nation will be faced with unemployment, uprisings, riots, discontent, and the danger of the very foundations of our present system of government being destroyed and overthrown.

#### HEADSTART

I do not maintain that the enactment of this program, the so-called poverty program, is the solution, but I do say that during its rather brief existence it has helped millions of our unemployed and poverty-stricken families and millions of our young folks to be given an opportunity to learn a trade or skill that will enable them to provide for themselves. In addition, millions of younger children have been given invaluable information in the so-called Headstart programs in order to instill in their young minds the necessity to continue their education to lay a foundation to become productive future citizens of America.

In my congressional district there are 28 centers established to meet the comprehensive education, health, and welfare needs of economically deprived children who are about to enter school. Approximately 2,000 youngsters were enrolled in this program during the summer of 1967. These youngsters received a complete medical and dental checkup and followup work when necessary. In addition, parents are encouraged to take an active part in the program.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

The neighborhood opportunity centers are also established in my district to help poverty-stricken and backward people learn methods to aid and help their families. Different church societies and organizations, health groups, visiting nurses, human relations groups, and so forth, are all taking interest in the poverty program in the Calumet region of Indiana. The Trade Winds Rehabilitation Center in Gary, financed with free labor by the AFL Building Trades Union, has been working in cooperation with the poverty program in conducting a speech and hearing class for economically deprived children in aiding them to speak plainly and build confidence so they can enter school with their young neighbors. The OEO organization has also established a home management and consumer education project, aiding low-income women to learn techniques which would improve homelife and teach them to become effectively involved in their communities. The Visiting Nurses Association of East Chicago are working in cooperation with the OEO in establishing a public health and education program for low-income families. In my area the OEO established numerous summer programs for grade and high school children to be given the opportunity for exercise and practical education outside the schoolroom, and these programs have greatly reduced juvenile delinquency in our district. They have provided summer day camps, swimming programs, and other recreation for the youth.

#### VISTA

Many volunteers have joined the VISTA program in order to visit homes



and aid in every way to improve and uplift the lives of poor and impoverished American families. This work has brought about great results in aiding parents with delinquent boys and girls in elevating their home life and extending cooperation to place their youth in temporary jobs or pursuits that will take them off the streets and away from youthful clubs and gangs. The poverty program has also established a free and voluntary nursing project. Many doctors have volunteered to aid in expanding these programs.

I fully realize that it is difficult for some Members of Congress, representing rural districts and smaller towns throughout the country, to visualize the hazards and the shocking conditions which exist in the slum areas of most metropolitan cities.

Statistics reveal that in the average metropolitan industrial communities that 13.8 percent of the families have an income of less than \$3,000 per year.

Approximately 3 percent of the families have an income of less than \$1,000 annually.

Nine percent of the families are in houses which are substandard.

About 6 percent received aid from dependent children's funds.

Of the total population over the age of 65 approximately 11 percent receive old-age assistance.

As I previously outlined in my remarks, there will be approximately 70 million more people living in these urban areas 20 years from now. The situation is critical now, and as the years pass it will not only expand and become more critical, but if the Congress and the Government reject their responsibilities to solve these problems it might mean that in another generation the very citadels and pillars of our free enterprise system as we know it will be destroyed. The next generation will condemn our present-day leaders for not erecting and providing solutions and barriers against the continuance and expansion of these conditions.

Some Members are deploring the cost of this OEO program. We should not forget that millions of our youth and unemployed will be placed on an income-producing basis in a few years, by reason of this training and cooperative assistance. They will become taxpayers instead of dependents on future tax relief rolls. After World War II our gross national product was approximately \$202 billion—today it is approximately \$770 billion, so the Nation can easily afford this solid investment in our future.

I hope the Congress enacts this legislation and provides for future expansion so we can bring about a curtailment of poverty, unemployment, and discontent throughout the land.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather interesting to observe some of the language that is contained in this resolution, the resolu-

tion that would make in order the consideration of the so-called antipoverty bill, because it says on line 4 of this resolution that it is to "provide for an improved Economic Opportunity Act." That, certainly, is a result devoutly to be hoped for in view of all the criticism that has emerged and the strife that has swirled around this program since its inception.

Mr. Speaker, upon occasion it is very interesting, and usually very instructive, to go back and read the debates which have taken place in this body, debates as they relate to legislation—and I did that last night.

Mr. Speaker, I thought of our late and distinguished colleague, our beloved friend from Ohio, the late Clarence Brown, who spoke almost in prophetic terms about this program as we opened the debate back in 1964, at a time, incidentally, when it carried a price tag of only \$962 million, and not the \$2 billion-plus we have today. In referring to this legislation he said:

In my 46 years during which I have served in public life I have never seen a piece of legislation so loosely drawn, so poorly prepared, so poorly written, and so badly drawn.

Mr. Speaker, he said that in 1964.

We heard, of course, when we had the so-called Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 pending before us some of the same apologies, some of the same excuses that were offered previously, that after all, we were plowing new ground, and that this was an experimental area and, therefore, we had to expect many mistakes.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress are getting letters currently from their constituent-taxpayers back home, constituents who object to the tax-load and who are a little bit hard pressed. When they are told they must overlook these mistakes for just another year they get upset.

One constituent writes to the effect that he realizes that we are harassed because he says he wonders what Moses would have done with the Ten Commandments if he had to get them through the legislative process? What does it take to accomplish these objectives, even after the Committee on Education and Labor had held 26 days of hearings, and after all of these witnesses had come to testify before that committee in behalf of the bill which I still think represents much less than what we hope for and stands in very obvious need of improvement.

Mr. Speaker, it was back in March 1964 that the President declared a national war on poverty. The announced objective at that time, of course, was "total victory."

As of June 1967—and I do not have later figures than these—but as of June 1967 the total national expenditure under this program had been \$7.2 billion and now we are asked to authorize an additional \$2,060 million.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the results that have been achieved to date do very little to bear out the hope of "total victory," or the very optimistic prediction that was made by the Director a little while ago—or, maybe, it

was a year ago now—that by 1976 when we celebrate the bicentennial anniversary of our national independence, we would also have been able to eliminate the scourge of poverty and would be able to celebrate the elimination of poverty. That scarcely seems likely, in view of the matters that were brought out at the hearings held on this particular bill.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, the question was asked in the Committee on Rules yesterday—while Members of Congress are certainly united in their belief that we ought to attack poverty and that we are trying to do something to eliminate the substandard conditions that do afflict many of the people in this country—why do we have to have all this controversy about this legislation?

I believe all the reasons will be brought out during the general debate we will have next week. But I believe, frankly, part of the difficulty lies in simply the very poor administration of the legislation.

Back in February of this year, 1967, I had a letter from the community action director of my own community, in which he had something to say about the regional office in the State of Illinois which is charged with the overall supervision of the program. Here are some of the complaints that he made:

Lack of communication and direction within the policy group of the regional office; unreasonable control held by the staff of the regional office over the local communities; shifting of staff within the regional office until it has become a musical chair game, and makes it impossible for the local community to function. We spend most of our time having to re-document, reiterate, retrain personnel about the peculiarities and basic background of our community and program.

I took the trouble at that time to call the Director of the Poverty Office, Mr. Shriver, to ask for a conference to try to meet these problems of administration in my own State and my own area. Mr. Shriver did not come, but he sent a representative, and we had a long talk about the failings of the northeast regional office, and one might have been hopeful that as a result of this some improvement would be forthcoming. I believe it is obvious that that has not taken place. Just a little more than a month ago I received a copy of a letter from the clerk from our county in Illinois, which he was writing to the director of the regional office in which he said:

I have been instructed by a unanimous vote of the executive committee of the Springfield and Sangamon County Community Action, Inc., taken on September 12, 1967, to write this letter to you in re the approved budget for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1968.

Then he went on to say:

The committee as a whole is unable to comprehend how people located 200 miles from Springfield can better determine our needs than a hard-working volunteer group and professional staff on the spot. This is especially true when the staff of the district office in Chicago has not made a survey of our community.

Or even considered what their needs were.

That problem of administration certainly continues to exist, at least, within



the regional office that is responsible for the programs in my own State of Illinois. I believe, furthermore, that some of the trouble that the OEO office has can be laid at their own door because of the overly optimistic predictions they have made, and some of the propaganda they have indulged in to describe the vast successes they claim under this program.

I note that last year Mr. Shriver in the hearings on the program said that more than 3 million poor people had been reached and more than 5,000 who were residents of the areas were serving on these community action boards.

I believe maybe the ultimate in this propaganda campaign was reached the other day when COPE sent me a pronouncement in which they very estatically proclaimed "Breakthrough on 50-State Front, 7 Million People Aided."

Of course, that is not very precise language.

What do they mean about aiding people? What do they mean when they say they have reached 3 million people, that they have involved 5,000 members on these boards?

The difficulty that I find with this report, and with the hearings, is that when we get right down to it there is not the data, there is not the information or criteria by which we can back up some of the highly optimistic things that have been said by the OEO about itself.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of the hearings; does the gentleman have, or has he been able to obtain, all of the committee hearings in connection with this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I have received in my office three volumes of hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I note that the report speaks of four volumes.

Mr. GROSS. There are actually five volumes.

I am surprised that this bill is even up today for consideration, even of the rule, without the hearings being available—all the hearings being available to the Members of the House. There are two volumes that cannot be obtained as of noon today.

Also, there is information that was supplied to the committee, and the Members of the House who were not on the committee are advised to go to the still unattainable volumes of the hearings in order to get the information that was supplied in answer to questions.

I say again, I am surprised that this bill would come to the floor of the House without the hearings being printed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a very pertinent point. I might add that one witness in testifying before the Committee on Rules voiced the objection that all too often in trying to ascertain the facts about this program from the OEO there is a great tendency to conceal, until at least a very late date, some of the pertinent information that ought to be made available, particularly to members of the

Committee on Education and Labor which has direct oversight of this program.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Does the gentleman know whether or not anybody from the Salvation Army was asked in to appear as a witness?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. A great many witnesses were called, but whether there was anyone from that particular group, I am not sure.

Basically, it gets down to this, that as the minority views in the report state, what this program needs is a fundamental redirection, and that is not obtained in the kind of cosmetic job that has been done on the OEO in this bill.

They have tried to change the idea of perhaps turning community action programs to local government units, and said that they shall be a community action agency unless they do not wish to do it themselves.

The committee made some changes as to the Job Corps, providing for nonresidential centers as well as residential centers and lowering the direct operating costs of the enrollee to \$6,500.

They have done a few other things in an effort, I think, to dress up this legislation, but certainly as I read the report, and as I listened to the chairman of the committee yesterday when he testified before the Committee on Rules, I could not get away from the feeling that along with the increased money being called for, we were not getting the kind of redirection and fundamental change in the program that most people believe is needed.

You know, we hear over and over again that all that is being asked for in many of these administration grants and programs called for here is a little seed money. That is the favorite expression. It reminds me of the old story the late Fred Allen used to tell about some Christians being people who go out and sow their wild oats 6 days a week and then go to church on Sunday and pray for a crop failure. It seems to me we are almost in the position of praying for a crop failure in some of these demonstration programs where a complete jungle has grown up of administrative overgrowth, and very little in the way of tangible accomplishment can be seen through the jungle.

I would hope as we proceed through the general debate and read the bill under the 5-minute rule, that we could do some of the things here on the floor that, unfortunately, were not accomplished during the time that this bill was considered in committee.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman indicated that the committee bill did propose what he called redirection in the community action programs.

May I inquire whether you do not agree that—to require community ac-

tion agencies to be dominated by city hall, and further to require that 10 percent of the amount which will be required for local community action efforts to be made in cash rather than in kind—will that not, in many cases, do very serious damage to the concept of independent community action agencies?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Certainly, in answer to the gentleman's question, the effect of the amendment that he described could be to place a community action program under the domination of city hall; I would agree. This would not be the kind of fundamental redirection that we need to really involve the poor and to have the kind of program needed to solve the problem of poverty.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I concur completely. I think this is a significant point which the House will have to consider as it begins general debate next week and considers various amendments. That is the question of how we can meaningfully involve both those who are to be served and those units of our Federal, local, and State governments, which must have a role to play in the war against poverty.

My fear is, as I would understand from what the gentleman has said, unless we can move in such a direction we will have lost the initiative and we will foreclose really creative participation of the poor themselves by the amendments which were adopted by the committee and which I hope will be overturned on the floor of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I will be pleased to yield to those who are on their feet, but before my time is up, I have one question that I must ask, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky. This question was raised, you will recall, Mr. PERKINS, in the Rules Committee yesterday. Great concern has been expressed about section 406 of title IV, which would seem to read the Small Business Administration out of the picture as far as its Office of Procurement Assistance is concerned. It is an office now, as I understand, that administers a number of programs that are designed to funnel contracts into distressed areas.

The fear has been expressed by small business that the SBA is going to find itself in competition with the EDA, the Commerce Department, and the ADO, to the point where it can no longer function effectively in procurement assistance. I understood the gentleman to say that he would accept an amendment to section 406 of title IV which would make clear that the SBA would continue to play its role in these programs.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to answer the gentleman from Illinois. First, let me state that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] offered the amendment which provided the terminology using "Secretary of Commerce" instead of "SBA." I stated yesterday, and I certainly intend to adhere to that statement, that I will accept an



amendment insofar as I am concerned, but I am in the process now of trying to work the amendment out with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER]. I told him yesterday that he and I would get together, and we intend to get together this afternoon. I do not see any reason why the language should not be changed. We need the Small Business Administration involved, and that, I believe, will be the intent of the committee. At least that would be my intent.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I have always admired the gentleman from Illinois. I can remember the very studious way that he has discussed this bill before. My little discussion with you now is an attempt to help point out the inconsistency in what you just said. First, you said the program was too loose. There were too many things going on. Then Mr. STEIGER rose and said, "Don't you think the Green amendment went too far?"

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman suffer an interruption at that point?

Mr. GIBBONS. What you are trying to do, Mr. ANDERSON, is unclear. There are many of us who think that the program needs tightening. I am the author of the 10-percent cash requirement amendment. That provision is in there for the purpose of making sure that we do not have programs unless someone in the local community is responsible enough to put up some money, some cash, to help those programs along. If a program is so wishy-washy that the local people cannot raise any cash, then I do not think there should be a program in that locality.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment? In answering the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER], I addressed myself to answering only that part of his question which related to the amendment making the local political subdivision the local community action agent. I did not comment on the 10-percent cash payment amendment. You may have a perfectly good case for the added cash contribution. But let me say this: I also qualified my answer and said that if the real purport of the other amendment—and I do not know whether you offered it or someone else did; I think it was Mrs. GREEN, perhaps, who offered the amendment—I said that if the real effect or purport of that amendment was to put these programs under the thumb of city hall, then certainly I would be opposed to it.

If, on the other hand, you can establish, as I hope you may be able to do during debate on this bill, that the effect will be to tighten up the program and to make it a better program, you do not have to be afraid about my support.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. We attempted to tighten up the program as many people on

your side have asked us to do. The amendment was adopted in open committee hearings and on a bipartisan vote. I am talking about the Green amendment and my amendment.

I thank the Members on the other side of the aisle who joined some of us on the Democratic side, who helped to adopt the Green amendment, because I think it was a real major bipartisan step forward.

I do not think this puts the program under the domination of city hall. The Green amendment sets up a series of options allowing the State to act, allowing the counties and cities to act, and if they fail to act or if they fail to comply with the criteria that all other community action programs have to carry out, then there is a possibility for these private nonprofit so-called community action agencies to come in, and it provides an orderly transition.

I believe when we get to that part of the debate, that all responsible Members on the floor, regardless of their party affiliation, will agree this is a step forward in helping to bring this program more into the mainstream of responsible America. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon, and all other members of the committee who voted to adopt this, for having taken a sound constructive step forward.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, before I yield further, may I have some assurance from the gentleman from Indiana that he will yield me some time, because I have some requests for time on my side, and before I yield further, I would like to know I will have some time to keep my promise to yield to these people.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will yield the gentleman some time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman in the well I am pleased that in the amendment as it is reported here, it is not contemplated it will simply place programs under the domination of local officials for their own gain. Of course, we would all be opposed to that. But I think, as expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, we are now delivering, in effect, the program to the local politicians.

In the report the gentleman will notice I am quoted by the minority, in the person of Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. GARDNER, because I stated that in deference to my concern for the poor and their benefits under this program, I would not take the lid off things I knew would redound to the disfavor of the entire program, and they said they respectfully disagreed with me and considered it was my obligation to make these things known, because they would reflect on the politicians.

I am going to be convinced by them, and I am in the debate next week going to take the lid off things that have been generated in the city of New York where public officials in New York have not been involved. And, in fact, the only politician involved has been the young mayor, a young politician of great virtue,

but he has run the program according to his own ideas. I will take the lid off, line by line, item by item, as to the kind of operations being conducted without participation of local public officials and maximum participation of the local poor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I do want to say, of course, it ought not to go unnoticed in passing that I think a very fundamental reason why some in the minority have felt that it is a mistake to make the local political subdivision the community action agency is the very real danger that, for obvious purposes of political patronage, the local agency may become the refuge for a lot of political hacks and people who are owed political favors and who simply are looking for a job, rather than being in a position to contribute creatively to the solution of a difficult problem. So there is some argument on the other side that we ought at least to throw out.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I would like to return to House Resolution 966, specifically to two things, on page 1, line 8, and page 3, line 2. The Committee on Rules in its wisdom has apparently seen fit to offer the House a rule waiving points of order, in the first instance against the bill, and in the second instance against the committee amendment as a substitute.

This will get us into the same legislative situation we have been in quite often recently, if the Committee in its wisdom sitting on this—that is, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union—accepts this amendment and separate amendments when we go back into the full House. Why is it necessary, in view of the content of the bill and the report submitted, to waive any points of order?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. There is a provision under title I that certain funds that are made available under part B—and title I, of course, deals with the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, work-training programs, and manpower programs in general—that there can be a reprogramming authority given to the Director of the poverty program with respect to funds that are allocated under part B of title I.

He can reprogram them and use them under another part of that title. This was the reason that was given to the committee for waiving points of order on the bill.

Mr. HALL. Is there any reason why the legislative body should not work its will on reprogramming by line item, as we do, for example, in the Committee on Armed Services when reprogramming questions come up? There is a real objection on the part of some of the individually elected legislators to a committee of the House superimposed over it taking away the right to waive points of order.

I would ask again the usual question, if the gentleman will yield further: Was this done at the behest of the commit-



tee, as submitted by the Parliamentarian, or in the wisdom of the Rules Committee?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It was done at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. The language requiring the waiver, he said, was language appearing on pages 146 and 147 of the bill. That deals with funds available for certain programs under part B of title I of the act.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I am disturbed by the conversation about city hall, as though this is an unfortunate way to administer programs. What better way do we have to appoint the people who administer these programs than through our regularly elected officers, in the duly elective process we customarily use? Is there a better system to get people to administer the program?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. There are those who feel that the maximum participation of the poor is not always achieved under situations where city hall dominates the program. The proposition probably is arguable.

Mr. HUNGATE. Would this be an argument that the elected Representatives are not representative of the people?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Ultimately one would have to come to that conclusion.

Mr. HUNGATE. I understand, under the present state of the bill, if there is a wish for the program to be continued they will have to put up \$1 to get \$9?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I believe that is the formula which is used.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I hear the argument advanced that this is a fairly new program and should be given an opportunity to test its merit.

The gentleman was on the Rules Committee in 1964 when this program was first presented to the House. It was then known as the Landrum-Powell bill or the Powell-Landrum bill.

I hear counterarguments that this program is indeed far different from the bill which first came to the House in 1964.

Is this really a new bill? I wonder if the gentleman could shed some light on that.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In my opinion, as I said, I do not feel it is. I believe, basically, it is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with a little cosmetic treatment here and there to dress it up. There is a fundamental change, perhaps, with respect to community action programs, and some fairly minor changes with regard to the Job Corps. Basically, I believe it represents the same approach we adopted initially in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 966 and I urge its prompt adoption.

The subject before us today is poverty. Not alone the poverty that afflicts 30 million Americans in our apparently affluent Nation but as well the poverty that afflicts this House. For in recent weeks I have heard Members of this body speak words that reflect the poverty of our commitment, the emptiness of our promise to the ghetto dwellers, to the rural poor, principally to the young people of this Nation.

Some have protested the cost. Others have proclaimed its ineffectiveness. But the question is not whether the poverty program has failed us, but rather whether we have failed it.

None would say the bill is perfect. None would argue that there should not be amendments—certainly not I.

But this House, I believe, will gravely misread the country if we fail to raise our sights to meet the expectations of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York 1 additional minute.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank both gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, to repeat, I believe that this House will gravely misread the country if we fail to raise our sights to meet the expectations of the American people. Just as the American people abhor crime and violence so do they reject facile and simplistic answers to problems that clearly cry out for difficult and complex solutions which indeed may not easily be obtained.

Let us recognize the \$2.06 billion authorization in this bill for what it is. Less than what we spend in Vietnam in 1 month and not nearly enough, even under present economic conditions, to do what is essential for those Americans still living in poverty—not out of fear of violence and riots but because it is right—and long overdue. It is clear that many Americans have not had the opportunities that our democracy and our national purpose, and the commitment they imply, in fact guarantee.

If in the days ahead we emasculate this program, if we renege on our pledge, if we cut the heart of creativity out of this endeavor in the name of efficiency or political pragmatism, then we will have borne witness not to our courage, conviction, and principles but, rather, to the poverty of this body. Our national purpose is not to enshrine the status quo but to forge a new life for all Americans—and in this generation.

Certainly I, for one, believe that we need to strengthen the job orientation of this program. There is no question, in my judgment, but what this House must stand back of the model cities and education and other programs that are as basic to our cities as is the legislation we are about to consider. I would remind this House that the city of New York,

as an example, needs at the very minimum \$50 billion in the next 10 years to address itself to the basic needs of its population.

So I deeply hope that the sights of this body will be raised and that we will not dash the hopes of those who have little to live on but faith. I think it is within our power to write a bill that will improve this program and thereby their lives, that will meet the problems of education and housing and job training and, I hope, that will make real the promise of America and the commitment of our Nation to all.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. All the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] has expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], who has just spoken. As I believe the poet John Ciardi once put it, a fool is a man with short answers to long questions. I oppose the rule and I oppose the bill not because we cannot afford to do something about poverty. I think we can afford better education, and I have so voted. I think we can afford better housing, and I have so voted. I think we can afford better wages, and I have so voted. I think we can afford better farm prices, and I have so voted. I think that the problem that we face here is not that we are not working to solved poverty, but this is not the way we are going to solve the problem. It reminds me, you know, of the story they tell about Casey Stengel in his playing days when he was beginning the game. He was on the bench and the outfielder in left field dropped the ball when they hit one to him. They hit another one out there, and he let it go between his legs. The manager then called for Casey and put him in left field. The first batter up hit one out there and Casey stood out there in the sun and lost the ball and it hit him on the shoulder. When the inning was over he ran back to the dugout and he said, "You know, that son-of-a-gun has left field so screwed up nobody can play it."

Mr. Speaker, I think his program is in that condition. I think we need to look thoroughly into this problem, but look at it in another manner.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that people used to wear asafetida bags to ward off illness. Also, there used to be the practice of bleeding a patient in the treatment of the disease with which he was afflicted. However, we learned that these processes did not do the job.



Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this is one of the problems we have here. I am hoping that those on the other side of the aisle, who support economy in Government will see this opportunity for what it is. I hope those on either side who say they believe in efficiency and the need for economy in our governmental programs, will see this as an opportunity to move in that direction. I say there are certain programs under which we can move to bring about economies. I hope they will recognize this program as an opportunity to accomplish the job.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can move on with the same money and build Dickey-Lincoln, and with the same money we can bring our farmers their fair share of our national prosperity while at the same time reducing poverty. We can build certain other public works with the same money we find in this program and accomplish desired results, creating real wealth and real jobs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can take action in this direction. It is for this reason that I oppose the bill and the rule on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I say to those who are calling for economy but who upon occasion vote the other way, those who call for efficiency and sound business management in Government that the time for this type of vote is now. In other words, those who are for economy and those on the other side of the aisle who unanimously voted along that line on the continuing resolution the other day, I hope you will not miss this opportunity to vote for economy.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for just a moment.

Mr. HAYS. I noticed this economy vote to which the gentleman referred. I just heard a speaker over there speak about the sum of \$50 billion which is needed for New York in the next 10 years alone. I hate to embarrass the gentleman because he is a great Congressman and a great advocate of the needs of the State of New York, but I do not think the temper of the Congress is to the effect they could expect to get \$50 billion or \$1.5 billion for the great State of New York at this time, or in the next 10 years.

I just wonder how the gentleman from Missouri feels about that.

Mr. HUNGATE. I think New York could use a good bit of funds, but I am not sure this Congress is the place to come for them.

Now we are going to hear a great debate and some eloquent oratory and the proponents of the bill will undoubtedly have the best of the argument. But when the debate is over and you go back home, you will still find the program is inefficient, unpopular, and obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, the story is told about Abraham Lincoln when he posed the question—"How many legs does a dog have?" A fellow standing by said, "Four." And, Lincoln says, "What if you call the tail a leg?" The guy said, "Five." Lincoln says, "You are wrong. Calling the tail a leg does not make it a leg. He still has four legs."

Calling this an antipoverty bill does not make it an effective one and therefore I urge opposition to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. The committee has adopted certain significant amendments, which in my opinion strengthen the bill and remove some of the sources which have brought the greatest criticism of the program. It is my further opinion that after they are thoroughly understood by the Members of this body the House will support them.

Mr. Speaker, what we have undertaken to do is to close up certain loopholes in areas where there has been the greatest degree of criticism of this program.

There are some who say that this is an amendment for the big cities. I really do not believe the big cities are concerned as to whether this amendment is adopted or not. When I say this I am referring to the big cities like New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and Detroit. All of these cities are moving along. They have their own programs and the elected officials are thoroughly involved in their operation. But, I am concerned about the small communities of America where elected officials have been completely ostracized from the antipoverty programs in their community.

Mr. Speaker, my good and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], talked about this matter of involving elected officials in the program. This summer we had a riot in Aurora, Ill. I called the mayor out there and discussed this with him.

He said that he thought some of the people in the poverty program had created some of the atmosphere for this problem.

I said to him "Why don't you recommend to the community action board to get rid of these and get a good program going?"

He said "I am not even on the community action board."

I said, "You are not even on the community action board? You are the mayor of this city, and you are not on the board?"

He said "No, because the nominating committee closed the nominations and refused to nominate me and put me on the board."

We had testimony before our committee on a community action board in New Jersey where a rump group bodily took over the community action board and excluded everybody from the community from the board. The Office of Economic Opportunity could not withhold any money from this self-appointed community board simply because they had a contract which OEO said it had to fulfill.

We are talking here about millions upon millions of taxpayers' money. What we have done in this bill, is provide that all money must be funneled through the

responsible elected officials of the community who periodically have to account for their stewardship to the voters.

It would seem to me that for someone to quarrel with the safeguards is really running against the whole philosophy of government in this country.

We provide that a community action agency, which must be either a State, county or municipal body, will have to appoint a community action board.

And here we provide that one-third of the board must be people from the area to be served, the poor people, and one-third must be the elected officials so they have a responsibility, and one-third shall be other interested parties.

So I say to you that we have strengthened this bill. We put in another amendment, and I hope you will fully consider this companion amendment which prohibits the Office of Economic Opportunity here in Washington to fund directly and bypass the Community Action Board, and fund directly to fly-by-night organizations with all sorts of programs that have been subjected to so much criticism since this program started.

I say to the Members this is a good amendment, and I hope the Members over the weekend will study the amendment, because this has been an area in which we have had the greatest criticism. We have not had criticism of this program in those communities of America where they have been run in cooperation with the local public officials. There they have a good program going. The criticism has come of those programs funded by some bureaucrat here in Washington deciding to ignore the community action board and ignoring the recommendations of the poor people, and everything else, and just went ahead and funded some program out of Washington in the community. This is where the criticism has come from, and where the programs are in trouble. That is why they are in trouble, and we have closed that gap in the committee bill. So I say to you we have strengthened the bill.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] was correct when he quoted from Mr. BROWN's statement in 1964 where Mr. BROWN said that this was a loosely written bill. I agree with him. I believe what we have done in the committee is tighten this up. I hope the House will support us in our efforts to make this a workable program.

[Mr. HAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLNBORN].

(Mr. ERLNBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on the future role of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I believe that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will be interested in the authenticity of the material contained in a 50-volume report the Office of Economic Opportunity released in January 1967.



Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced the forthcoming "Summary of Federal Social and Economic Programs" on November 22, 1966, at a press conference. He was most enthusiastic. He hailed the summary as a great aid to local government.

As I mentioned the summary was divided into 50 parts with a volume of statistics for each of the 50 States. The individual State reports were further divided by counties.

When Director Shriver sent each Congressman a copy of the summary for the Congressman's State, the Director noted that:

You will probably be able to find a few gaps. You might even find a mistake or two.

Recognizing that this was a new program, like many of the Office of Economic Opportunity directed experiments, I accepted the Director's explanation that a few mistakes might be detected in the material I had received.

In January I released the OEO report of a "Summary of Social and Economic Programs" to the newspapers in the Illinois 14th Congressional District. I distributed copies of the OEO county reports for both Du Page and Will Counties, Ill., and I forwarded the OEO summaries to nearly 200 local governments in my district. I accepted Director Shriver's statement that this material would aid local government.

The news media published the material on January 24, 1967. By January 26, 1967, I received notice of the first error in the tabulation for Du Page County, Ill.

Du Page County had been credited with a \$44,674 TB project. My staff spent February and most of March tracing down this error.

We discovered that the \$44,674 had not been funded to a Du Page TB project, but instead to a school district research program in adjoining Cook County, Ill.

The confusion did not end there. When other local governing agencies questioned other aspects of the OEO summary, I assigned a member of my staff with the task of contacting the Congressional Relations Office of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to recheck the validity of the report.

Several telephone inquiries failed to bring any response from the Office of Economic Opportunity. On April 4, 1967, a member of my staff made an appointment with a staff member at the OEO Washington Office. My staff member requested a copy of the original November 1966 press release and the Federal aid listing for Illinois counties that apparently was released that day.

We requested this initial information because newspaper stories published in December 1966, we discovered, reported a different total amount of Federal aid for Du Page County than had been included in the summary I received in January 1967. The original newstories indicated the summary would include a tabulation of war on poverty aid, Federal grants and loans to individuals and communities, and fundings listed as available in Federal Aid guide published by OEO the previous year.

I was, of course, surprised to learn that the fourth wealthiest county in the Nation received more than \$30 million in 1 year for this kind of aid.

Later I discovered the total reported for Du Page included more than \$28 million in social security payments.

The Office of Economic Opportunity supplied my staff member with a two-page report describing the "Federal information system," three pages of notes Director Shriver reportedly distributed to the news media on November 22, 1966, excluding any State or county summary, and a news release dated December 22, 1966, announcing that John Johnson had been named Director of the OEO Information Center.

Since I was not receiving the information I had requested from the Office of Economic Opportunity, I decided to direct my inquiries to the seven departments or agencies whose purported fundings for fiscal year 1966 had been included in the OEO summary for Du Page County, Ill.

On April 4, 1967, I sent letters requesting verification of the OEO summary to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Interior, the General Services Administration, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Small Business Administration.

Director Shriver's few possible mistakes mushroomed into at least one error in every section of the Du Page County summary. Not one department or agency, including, as it turned out, OEO itself, was able to completely verify the information contained in the Du Page County summary.

The errors uncovered ran into the millions of dollars and included not only errors for Du Page County, Ill., but at least one common error found in every one of the 50 volumes of the report for every State and every county in the Nation.

Yes, in the case of Du Page County, Ill., OEO was wrong seven times in seven department and agency funding summaries.

The direct reports I received, and I should add promptly received from the departments and agencies involved, uncovered more than \$6.8 million in OEO errors. Program fundings were credited to Du Page County in error. Other program fundings were omitted.

Let me briefly recount the extent of these errors with a by-the-Department report:

First. OEO reported fundings totaling \$3,290 for the Department of Agriculture. Omitted from the tabulation were a \$880 rural loan, \$326,826.05 county stabilization and conservation service aid, \$239,226.90 for milk to schools, and \$74,078.58 for school lunch programs, for a one-department error of \$641,011.53.

Second. OEO reported that the General Services Administration donated surplus property valued at \$6,619 to Du Page institutions. GSA did not start to participate in the OEO information service program until the 1967 fiscal year.

GSA told me:

We are unable to identify the source of the information reported by OEO for donations of surplus property to Du Page County, Illinois, as of June 30, 1966, since our first statistical report was made to OEO for the month of July 1966.

All summaries for GSA in all 50 volumes are in error. OEO later admitted this nationwide reporting mistake of more than \$4.7 million.

Third. OEO reported a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funding total of \$29,328,734. The correct total is \$31,098,267. In addition to omitting \$1.8 million in construction grants and loans to colleges, OEO reported incorrect figures for two other HEW programs and by error a Cook County school funding was listed as a Du Page County TB project.

Fourth. OEO's total for Department of Housing and Urban Development fundings was \$540,000. The correct figure is \$388,560.

Fifth. OEO reported Department of Interior expenditures of \$5,266 in Du Page. To be consistent with methodology used in other parts of the report this should have been credited to the State of Illinois because the water study grant was made to the State, not the county.

Sixth. OEO reported OEO expenditures of \$11,550 and included a loan acquired from the Department of Agriculture. Again, to be consistent with methodology the loan should not have been included in OEO fundings. The correct OEO total is \$10,670.

Seventh. OEO incorrectly reported Small Business Administration fundings totaling \$397,300. SBA reported that the correct total is \$228,000.

The total error I uncovered for just one county was \$2,111,039.32. OEO reported a Du Page County total of \$30,312,759. The separate departments and agencies informed me the correct total for these Federal fundings is \$32,423,798.32.

This is an example of the efficiency and accuracy of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It staggers my imagination to think of the total dollar error that would be uncovered if all Congressmen sought verification of the OEO summary of so-called statistics for each county in their congressional districts.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is a bureaucrats' haven for make-work experiments. OEO is inefficient and expensive. OEO must win the award for the world's worst bookkeeper.

OEO later regretted that the computerized listing confused me. Confused—I was dazed. The OEO Information Center was telling me that more than \$31.8 million in war on poverty moneys had been spent in one of the wealthiest congressional districts in the Nation during the first 10 months of the 1967 fiscal year.

The Information Center at OEO is responsible for the publication of tons of sheer mishmash. Its computer's products remind me of that well-known saying among computer experts "Garbage in; garbage out."

Although OEO continues to grind out all sorts of wondrous alleged statistics,



anyone utilizing them without checking and double checking runs the risk of being labeled both a "fool" and a "purveyor of untruths." I have learned that you cannot believe reports issued by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has not lived up to the expectations of its sponsors. It serves little useful purpose. It has caused a gross waste of the taxpayers' moneys. It administers little more than constant confusion, and most of the programs it administers should be transferred to old-line departments and agencies.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yea and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 39, answered "present" 1, not voting 130, as follows:

## [Roll No. 361]

## YEAS—262

Addabbo	Edmondson	Kupferman
Albert	Edwards, Calif.	Kyl
Anderson, III.	Edwards, La.	Kyros
Anderson, Tenn.	Eilberg	Laird
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Landrum
Annunzio	Evans, Colo.	Leggett
Arends	Evins, Tenn.	Lippscomb
Ayres	Fallon	Long, Md.
Bates	Fascell	McCarthy
Battin	Feighan	McClary
Belcher	Findley	McClure
Bell	Flood	McCulloch
Bennett	Foley	McDade
Betts	Ford, Gerald R.	McDonald, Mich.
Biester	Fraser	McFall
Blanton	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald, Mass.
Blatnik	Friedel	Machen
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	Madden
Bolling	Gallfianakis	Mahon
Bolton	Gallagher	Mailliard
Bow	Garmatz	Marsh
Brademas	Gialmo	Matsunaga
Brasco	Gibbons	May
Brock	Gilbert	Mayne
Brooks	Gonzalez	Miller, Ohio
Brotzman	Goodell	Mills
Brown, Calif.	Goodling	Minish
Brown, Mich.	Gray	Mink
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Oreg.	Minshall
Buchanan	Green, Pa.	Mize
Burke, Mass.	Griffiths	Monagan
Burton, Calif.	Grover	Moore
Burton, Utah	Gude	Moorhead
Bush	Hamilton	Morton
Byrne, Pa.	Hanley	Moss
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanna	Murphy, Ill.
Cabell	Hansen, Idaho	Natcher
Cahill	Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi
Carey	Harrison	O'Hara, Ill.
Carter	Harsha	O'Hara, Mich.
Cederberg	Hathaway	O'Konski
Chamberlain	Hawkins	Olsen
Clausen, Don H.	Hays	O'Neill, Mass.
Clawson, Del	Hechler, W. Va.	Patman
Cleveland	Heckler, Mass.	Patten
Cohelan	Hicks	Pelly
Conte	Hollifield	Perkins
Corbett	Holland	Pike
Daddario	Hosmer	Pirnie
Daniels	Howard	Poff
Davis, Ga.	Hunt	Pollock
Davis, Wis.	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
de la Garza	Irwin	Price, Tex.
Delaney	Jacobs	Pucinski
Dellenback	Joelson	Purcell
Dent	Johnson, Calif.	Quile
Devine	Johnson, Pa.	Railsback
Dingell	Jonas	Randall
Dole	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Donohue	Karsten	Reid, Ill.
Dorn	Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.
Dow	Kazen	Relfel
Duncan	Kee	Reinecke
Dwyer	Keith	Reuss
Eckhardt	Kelly	Rhodes, Ariz.
	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
	Kirwan	
	Kleppe	

Riegle  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rosenthal  
Roth  
Roush  
Roybal  
Rumsfeld  
Ryan  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Scheuer  
Schneebell  
Schweiker  
Schwengel

Shipley  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Okla.  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Teague, Calif.  
Tenzer  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tunney

Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Wampler  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Widnall  
Wolff  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Fino against.  
Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Snyder against.  
Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Pettis against.  
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Watson against.  
Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Passman against.  
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Haley against.  
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

## Until further notice:

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Hammerschmidt.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Hardy with Mr. King of New York.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Andrews with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bob Willson.  
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Sandman.  
Mr. Everett with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Mosher.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Walker with Mr. Adair.  
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Esch.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Conable.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Mathias of California.  
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Harvey.  
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
Mr. Abbt with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.  
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Adams with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mr. Pryor with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Wylder.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Curtis.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Gurney.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Poage with Mr. Winn.  
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Springer.  
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Myers.  
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Pool with Mr. Lukens.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Gardner.  
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Denney.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Helstoski.  
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. ASHMORE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."  
Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASHMORE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

## NAYS—39

Abernethy  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Baring  
Bevill  
Brinkley  
Clancy  
Colmer  
Cramer  
Dickinson  
Dowdy  
Edwards, Ala.  
Flynt

Gathings  
Gettys  
Gross  
Hagan  
Hall  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Hungate  
Jarman  
Jones, N.C.  
Kornegay  
Langen  
Latta

Lennon  
Martin  
Montgomery  
Nichols  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Quillen  
Rivers  
Satterfield  
Scott  
Stuckey  
Tuck  
Whitener  
Whitten

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Collier

## NOT VOTING—130

Abbt	Gardner	Philbin
Adair	Gubser	Pickle
Adams	Gurney	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Haley	Pool
Ashley	Halleck	Pryor
Aspinall	Halpern	Rarick
Barrett	Hammer-	Resnick
Berry	schmidt	Rooney, Pa.
Bingham	Hardy	Rostenkowski
Blackburn	Harvey	Roudebush
Boggs	Helstoski	Ruppe
Bray	Herlong	St Germain
Broomfield	Horton	St. Onge
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Selden
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Burleson	Karth	Smith, Iowa
Button	King, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Casey	Kluczynski	Snyder
Celler	Kuykendall	Springer
Clark	Lloyd	Steed
Conable	Long, La.	Stephens
Conyers	Lukens	Taft
Corman	McEwen	Taylor
Cowger	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Culver	MacGregor	Thompson, N.J.
Cunningham	Mathias, Calif.	Tiernan
Curtis	Mathias, Md.	Utt
Dawson	Meeds	Waggonner
Denney	Meskill	Waldie
Derwinski	Michel	Walker
Diggs	Miller, Calif.	Watkins
Downing	Morgan	Watson
Dulski	Morris, N. Mex.	Watts
Esch	Morse, Mass.	Wiggins
Eshleman	Mosher	Williams, Miss.
Everett	Multer	Williams, Pa.
Farbstein	Murphy, N.Y.	Willis
Fino	Myers	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Nelsen	Wilson, Charles H.
Ford	Nix	Winn
William D.	Ottinger	Wylder
Fountain	Passman	
Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper	
Fuqua	Pettis	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Morse of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Selden against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.



Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

For Monday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. Also, there are 12 suspensions to be considered which are as follows:

H.R. 11565, to provide for transfer of peanut acreage allotments;

Senate Joint Resolution 33, to establish a National Commission on Product Safety;

H.R. 3639, Animal Drug Amendments of 1967;

H.R. 3982, to provide for transportation of house trailers of members of the uniformed services;

H.R. 1341, to authorize additional accumulation of leave in certain foreign areas;

H.R. 8547, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps;

Senate Joint Resolution 114, to extend the duration of copyright protection in certain cases;

H.R. 13669, to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to military claims;

H.R. 13165, to provide Secret Service protection for a widow and minor children of a former President;

H.R. 2138, to permit naturalization of certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations;

S. 1552, to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966; and

S. 423, to authorize certain construction at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii.

Also scheduled for the consideration of the House on Monday is S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. It will be considered under an open rule, with 6 hours of debate, waiving points of order, and making in order the committee substitute now in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment. I might say we hope to consider the bill under general debate on Monday and on Tuesday, but we do not plan to go any further than general debate on Tuesday.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day, and of course we will continue on Tuesday with the Economic Opportunity Amendments, and continue through the balance of the week on that bill, or until the bill is concluded.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, November 11, is Veterans Day, and I am sure that some Members of the House have plans for observing that day. Will it be the purpose of the majority leader to have a session on Friday if it is necessary to finish the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. We feel because of the urgency of disposing of this legislation, for many, many reasons, that if we have not disposed of the bill by that time we will have to consider it on Friday.

May I add further that this announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader when it is contemplated the fund-giveaway conference report may be brought up?

Mr. ALBERT. In reply to the gentleman's inquiry, I will say that we are not in a position as yet to make that announcement. My understanding is that it is not ready as yet. We certainly would not bring it up on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. It will be brought up Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. No. I said we would not bring it up on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. It will not be brought up on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct. The reason we would not bring it up on Monday or Tuesday is that Tuesday is a general election day. I believe some 37 States are having elections on Tuesday. While we would not put votes over on primary elections, we would not put any votes over that come on Monday, I would certainly be disposed—and I believe the House would be—to take up any matter requiring a record vote and certainly any matter as important as a conference report on Wednesday or later in the week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I assume Members of the House will be safe now in buying a Christmas tree to be used in Washington, D.C., rather than in their home district?

Mr. ALBERT. I believe they would be safe in buying one in Washington, D.C., if they wish.

Mr. GROSS. They would not have to cart it out to their respective districts, would they?

Mr. ALBERT. That would depend on where they want to spend Christmas, either here or there.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman believe that this Congress can be adjourned by December 20?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is calling on me for speculation. I do not like to indulge in answers to hypothetical questions. My judgment is that we will be adjourned by then.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### JACKY BAYNE DAY

(Mr. GETTYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, November 4, has been proclaimed Jacky Bayne Day in Fort Mill, S.C., by Mayor Clevy Lytle.

I am sure that many of my colleagues learned yesterday through the news media of the tragedy that befell this brave South Carolinian as he served his Nation in Vietnam. Specialist Bayne was critically wounded by a Vietcong landmine and had been given up for dead by everyone except Jacky Bayne, and when life was detected, the long road to recovery began.

Jacky Bayne is now at Walter Reed General Hospital where his mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Eb L. Bayne, have stood bravely by his side since he arrived there on August 4.

They are proud of Jacky and rightfully so. He is a youth who never burned a draft card, never stormed the steps of the Pentagon to decry the policies of his Government, never participated in a protest march, never joined in an act of civil disobedience. He did his duty gladly. His sacrifice should put to shame those who strive to undermine our efforts to protect freedom and liberty.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is commendable that tomorrow has been proclaimed "Jacky Bayne Day" in his hometown. I know every Member of this House joins with me in saluting courageous Jacky Bayne and his splendid family. He serves his country and he serves it well.

It is my fervent hope that a kind providence will in time bless Jacky Bayne with full restoration to good health.

#### COMMISSIONING OF THE "GREENLING," NUCLEAR SUBMARINE

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include an address by Hon. GEORGE W. ANDREWS of Alabama.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the commissioning of our 29th nuclear attack submarine, the *Greenling*, at Groton, Conn.

The gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS, is delivering the commissioning speech. He, too, is calling for the rapid development of the nuclear side of our surface Navy. His remarks are cogent and important. I insert them in the Record at this point:









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 8, 1967  
For actions of November 7, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 181

### CONTENTS

Appropriations.....14,22,26	Foreign aid.....1,26	Personnel.....3,12,25
Budget.....31	Hides.....24	Payroll allotments.....3
Census.....7	Intergovernmental	Potato labeling.....23
Coffee.....27	relations.....12	Poverty.....2
Credit unions.....3	Legislative program.....26	Power reliability.....22
Economy.....18	Livestock.....17	Public Works.....14,22
Education.....26	Meat inspection.....21	Recreation.....13,33
Electrification.....9,22	Medical care.....25	Social security.....26
Expenditures.....29	Military construction...26	Taxation.....5,18,29
Farm Bureau.....10	Mink imports.....32	Textile imports.....34
Farm loans.....19	Oil and gas leases.....4	Tobacco.....11
Farm program.....6	Opinion poll.....8	Water resources.....16
Flood insurance.....30	Product safety.....15	Wilderness.....33
Foreign affairs.....28	Pay raise.....26	Wildlife.....20

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House received conference report on foreign aid authorization bill. House debated poverty bill. Senate committee reported Sawtooth Recreation Area bill. Senate passed bill to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation in personnel practices.

### HOUSE

1. **FOREIGN AID.** Received the conference report on S. 1872, the foreign aid authorization bill (H. Rept. 892) (pp. H14715-27). Rep. Widnall commended the report (pp. H14773-5).
2. **POVERTY.** Began debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill. pp. H14727-64, H14771-2, H14804-5, H14812, H14816-7, H14766-70, H14786-7

3. CREDIT UNIONS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported H. R. 6157, to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotments (H. Rept. 893), and with amendment H. R. 13489, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, and dividend provisions (H. Rept. 894). p. H14820
4. OIL AND GAS LEASES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7940, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely (H. Rept. 895). p. H14820
5. TAXATION. Rep. Gurney stated that the letters he has received from his district in response to the President's "call for public pressure...to enact his proposed tax increase" have been "100% against the tax increase." pp. H14772-3
6. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Zwach inserted an editorial, "Farmers Struggle in False Prosperity." p. H14779
7. CENSUS. Rep. Curtis discussed the "major issues" of the forthcoming decennial census. pp. H14782-3
8. OPINION POLL. Reps. Andrews, N. Dak., and Morris, N. Mex., inserted the results of questionnaires including items of interest to this Department. pp. H14787, H14805
9. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Cleveland stated the Lincoln-Dickey project "is not the answer to cheaper electric rates in New England" and inserted articles on the subject. pp. H14788-9
10. FARM BUREAU. Rep. Resnick stated that the Farm Bureau has not "refuted" one of his "charges" during the investigation of its activities, added that many cooperatives "are truly farmer controlled and farmer owned," and commended and inserted a statement of the Dairymen's League describing its policy of distributing patronage dividends. p. H14805
11. TOBACCO. H. R. 13653, as reported, would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to add burley tobacco and cigar-filler (types 42, 43 and 44) to the lease and transfer provisions, extend the period of a lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas for all kinds of tobacco from 1 year to a maximum of 5 years, and provide for a limitation on the amount of acreage that can be leased and transferred to any farm in the case of burley and cigar-filler (types 42, 43, and 44) tobacco to an amount not to exceed 10 acres.

#### SENATE

12. PERSONNEL; INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Passed, 54-26, with amendments S. 699, to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation and the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to extend State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds, to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training



enforcement agencies was desirable, the consequences of permitting sales to individual law enforcement officers might be such as to justify further study.

**PART V—ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PARTICIPANTS IN FUTURE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS**

Eligibility of certain participants in future foreign aid programs (House—Sec. 502)

The House bill provided that any individual, firm, or entity participating in any transactions financed with foreign assistance funds who had been found by the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, to have attempted, aided, assisted, or engaged in bribery or other illegal or fraudulent payments or credits in connection with such transaction should not be permitted to participate in any program or operation financed under the act.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the Senate objected to certain provisions of this section, including the apparent lack of the usual safeguards concerning notice and hearing which are applied to Government regulations, and an implied permanent debarment since no time limit was established for ineligibility.

The managers on the part of the House agreed that, in view of the questions raised, this provision should receive further consideration by the Congress.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,  
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
EDNA F. KELLY,  
WAYNE L. HAYS,  
W. S. MAILLIARD,  
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

**CORRECTION OF VOTE**

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 362 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

**ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967**

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will be recognized for 3 hours, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 28 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on April 10, 1967, I introduced H.R. 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. This legislation was studied by members of the Committee on Education and Labor until the bill was reported October 20, S. 2388, as passed by the Senate, was before the committee when we completed the markup of H.R. 8311. In reporting the bill, the committee amendments struck out all of S. 2388 after the enacting clause and substituted the language in the House bill.

Members of this House are aware of the tremendous impact that has already been made as a result of the decision made by Congress 3½ years ago when we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It has been accepted by the people of this country as another piece of landmark legislation along our road to a better life. Thousands of men and women who 3½ years ago had been left outside the great prosperity which the American economy is capable of sustaining, have now been brought into the mainstream as fully participating members.

We have had many successes, and we have made mistakes.

Congress acted responsibly in 1965 and 1966 when it amended the original act to make improvements and to correct errors. S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, is in that tradition. We feel that the bill before you today will make some needed improvements in the basic legislation, and will eliminate some of the mistakes we have heretofore made.

I admit at the outset that we are tardy in bringing this legislation before the House, and for that I am willing to take my share of the responsibility.

We held long and exhaustive hearings on the operation of the entire economic opportunity program—much longer than were conducted even before passage of the original legislation. We took longer with the markup of the bill than we should have. But I thought it was important that we take every step that could possibly be taken to reach agreement and accommodation among all the members of both parties.

While the measure that we produced is not what could be called an agreed bill, I must say that neither is it a one-man bill; nor a one-faction bill, nor a one-party bill. I believe there is something of every member of the committee in this bill, and I am delighted to recommend it to this House.

I would urge the House to act with speed and dispatch. The delay in funding the programs for fiscal 1968 is already producing great havoc and frustration throughout the country.

And I would certainly counsel against the temptation exhibited by some to inflict mortal cuts in the authorization for the economic opportunity programs.

For the past fiscal year, the economic opportunity programs operated on an appropriation of \$1,687 million. The request for fiscal 1968 is for \$2,060 million, and that is the figure S. 2388 would authorize.

At the same time we were holding hearings on the basic measure, we also

were considering H.R. 10682, the minority party's opportunity crusade.

Even the minority measure envisioned \$1,669 million for fiscal 1968, and that was certainly the very bottom figure that anybody on the committee felt could be seriously considered.

Let me tell you some of the things that are already happening as a result of our delay in funding for fiscal 1968.

Six local community action agencies—including one in my own congressional district, right in the heart of Appalachia, are without funds.

One other local CAP agency has had to cut half of its operations.

Unless we act by November 23—just 17 days from now—35 other local community action programs will have to close down their operations. This involves \$42 million worth of CAP programs and affects the lives of some 500,000 poor people.

The local agencies are scattered throughout the country in 16 States, including New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Colorado, and California.

The community action agencies are not the only ones affected by our failure to provide funds.

The approximately 4,000 VISTA volunteers have been asked to serve without food and living allowances until we act.

In the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 67 projects are already closed down, affecting 16,463 boys and girls.

Unless we move by November 23, another 134 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects will have to close down, leaving 33,000 boys and girls without the opportunity to continue their education and training.

Unless we act, the Job Corps will be unable to pay the November allowances to its 40,000 enrollees, amounting to \$1.2 million. That agency will also be unable to pay \$1.5 million in allowances to the families of the Job Corpsmen.

You can well imagine the anxiety and the frustration that this lack of funding is creating in the hearts and minds of poor people throughout this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know there are those who would have us go the route of a continuing resolution—who would have the Congress simply say to the Office of Economic Opportunity. "Go ahead and operate but don't spend more than \$1.2 billion, or \$1.3 billion," or whatever figure they settle upon.

Those are strange figures indeed, coming from people who just a short time ago were boosting an Opportunity Crusade for \$1.669 billion.

This continuing resolution, of course, would have the virtue of being fast. But then the meat ax always is. You do not have to wait around in slow agony. It gets the job done fast.

But for the House to ignore the lengthy study given to the economic opportunity programs by the Committee on Education and Labor, to scrap all of the really constructive work we have done to bring about substantial improvements, this is completely unrealistic and completely irresponsible.

Make no mistake, the impetus for a continuing resolution approach is com-



ing from those who want to see the economic opportunity programs severely crippled. It is camouflage to shield the wishes of those who would slam shut the door of opportunity in the faces of some 30 million of our fellow citizens.

I have faith enough in the Congress and in this House to believe that we are not going to let the poor people of America down—that we are going to act promptly and decisively to get these good programs funded and back in enthusiastic operation again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to discuss briefly some of the titles in the bill before us. Because of the many programs that are involved, even brief mention will make the discussion lengthy. I shall confine myself to brief comments, and rely upon my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor to discuss in detail various phases of the bill.

#### TITLE IA

Title I, part A involves the Job Corps, one of the most significant programs undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We are asking for fiscal 1968 an authorization of \$295 million to provide meaningful training for some 40,000 young men and women.

During its relatively young life, the Job Corps has been damned by its critics for being "controversial"—whatever that means. They said it was expensive, that the enrollees did not behave themselves, and even that the rolls were loaded with juvenile delinquents.

I can only say that this was the judgment of the uninformed, particularly with respect to the Job Corps as it exists and operates today—November 1967.

At the outset, I will admit that the Job Corps' first months were less than impressive. Its operation was marred by blunder and mistake.

The cost was high.

And its enrollees did include some pretty tough customers. For this we merely say "Thank God," for that is exactly the kind of young men and women the Job Corps was designed to accommodate.

Today there is a new Job Corps:

One that has built upon its experience;  
One that has found its focus;  
One that is carefully and ably managed;  
One whose costs have steadily gone down;

And one whose record for reclaiming and rehabilitating young men and women has steadily gone upward.

This is a Job Corps that is making an important contribution to a greater and stronger America.

I want it to work itself out of a job as soon as possible. No one will be happier or more relieved than I to vote to dismantle Job Corps just as soon as it has performed the task which we have set for it.

If this is a paradox, I explain it by reminding the House that the Job Corps was designed to give another chance—to give a hand up, if you will—to the thousands of young people who have, by reason of poverty and deprivation, been left outside the mainstream of life in this country.

They are the youngsters whose education is so scant or of such poor quality as to leave them powerless in an economy that depends upon ever greater sophistication in its work force.

They are often youngsters who have gotten off on the wrong foot with the community of law and order, because of the frustrations accompanying their poverty.

These are often youngsters whose lack of elemental medical and dental care has handicapped them from birth.

They are often youngsters whose very motivation to be independent, self-reliant, self-supporting men and women has been eroded and possibly destroyed by the only experience with life they have known.

Can there be any wonder that some of these youngsters have on occasion gotten into trouble? For the first time in their lives, many of them have been taken out of a poorly structured home environment and exposed to a residential community based upon rules, discipline, hard work, and consideration for other people.

To be perfectly frank, we ought to be surprised that the Job Corps proved workable at all.

Now the critics are confounded by the knowledge that it is not only working, but working well. The Job Corps is getting results.

Current information shows that of 103,000 youths who have been through the Job Corps program, 71,500 are now holding jobs; or have upgraded their training to the point where they have returned to school; or have successfully passed induction standards to enter military service.

We now have operating some 123 Job Corps centers—with a capacity of handling 43,000 youths at any one time.

During fiscal 1968, the Job Corps expects to operate at an average on-board enrollment of 41,000. Before the fiscal year is out, an additional 100,000 young men and women will have been involved.

During this calendar year, the Job Corps has more than doubled its capability for training young women in the 18 women's centers. Plans are well under way to increase the proportion of women until it eventually reaches 50 percent.

As I have mentioned, the cost of training a corpsman has steadily dropped during the 2½ years this program has been in operation. Last year, at a time when costs per enrollee were averaging about \$9,000 per year, Congress imposed a statutory limit of \$7,500.

Under the dedicated management of Mr. William Kelly, the Corps director, this cost has actually been reduced \$800 below that to \$6,700.

Although I firmly believe that figure can and will be reduced even further I am neither alarmed nor horrified by the \$6,700 figure. This is a special situation, and it calls for extraordinary measures.

I realize that there are those who say that for \$6,700 you could send all these youngsters to a good university. They are talking hogwash.

The youngsters for whom this program was created could not even get near a university campus—unless it was to

sweep up the debris left by an antiwar demonstration.

For the most part, these young people could not even make it through grade or high school. They are people who have been failed by the elementary and secondary schools of this country, in many instances through no fault of their own.

Except for programs such as the Job Corps, they stand to become a drain on the productive elements of our society for the rest of their lives.

The Job Corps is simply trying to retrieve these young people and restore their capacity to be productive and self-supporting before it is utterly destroyed. We are simply holding out a ladder by which they can climb back from the brink, over which many of their parents have already disappeared.

If this ladder costs \$6,700 and will give to society a useful, productive, contributing citizen—then it is the best money the Congress can spend.

The question is not whether to spend that \$6,700 or to save it.

The question is: Can we afford not to spend \$6,700 now, and risk many times that amount in future years as the cost of welfare handouts to this individual and his progeny, and even more if he develops a criminal or antisocial behavior pattern?

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not impeach the character of the young people who enter this program. Far from it.

The fact that they have made a decision—a hard decision—to improve themselves and to take a purchase on an independent future for themselves, indicates that they have courage of a very high order.

This is the American way. A young man or young woman sees and seizes an opportunity to make something of himself by dint of perseverance and hard work. And the rewards are his.

I urge every Member of this House to get acquainted with some of these young people, if you have not already done so. When you do, I suspect that you are going to be pretty impatient with people who call the Job Corps a "controversial" program.

I yield to no Member of this Chamber as an advocate and supporter of vocational education. It has long been one of my major interests in Congress.

I can understand those of my friends who say that we should take Job Corps out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and lodge it in some expanded vocational education program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We may come to that point someday, but the time is not yet.

In the first place, vocational education is not yet equipped to deal with the kind of youngster now served by Job Corps.

Vocational education is taking the "cream of the crop" of the school dropouts, and is doing a good job with them. I do not mean it derogatorily when I say that the vocational education schools are giving first preference to those young men and women that are most easily trainable and most easily placed in a job. That is only natural.



But the Job Corps youngster is something else. He is the most deprived, the most handicapped, the most difficult to place, and unhappily, the most unwanted.

As of now, only Job Corps is equipped to deal with this highly specialized problem. And the program is making great strides.

The private industries, educational institutions, and government agencies that are operating Job Corps centers are developing new methods, new techniques of teaching these youngsters. Much basic research is being done.

Eventually, this new material will be picked up by the vocational education schools who will make excellent use of it. In fact, some of the techniques are even now being used in such institutions.

This is a fringe benefit of Job Corps, of course. But in the long run it may turn out to be worth the investment on this score alone.

For the moment, only Job Corps is equipped to deal with the truly impoverished youth of the country. Only the Job Corps is equipped to treat the total youth—his educational, vocational, social, and cultural needs. Only the Job Corps operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. It is a unique agency, designed for a special purpose, and it is serving that purpose very well indeed.

For me, it is unthinkable to do other than continue it as presently constituted, subject of course to the improvements that we have sought to make in the bill before us today.

#### TITLE IB

The bill which we bring before the House today combines all work and training programs for youth and adults in a single heading—part B of title I.

The authorization for this important work would be \$579 million, of which \$321 million is for Neighborhood Youth Corps and \$258 million is for the adult programs.

I shall give you a detailed breakdown of these proposed authorizations in just a moment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been in operation less than 3 years. During that period, it has developed 3,895 local projects in all of our 50 States.

These projects have provided almost 1½ million youth with work opportunities:

- To help them stay in school;
- To help them return to school;
- And to improve their chances for gainful employment in the job market.

The latest available figures indicate that some 1,770 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects are currently active, serving more than 300,000 boys and girls throughout the country.

These projects are located in both urban and rural areas. Of the 1,438 projects authorized in fiscal 1967, 772 were in urban areas, 657 in rural areas, and nine in mixed urban-rural areas. Rural participation accounts for 35 percent of the enrollment opportunities.

For the \$321 million requested for the Neighborhood Youth Corps for fiscal 1968, we propose:

To provide enrollment opportunities for 106,000 youngsters in in-school programs at a cost of \$67.8 million;

To provide 50,000 out-of-school slots at a cost of \$152.7 million; and

To provide 165,000 summer Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollment opportunities at a cost of \$88 million.

The remaining \$12.5 million of the requested authorization would go for research and demonstration programs and for program direction.

During the extensive hearings on the bill before us this week, I do not recall a single critical reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It is not a visionary, pie-in-the-sky program, but one that gets straight to the heart of one of the most pressing problems in America today.

The adult work-training experience programs were authorized by 1965 and 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. These programs now consist of three main groupings: Operation Mainstream, New Careers, and Special Impact.

The bill which we reported and which we discuss today makes some revision, in that all manpower activities carried out at the local level are to be consolidated into this part.

The focus is to be upon unemployed or low-income persons, both youth and adult, with emphasis upon full use of local capacity for planning, operating, and evaluating programs that will draw upon all available public and private resources.

Authority for all existing programs is continued, including the Nelson amendment—Operation Mainstream, the Scheuer amendment—new careers, along with necessary supportive services.

But we have taken a significant step in providing for substantial funding of the concentrated employment program recently initiated by the Department of Labor. This replaces the special impact program, and is designed to reach the hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged residents of urban and rural areas through a single contract with a single sponsor and a single intake center where all participants will go to get whatever help is necessary to move toward employability.

It combine in one local program all of the Federal and local manpower resources that are available to operate a manpower program in a specific target area.

The concentrated employment program now operates in 20 cities and in two rural areas, and is aimed at those individuals in greatest need of a concentrated effort.

The committee believes that this is a significant new step to get at the hard-core unemployed, and have great hope for its effectiveness.

To carry out these adult work-training experience programs, we propose to authorize for fiscal 1968 these amounts:

For Operation Mainstream, 14,200 training slots at a cost of \$48 million;

For the new carrers program, 12,100 slots at a cost of \$48.1 million;

And 64,400 slots in the new concentrated employment program at a cost of \$155.8 million.

We further propose \$3.6 million for research and demonstration projects and \$2.5 million for program direction.

Adding the 90,700 slots of the adult programs to the 321,000 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we have a total of 411,700 openings in the work and training programs under title I, part B, at a total cost of \$579 million.

This, I admit, is a great deal of money. But I say we are getting our money's worth from these programs. We stand to gain a great deal more than that in increased productive capacity spread over the life times of the 411,700 individuals involved.

We risk having to spend a great deal more on them if we fail to provide them with an opportunity to enter the mainstream of American economic life as fully participating members.

#### TITLE II

Under title II of this bill, Mr. Chairman, \$1,022 million would be authorized for a strengthened and expanded community action program. Community action is at the heart of our effort to improve the lot of the poor—a working concept the committee has strengthened through important changes in the bill before us.

We have made provision, Mr. Chairman, for the greater participation of local public officials in this important part of the economic opportunity program. We have strengthened the prohibitions of law against political activity by anti-poverty personnel. We have restricted the size of community action boards and tightened quorum requirements to assure responsible majority control. We have tightened the audit requirements for community action agencies. And we have called for greater emphasis on programs for the elderly poor, on day care centers, and in providing emergency food and medical services where severe conditions warrant such action.

These changes should not be interpreted, however, as a retreat from the concept of community action by the committee. It is a good concept and it is working. Businessmen, religious and civic leaders, educational experts, women's organizations, labor leaders, and the poor themselves are working together in communities across the country to develop and implement programs.

Since the endorsement by the Congress of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, more than 9 million poor Americans have been served by this program—most of them through community action that is bringing together, at the community level, local resources, local intelligence, local pride, local responsibility, and local decisionmaking in a fight against the causes and consequences of poverty.

More than 1,000 community action agencies across the country have been formed to implement such national programs as Headstart, Neighborhood Health Services, Upward Bound, and Legal Services; as well as thousands of unique, locally initiated programs developed by the individual community.

Under the Headstart program, more than 1.3 million youngsters have been given the chance to start school on a more nearly equal basis with children from more affluent homelife.

Under the legal services program, 172,000 poor persons have been given the



opportunity for justice that only a lawyer can provide.

More than 55,000 poor persons have obtained necessary medical help through neighborhood health centers.

And in programs initiated at the local level, more than 1½ million poor people have gained a better education and 4 million have taken advantage of the neighborhood centers in poor areas to obtain information about jobs and job training, counseling, and available manpower and social services.

But it is time to move on, Mr. Chairman, if only in the modest and responsible fashion that our overall financial situation dictates.

In authorizing \$1,022 million for community action in this bill, the committee is recommending a step-up in the war against poverty that is both necessary and minimal.

We are proposing under this title that 50 new community action agencies be started in rural America and that the Office of Economic Opportunity proceed along the following lines:

For a Headstart program, \$352 million, to serve 520,000 youngsters in the summer and 213,000 in full-year classes;

For a Followthrough program, \$120 million, to assure that the benefits of Headstart are not lost when a youngster moves on into school;

For an Upward Bound program, \$35 million, to encourage 30,000 potentially capable but previously unmotivated high school youngsters toward college;

For an expansion of the legal services program, \$47 million, in both urban and rural areas—a move fully supported by the American Bar Association, which asked the committee to double the present program;

For the funding of 50 centers to provide comprehensive health services in areas of concentrated poverty, \$60 million;

And \$329 million for locally initiated programs, including the development of 1,000 neighborhood service centers.

These proposed allocations by OEO reflect only the most urgent needs. Of the 613 rural community action agencies in this country, many have received only program development grants and now need funding to put their program in operation. Of the \$166 million increase in funds for national emphasis programs, all but \$46 million is for the new Followthrough program for youngsters starting to school.

The need is urgent. We cannot tolerate a condition that condemns 30 million of our fellow Americans to remain untouched by the prosperity and the hope that is available to the other 170 million.

The Office of Economic Opportunity—the director and coordinator of our effort—the acknowledged symbol of hope and promise to the poor of America—is now out of funds and the authority to spend. It cannot even pay its own employees.

And the many community action agencies which helped keep the peace during the urban tensions of last summer are now ending their program years without money to continue the important work they are doing.

It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the community action program should be dismantled—that certain of its programs be transferred to other agencies. The committee rejected such an approach after hearing more than 100 witnesses—selected by both the majority and the minority—testify in favor of OEO as the agency to operate these programs.

I could cite many reasons why a transfer of these programs would be unwise at this time, but let me, at this point, make just two observations.

First, the strength of a full-scale effort to provide full economic opportunity lies in a centralized source of direction with powers of coordination and operation. You cannot curb the authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity in these areas without curtailing the overall objective.

Second, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have both said that OEO should run the programs which opponents of the present program would transfer to them.

It has also been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the funds for the program should be cut back severely. Some of my colleagues have suggested that the program should even be cut back to a level of \$1.2 billion—a billion less, in other words, than the Senate has already authorized; \$800,000 less than the President requested and almost half a billion less than the program received in the last fiscal year.

I would urge my colleagues to reflect for a moment what a cut of this magnitude would mean. It would mean, for instance, that California would receive \$48 million less in antipoverty funds; New York, \$44 million less; Texas, \$24 million less; Illinois, \$21 million less. I could go on, but for the benefit of all I will include in the RECORD at this point the State-by-State cutback a \$1.2 billion program would mean:

*Dollar reduction by State that would be necessitated by a \$1.2 billion appropriation*

State	Amount
Alabama	\$8,810,075
Alaska	1,679,601
Arizona	8,299,494
Arkansas	6,769,531
California	47,812,673
Colorado	6,509,592
Connecticut	4,558,578
Delaware	777,049
District of Columbia	8,666,376
Florida	12,007,188
Georgia	10,061,385
Hawaii	1,513,550
Idaho	2,662,589
Illinois	20,959,551
Indiana	6,539,210
Iowa	4,833,487
Kansas	2,377,921
Kentucky	16,089,786
Louisiana	8,955,197
Maine	3,892,561
Maryland	5,345,923
Massachusetts	11,011,527
Michigan	17,983,533
Minnesota	8,211,178
Mississippi	17,493,546
Missouri	12,809,585
Montana	3,224,097
Nebraska	3,645,302
Nevada	1,397,080
New Hampshire	1,094,443

*Dollar reduction by State that would be necessitated by a \$1.2 billion appropriation—Continued*

State	Amount
New Jersey	\$17,744,406
New Mexico	7,695,309
New York	43,830,779
North Carolina	13,125,782
North Dakota	1,875,650
Ohio	15,829,088
Oklahoma	8,102,033
Oregon	6,946,712
Pennsylvania	18,767,889
Rhode Island	1,739,242
South Carolina	6,231,878
South Dakota	3,223,729
Tennessee	10,318,996
Texas	23,579,540
Utah	3,354,711
Vermont	1,111,316
Virginia	7,416,133
Washington	8,221,931
West Virginia	9,748,247
Wisconsin	6,197,835
Wyoming	1,580,470
Guam	421,854
Puerto Rico	8,484,649
American Samoa	187,315
Virgin Islands	562,453
Multistate	5,821,365

In the area of community action alone, a \$1.2 billion program would deny the benefits of Headstart to 92,000 children who would receive them under the committee bill; it would close 320 legal services offices; preclude any new follow-through projects; deny basic education, day care, and housing programs to 15,000 migrants; cut 19,000 students out of Upward Bound; prevent progress on 33 neighborhood health centers; and cut versatile funds to local communities by nearly 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is what the Congress or the country wants.

The questions before this House are quite clear.

Are we, Mr. Chairman, to let the community action agencies serve and speak for the urban poor—or are we to give ground in the ghetto to the Stokely Carmichaels and the Rap Browns?

Are we to offer the poor in rural America a way out of the poverty that grips them—or are we to abandon them to the expensive welfare existence their families have known for generations.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the House will take the route of responsibility—a route that commands the continuation of the community action program and all the American traditions it involves: local initiative, self-help, community cooperation, and innovation.

Those thousands of Americans who are working in community action programs across the country—to bring peace to our cities and opportunity to all—need our endorsement.

#### TITLE III

Turning to another important feature of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I turn now to the rural loan program under title III.

This program provides for loans to rural residents to assist them in such agricultural or nonagricultural enterprises as may increase their income. The authority to operate this program is delegated by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Farmers



Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The significant amendment proposed by the committee with respect to this program is to specifically spell out the eligibility of elderly rural people to participate. Another proposed change is merely a technical one having to do with the manner in which the \$3,500 loan limit is calculated.

I felt it was particularly important that the Congress make it crystal clear that our elderly rural citizens are eligible for this program. For in many cases, particularly in my area, these are the people who suffer most with least outcry from economic privation.

Some lending agencies are reluctant to enter loan agreements with an elderly fellow, even if it can be demonstrated clearly that a loan would help him upgrade his economic prospects and make him self-supporting. We want to correct this situation, and we believe this move merits your support.

The bill contains a proposed authorization of \$20,000,000 in new obligation authority for the rural loan program.

Amounts in the loan fund resulting from loan repayments and funds carried over from fiscal 1967 will be used with this new obligational authority to support \$27,000,000 in individual and \$5,000,000 in cooperative loans. These amounts will provide 13,000 loans to individuals and 368 cooperative loans.

Individual loans under this program may be made up to an aggregate indebtedness of \$3,500. Loans generally are secured by a promissory note and a loan agreement. The maximum term is 15 years with an interest rate of  $4\frac{1}{8}$  percent on the unpaid principal.

Cooperatives financed through this program may be either incorporated or unincorporated groups providing a needed marketing, purchasing or processing service predominately to low-income families and individuals. Before a loan can be made, the FHA must determine that the service involved is not already being supplied by others in the area. Cooperative loans have a 30-year limit, and the interest rate is the same as for individuals.

Up through June 30 of this year, \$13,165,000 in principal and interest had been repaid by rural borrowers under this program. And as of the same date, repayments on loans were about 3 percent greater than the amount due.

The bill before us today makes no change in the other major program under title III, the migrant and seasonal farm-worker program.

We simply ask for an authorization of \$27 million which is approximately \$6 million below the amount authorized for fiscal 1967.

This program was designed to meet the special needs of groups with respect to education, housing, sanitation, and day care. The migratory nature of their lives simply puts them beyond the reach of the ordinary public welfare and rehabilitation programs available to other citizens.

It is anticipated that the number of enrollees in the migrant adult education program will be about the same as last year—28,000. The cost will be \$17 million.

No funds are sought in this bill to continue the youth education program for the children of migrant workers. These children are now covered by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We are asking in this bill for an authorization of \$5 million for permanent housing for migrant workers, covering some 2,000 units to serve 12,000 occupants.

The \$1 million authorization requested for temporary housing under this title will cover 1,600 units servicing 16,000 occupants.

A total of \$4 million is sought for the day care program to serve an estimated 13,000 children.

This latter program permits a migrant mother to work along with her husband and older children, insuring that the younger children need not be left unattended, frequently inside locked automobiles on the roadside.

The day care program for these migrant children provides not only the normal babysitting, but medical attention where needed. Even the mothers are trained in the elements of child care and child guidance.

This is truly a "stitch-in-time" program that will certainly "save nine" and many more in the years ahead.

#### TITLE VIII

The Volunteers in Service to America, popularly known as VISTA, is a corps of full-time and part-time volunteers from all walks of life who are willing to devote their efforts toward helping the Nation's poor.

Since its inception, some 7,200 people have served as volunteers, and at the beginning of fiscal 1968, the enrollment stood at 4,257.

The committee has sought, I believe successfully, to improve the effectiveness of the VISTA organization by several amendments.

We have made it possible for the Director to assign volunteers to work in their own or nearby community service programs to utilize part-time volunteers for periods of less than 2 months.

It is the hope that these changes will encourage the voluntary service of many business and professional men who have a little time to contribute their talents to needed projects. We see the changes as stimulating retired people to make use of their creative energies in useful work with the poor.

The authorization sought for the program this year is \$31 million, and I am sure the Congress will give consideration to it.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that in this discussion, I have been able to touch upon only some of the major aspects of the bill and of the economic opportunity programs.

I believe that subsequent discussion in this Chamber over the next few days will persuade a vast majority of the Members that the great journey upon which we set out with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is going well.

It is a journey that must be taken for when the objective is reached, this will be a stronger, richer, and more vital America.

In closing, I would compliment our

great President on recommending to the Congress so strong a renewal of this Nation's commitment to the alleviation of poverty.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. First of all I would like to clarify for the Record that the opportunity crusade involves over \$1.4 billion being expended, and we will have something over \$3 billion in money that would be going to help the poor cause.

So I would like to ask the gentleman, since he has made such a strong case for the \$2,060,000,000, I have also heard rumors going around, is the gentleman prepared to assure us that he is not going to come in at the outset, when we start reading this bill, and support the amendment that will cut this \$2,060,000,000 substantially?

Mr. PERKINS. It is my purpose to support the committee bill as recommended by the Members of the House who serve on the Committee on Education and Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 10 additional minutes to myself.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, then I will yield, but let me complete my statement first.

Mr. GOODELL. Do I interpret the gentleman correctly that he is going to oppose the amendment to cut this \$2,060,000,000?

Mr. PERKINS. As the gentleman knows, the proposed substitute of \$1.2 billion as I understand, will be offered at the outset and is nothing more than a very effective way to kill this legislation and place the responsibility on the majority party.

Personally, I feel that if the shoe were on the other foot, and the Republicans were in power and had a bill that had been thoroughly considered by the committee, I would not vote to cut the guts out of the bill.

If I were against the bill, I would vote against it—or else I would support the bill. I am certainly not supporting any substitute that would completely destroy this legislation. This substitute is a camouflage to shield the wishes of those who would like to kill the bill and to try to shift the burden somewhere else. I do not think this House is gullible enough to buy any continuing resolution of that type.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has described this as being an effective way to kill the bill. I would say a more accurate description is that it would be a very deceptive way of killing the bill—and that that is what is intended.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.



Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman's position on the \$1.2 billion continuing authorization should that be offered. As the gentleman knows, I do not intend to offer such an amendment or substitute.

Mr. PERKINS. I did not think that the gentleman from New York would offer the \$1.2 billion amendment. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio was going to offer the \$1.2 billion amendment at the outset.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has made a very compelling case here for the expenditure of \$2.06 billion but he still has not answered my question. The rumor is going around that there will be a move at the outset to revise that figure substantially and that it will be supported by the chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me state to the gentleman that as chairman of the committee, I know nothing about any such rumor.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not the chairman's intention to support such an amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not the chairman's intention to support such an amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not intend to support a move to cripple this legislation in any way.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman has referred to what may be done and has assumed that I was going to offer an amendment. I would like to discuss it briefly with the gentleman.

I know the gentleman is aware that the \$100,000,000 a month—and I think you can help a lot of poor people with \$100,000,000 a month—has already been approved by this House and is in conference now. So this House has already taken a position on that proposal.

Mr. PERKINS. I will agree with the gentleman that before we brought this bill to the Chamber that that resolution was approved by this House. But the resolution is now dead. We are out of spending authority, and if we cannot get a bill through this Chamber expeditiously and if we have to rely on this \$1.2 billion continuing resolution, the whole program in this country would go down the drain. In fact, you would find any competent administrator resigning. I cannot think of any competent individual who has had any experience in the field of administration who would think of assuming a position of that type under such circumstances. But the worst thing that is going to happen is that there will be thousands and thousands of dedicated employees, now working in the anti-poverty program throughout the Nation, who are going to resign almost overnight if we fail to come up with a bill. In my judgment, we would cripple the program to the extent that it would be completely unworthy of support and to all intents and purposes would kill off the program in this session of the Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the gentleman does not have the same feeling that many of us in the House have that the bill reported out by the committee would never pass the House. So I know that we would be very interested, if when the gentleman has the time available, he would discuss what he might intend to do in reference to this bill and improving it in some way so that the Members of the House might take a different view of the bill than they do of the bill that was reported out by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished minority whip, I think we have brought a bill out of the committee with many improvements, and many effective changes.

One of which was authored by the gentlewoman from Oregon to the community action section of the bill which she will explain to the Members of the House. Other provisions to strengthen the bill will also be discussed as this debate progresses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York, as I promised I would yield to him.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At the time I was asking the gentleman to yield, I wanted to clarify the matter.

The gentleman from Kentucky made a strong case that if we transferred the Job Corps it would take 10 years to get residential centers started. I believe in this debate we should be very clear about what the alternatives are.

The gentleman is aware, I am sure, that there is no proposal just to close up all the Job Corps centers and to start all over again with grants to the States and wait for the States to get residential centers. The proposal is to transfer the administration nationally of the Job Corps into the Vocational Education Office, with authority to continue the present Job Corps centers, but to begin the phasing over process so that we will set up realistic training centers on a regional or community basis.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe I understand. We went through weeks of hearings.

The proposal, as I understand it, is to transfer the operation of the whole Job Corps presently to the Office of Education, to be operated through the vocational schools. But that would require plans from the States, just like the present vocational school system operates today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. That is not the Opportunity Crusade. The Opportunity Crusade gives full authority for the Vocational Education Office to operate the Job Corps with 100 percent Federal funds, to keep these centers open. Then, over a period of years, they would work out integrated facilities with the existing schools, and work them into State plans to the degree it is feasible.

The Vocational Education Office has full authority to keep these centers operating under the Opportunity Crusade.

Mr. PERKINS. What about funds to be provided in the Opportunity Crusade for residential centers through the Office of Education? How long would the gentleman expect that program would take to get off the ground?

Mr. GOODELL. How long to get off the ground?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. It would be off the ground immediately.

Mr. PERKINS. Where are the centers?

Mr. GOODELL. They would take over the present centers.

Mr. PERKINS. Would it close down the present Job Corps centers being operated by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GOODELL. No.

Mr. PERKINS. Where are the facilities?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the confrontation is at hand.

I hope in the course of the debate in the ensuing days there will be a clear confrontation, that we will not muddy the waters, that we will not talk about alternatives which are fictional, which nobody is proposing.

I hope there will be an understanding of what we believe to be realistic proposals we are making, and that the House of Representatives will make a choice based upon the facts and the arguments presented here on a truthful and accurate basis.

This poverty legislation embarked at the beginning on a rather partisan course. Today, 3 years later, it is careening along a tortuous course, bordering on a precipice, apparently with many leaders clutching for the wheel and pulling in different directions.

It serves no purpose for us to talk here of passion or partisanship. All of us are concerned about doing more to help the less fortunate in our country.

I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress who would deny the means to implement a realistic program to help the poor and to eliminate poverty in this country.

The debate from the beginning, in 1964, revolved around the question of what is the best way? What is the most realistic way? What is really going to reach the poor?

Arbitrary, all-encompassing indictments of the war on poverty are also uncalled for. We have spent over \$4 billion in 3 years. Obviously, when you spend \$4 billion, you reach some people, you help some people. Virtually everyone in this Chamber would agree that some of the programs in the war on poverty are good and some of them are not so good. The issue before us as responsible Members of Congress representative of our people is to discuss how we can improve the war on poverty.

Let us not deal with overall indictments. On the other hand, let us not deal with paeans of praise from those



who advocate this program claiming that all has been going right and clean in the war on poverty. I think the record is unmistakably clear that it has not been all right in the war on poverty and that there are many difficulties with the present operation of the program.

Recognizing that the American people want to eliminate poverty in this country and that they are willing to pay in order to eliminate poverty in a realistic way, we should end up with a bipartisan approach. Yes, there is not anything partisan about the basic approaches to eliminating poverty. We should end up with a program that is not going to duplicate a variety of other programs and that is not going to add confusion to the present confusion and compound it all into chaos but which will straighten out the problems which are so evident.

Many of us believe this establishment downtown known as the Office of Economic Opportunity is a monument to administrative asininity. It is beyond any doubt the worst administered office that we have seen in modern times in Washington. Now, I say that flatly, and I think most of you off the record and privately would concede that you would have a lot of difficulty in naming another agency of this Government that is administered in a more muddled and confused way.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I will in just a moment.

It is not enough to say these are just new approaches and innovations and therefore inevitably involve some controversy and inevitably involve conflicts. I agree with that. I agree that new programs and innovations involving the poor, with a little decisionmaking of their own and guiding of their own destinies, involve some controversies. This can be constructive for our society. That is no excuse for the unending administrative blunders and confusions that have been going on in the war on poverty.

I can look at my colleagues across the aisle here and see one after another of those who have said this to me privately and conceded this. There is no controversy, really, and there is no discussion that anybody can debate on as to the poorness of the administration of this program. So then the question is how can we improve it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. Our initial suggestion was, let us get these programs into the existing agencies where we can count on some better administration.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. At this stage we have been forced to a new position recognizing that, listening to the hearings and listening to the experts who came in in an unpartisan way, they feel that the Office of Economic Opportunity has become an important symbol—an important symbol—that something, something, was going to be different and something might eventually come about that would help the poor. Recognizing also that we should move to get this program out of the partisanship in which it was born

in 1964, we tried to move in the opportunity crusade that we will present here later this week, to a proposal that is a fair compromise, that will improve the program and which will permit major redirections in the program without destroying the good.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky first and then to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me first say to the gentleman that we all admit that mistakes have been made. Mistakes are made everywhere in government.

Mr. GOODELL. Can you name me an agency that has made as many mistakes, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman that we threw a lot of money at Sargent Shriver and told him to get started at an early date, and he did just that according to my way of thinking, and he handled the situation in an excellent manner, considering the time he had in which to get started and to commence the operation. Considering the circumstances it has been an efficient operation and in my opinion he has performed in an excellent manner. He has profited from mistakes that were made from time to time. Improvements have been placed into operation. The Job Corps is an example, wherein the cost of its operation has been brought down. And, you can take the programs one by one and examine them and you will find that Sargent Shriver has been effective.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's blanket charge is completely unfair to the present Director, because he is doing an excellent job. The Office of Economic Opportunity was designed in one sense of the word to do a lot of experimenting, to do something for the poor people, and to do some coordinating in the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, it takes time for that to be accomplished.

We admit that mistakes have been made. But we have profited—the Office of Economic Opportunity has profited—from those mistakes and has done something about these mistakes when they detected them.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky did not answer my question. I certainly do not know of any other agency of this Federal Government that is working to help the poor that is so poorly administered—and we are spending somewhere between \$25 billion and \$40 billion a year on poverty-oriented programs, Federal money, depending upon how you define the "poverty oriented" program. Yet only \$1.5 billion is contained in the war on poverty, and I know of no agency that has made as many monumental mistakes as have been made by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and which has made such mistakes with consistency, with more consistency than any other agency of the Government.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for

yielding, because the gentleman began his original remarks with the statement of his desire to remove partisanship from consideration of the legislation providing for the war on poverty, and indicated to us on this side of the aisle in a grand and eloquent manner a fair and full discussion of this program so that those on this side of the aisle thought he was prepared to suspend the bombing. However, the gentleman then immediately came upon the question of extending this program by dropping the blockbuster upon the command post of the Office of Economic Opportunity or the office of the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any agency in the Government which is prepared and could sustain such an attack. Also, I do not know of any other agency that was ever asked to take on something that this country had never tried before in its history, the job of coping with the war on poverty and undertaking to improve the deplorable conditions which existed. However, as soon as it got to the point that the importance of the task before it was realized to be of such proportions they were then told that their funds would be cut back to the extent of 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any other agency which was ever given a job like that and then had its weapons spiked before it got to the frontlines.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York would indicate that the Republican side of the aisle controls this Congress and, therefore, the course of this legislation. We, together, on our side shall do everything we can in the next year to make that situation come to pass. But the gentleman from New York knows full well that the House of Representatives is 3 to 2 Democrat, and when he says that the minority deprived the Office of Economic Opportunity of 40 percent of their money, he is just engaging in a fallacy.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I do not yield further to the gentleman at this moment. However, I shall in a moment.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York is well aware in the second session of the 89th Congress—and it was, perhaps, the most generous Congress in our history—that second session of the 89th Congress cut back the war on poverty, and I say that there were some good reasons why this happened. The people, suddenly, in this House of Representatives and the other body, began to take a look at what was going on and said, in effect, "We had better stop here and try to redirect this program to some extent."

We had better not just funnel money out in a big load, because it will not solve very much, because not very much of it is really going down to help the poor. So let us do that in this debate here this week.

The gentleman from Kentucky was the first one who mentioned the Director. I said that the program has been poorly administered, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity has made great mistakes.



We said this in 1964, that we felt there was an unrealistic administrative structure. Frankly, I believe Mr. Shriver has made mistakes, but I will give him my sympathy in having to take over such an agency with the administrative structure that was proposed by the President, and that Congress created for him. It was an impossible administrative structure from the outset.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that since the gentleman has been relating the history of this bill, I believe it is clear upon the record who the friends of poverty have been, and who have really been interested in this problem of our Nation.

Let me say this: that the gentleman has never voted for this program, and the gentleman has always voted for the motion to recommit. The gentleman has voted for every crippling amendment that has been offered.

I recall one of the great contributions that the minority side made to the war on poverty was that Mr. Shriver—whom I consider to have done a terrific job, and who undertook a job that no one was willing to handle. And I believe he has done a fine job for the benefit of the poor. I say to the gentleman that I believe he has done a terrific job.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman believes he has done a terrific job.

Mr. CAREY. But when the minority first came to consider this matter, they insisted that one of the things that had to be done was in the fact that Mr. Shriver would have to remove one of his two hats, because he was handling the Peace Corps, and this meant that he was now going to handle poverty also, and they wanted him only to concentrate on the poverty program, and thus they then settled for removing one of his hats. Now they are asking for his head.

Mr. GOODELL. I refuse to yield any further to the gentleman. The gentleman can take all of his own time that he wishes to deliver his perorations. I would only say to the gentleman, as long as he has raised the issue, I would just like to quote what the gentleman stated in a public session—and this is from the transcript, and I am quoting the gentleman from New York who just sat down:

If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies \* \* \*. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation.

The record speaks for the gentleman. The gentleman now says he believes it is a very finely administered program.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield briefly, but I do not want the gentleman to go off on a tangent for another 5 minutes.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will say very briefly that the context in which I made those remarks was that I had specifically in my mind my hometown program in the city of New York.

I believe the gentleman realizes that under the local option formula in this case it is administered by Republican Mayor John Lindsay. And all the criticisms that I am going to make of this program will be directed as to the manner in which it has been conducted in New York City, where Mr. Shriver cannot prevail upon them to conduct the program in the manner he would suggest.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, the great irony is that most of your colleagues who have spoken or who may speak on this subject have very clearly in mind the way the programs are being handled in their own district, and they do not have the benefit that the gentleman from New York does of placing the blame for everything at the top, on the individual mayors of these cities as fall guys, as the gentleman has done here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. AYRES. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I believe actually it is not necessary, judging from the prior comments about all of the mistakes that have been made, to belabor this issue of chaotic administration, but at this stage I would like to quote two individuals who were active in the war on poverty who are very strong advocates of community action, and who certainly have done yeoman work in trying to straighten out the problems at the local levels.

The concentrated employment program was announced with great fanfare last spring. They were trying to get the summer programs started, as they should have been started and planned in the winter or fall of last year, not on a hit or miss basis last spring, in a panic. When these actions were taking place late last spring, James Banks, former UPO director here in Washington, D.C. had this to say:

The government's whole method of approaching the summer is a crazy, illogical, emotional response to a problem that deserves more serious consideration.

There's something rather immoral about it.

The government's response is: Let's keep down riots and violence rather than to eliminate the causes of riots and violence.

Then Mitchell Sviridoff, director of the program in New York City, the Human Resources Administration, said:

It is a hell of a way to run a public program. It's unhealthy. What it does is to inform people: The way to get some money is to have a riot or threaten one.

Two and one-half years after the war on poverty was declared, we were still last summer throwing together crash programs.

You can go through the hearings and find testimony after testimony from individuals, that in April, May, and June they were suddenly told that they were going to have \$8 million or \$10 million to spend in the summer. There was no time to put them together in a reasonable and realistic way.

Now, I want to talk about the Job Corps. I will not belabor the statistics there, but the only evidence we had on the Job Corps performance after 2 full years of operation had to come—and it is appalling to have to say this in a public body—it had to come from the OEO sending out Lou Harris, a pollster, to poll the Job Corps kids to find where they were and what they were doing.

These were kids for whom in the first 2 years we were spending about \$11,000 a year in the Job Corps centers per enrollee. We had to have the Federal Government go out and get a pollster to take a sample to find out how many of them got jobs, where they were and what they were doing.

There is something wrong with that.

I believe very deeply in the concept of residential skilled training for those who must have a change in environment to respond. But I believe that we can do it in a more efficient way and more effectively. I think it is kind of sad that we are here 3 years later still arguing that the Job Corps should not be changed and that we should go on doing it in the same way.

The gentleman from Kentucky mentioned the National Youth Administration and the CCC. That is part of the trouble. Apparently, we have not grown up from the tragic years of the thirties. We accept the same old, tired approach and that is not good enough for the problems of the 1960's.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. It took us a long, long time to get vocational education job oriented. Now you are the one who is proposing to take us back so that it will take us many, many years to go forward again, by reason of these transfers.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point because I was about to explain exactly what we would do.

Mr. PERKINS. I would hope that the gentleman would tell the Committee about Lou Harris and the statement he made when he appeared before the committee. It is true that the placement record is 70 percent in the Job Corps and that in the first year they did not have adequate followthrough procedures to see how many of those youngsters were employed, but they did contract for surveys, but I think the gentleman in good faith with this Committee should tell the Committee about the statement that Lou Harris made when he appeared before the committee keeping in mind that the report he made concerned the Job Corps as it existed in 1966 and not as it is today with greatly strengthened directions and administration.



Mr. GOODELL. I will respond first and tell you some of the things that Lou Harris reported to us.

Mr. PERKINS. But I do not mean the way you interpret it.

Mr. GOODELL. These are figures that come from the Lou Harris survey, the only information that we have as to what has happened in the Job Corps after 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. I will have to be quick about this because I would like to explain briefly the opportunity crusade. Mr. Harris showed that 44 percent of the Job Corps graduates, that is those who graduated and stayed to completion, had jobs before they came in. Fifty-three percent had jobs after they graduated. In other words, the number with jobs rose from 44 to 53 percent.

It showed that only one out of 10 Job Corps graduates got any help at all in getting a job from the Job Corps and another 11 percent got some help from the local employment office.

The rest were just cast on the open seas to fend for themselves.

The Harris survey showed that one-third of the Job Corps enrollees dropped out in the first 3 months and another third in the second 3 months. On the average that means that two-thirds of them dropped out in the first 6 months. Mr. Harris also showed that if an enrollee did not stay in the Job Corps for at least 6 months, they were getting very little if any benefit at all out of it.

In fact this is what Mr. Harris said, and I quote—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I do not yield now. The gentleman asked me to quote from the survey, and I will be glad to discuss with him later in a colloquy, if we have the time, the specifics. But I quote now Mr. Harris with reference to nongraduate terminations:

Overall, there is no reported change in the number currently employed compared with the pre-Job Corps studies. The number in school has dropped slightly. Unemployment has increased slightly.

These were the determinations in the first study. He indicated that if you dropped out in the first 6 months, basically, you ended up no better than before. In fact, in the Job Corps generally, with all the enrollees, 18 percent said they thought they were worse off, 29 percent said they were about the same, leaving about half, 47 percent of them, who said they were no better off than before they went in.

Mr. Harris' survey showed that only 15 percent of the total Job Corps enrollees were using the training that they received in the Job Corps in their jobs. He showed that of the graduates, those that went all the way through, only 25 percent were using the training that they received in Job Corps centers. These are some of the statistics that must be pointed out when we are talking about the Job Corps.

I do not think those statistics in the Lou Harris survey show that an across-

the-board indictment of any residential skill training program is indicated here. I think it does indicate very strongly that we can do this job better, that we should make changes. This is basically what we are proposing in the opportunity crusade.

First, the opportunity crusade, instead of spending \$2,060,000,000, would spend \$1.4 billion of Federal money. That \$1.4 billion would generate over \$3 billion of money going into the pockets of the poor. How? It would use the Federal money as seed money generating the involvement of private enterprise. Almost all of the money that is in addition to the Federal money would come from private employers hiring these people.

If we talk to the poor, we discover that they do not want dead-end, make-work jobs. They want meaningful jobs for the future. They want to get on-the-job training. They want to start moving up the ladder. That is what we are trying to do with our opportunity crusade.

We would transfer the Job Corps administratively in Washington to the Office of Vocational Education. That is the only change that would be made initially. The Office of Vocational Education would be administering the Job Corps centers that we now have.

Then we would put in the law authority for the Office of Vocational Education to begin to make a transition, a phase-over, into realistic approaches where we can follow through with these youngsters to get them jobs or to give them job training, where we can take some responsibility for placement.

At the end of the transition, in 3 or 4 years, we want these Job Corps centers phased over so they are no longer centers for rejects, where they send them out into the country somewhere. Rather we would have a complex of community training facilities around the country, so that these youngsters can go into a training facility that is residential and paid for 100 percent by Federal money. It would not be set up with the States having to match. Enrollees would go into that facility, and it would be integrated with existing technical institutes and vocational schools, so that those Job Corps enrollees who respond well could move into other types of courses. This would save a great deal of money in the program. We would abandon and reject the policy that you have to send Job Corps enrollees as far away from home as possible. The survey done by Mr. Harris indicates that 85 percent of the kids want to go back to their hometown when they get out. Let us take that into account. There will be a placement service built into this training facility. This is the kind of thing we want to move over to. We want to phase the present Job Corps into that kind of program so that we have a continuum carrying these youngsters—these boys and girls—from the beginning all the way through and placing them in a productive job at the end of the line, not dropping them off at the end of the line, as occurs in the Job Corps.

What else do we do? We now have an Education Act funding elementary and secondary education. Among other things we fund preschool programs and follow-

through programs in the early years of the youngsters. So then we set up a Headstart program that is completely uncoordinated with the education program, and we go through an entirely different channel, down to the local level, and set up all the torsions and frictions at the local level, and all trying to administer this program at the local level tear their hair.

We lose the major impact of a glorious program, Headstart. It has been a success. Many of us were urging it before the war on poverty. I strongly support it. Let us get a better administrative structure for this.

We propose transferring it to the Office of Education in Washington. They would allocate funds to the State through the State commission, and the State commission in turn would allocate Headstart funds to the local community action boards—not to the local school system—and the local community action boards would contract with public and private agencies for the provision of Headstart for these youngsters.

We think it is a fair and reasonable transition over, and all of it would be run out of the Office of Education and HEW, so there is an automatic coordination of education funds with poverty funds.

This, we feel, would give a great deal more impact to the whole Headstart project.

We would transfer the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is now delegated to the Labor Department anyway, to the Labor Department and give them full authority. This is one of the programs that would cause no difficulty at all in transferring, because the Labor Department already has it.

We would set up new military career centers on a voluntary basis for youngsters who want to qualify to get into the military service and where the military feels they can upgrade the skills enough—either mental skills or physical condition—to get them into the service. We found many of these youngsters, particularly from the ghetto areas, wanted to get into military service. A good many of them got into the Job Corps, and the minute they could qualify for the service, they enlisted. Why do we not have a special program in the military where they can have a uniform and go in on a voluntary basis, upgrade their skills, and then go into the service of their choice? We think this would be a sensible approach to the problem.

Let me come finally to a major change we make in our program. There are many others. We set up an Industry Youth Corps where the community action boards will be able to pay part of the wages of the poor youngsters, for up to a year, so they can get on-the-job training, and get over that first major hump to employment, when they are 16 to 22 years of age. We know this is a major crisis problem in this country, the employment of youth.

This would help, because the community action boards could pay one-quarter of the wages with a private employer paying three-quarters, for up to a year's time, with safeguards provided in the act. Also they could pay some of the ex-



penses of training. The employer is paying three-quarters of the wage, and it is not Uncle Sam paying 100 percent of the wage. Thus, with one-quarter of the wage paid by the Federal Government, we can reach so many more people, and the private employers come in and make a contribution and get productiveness from these individuals.

This is the kind of job the average poor youngster is looking for.

There are a variety of other programs providing counselors in our schools, to get part-time jobs for the youngsters in public or private employment, but once again it will be the approach that will get the jobs that are meaningful and productive.

Let me come to community action and how we handle that in our bill. Unfortunately in our committee we took a regressive step—resisted strenuously by most of us on this side of the aisle. In my opinion, we completely sandbagged the whole concept of involvement of the poor. We turned community action agencies over to city hall. I say bluntly, it does not do any good to guarantee the poor one-third representation on a community action board if we then say that the board is the instrument and the creature of city hall, that the board gets no money unless it comes through city hall, and that the board is created by city hall. This is what the Green amendment does. In my opinion, in most of our big cities, it will completely destroy the genius of community action. I believe it would do so in the South.

In the big cities and in the South it would destroy community action. Is this the price of the votes that may be necessary to pass this bill? If so, it is a dreadful price, because it is snuffing out the one spark that holds great hope for the future in a poverty program; that is, self-motivation, self-involvement in one's own destiny.

This is a good old American principle, going all the way back to the barn-raising days of getting people involved together as a team, working and exchanging and communicating, feeling a part of society.

This has been misconceived in some areas. In some areas community activism or community action has been confused with community militancy and destructiveness. Community building has been confused with community tearing down.

These things should be corrected. We need some standards and guidelines in the program.

We need to involve the local governments more effectively as partners in this, but we need to keep the community action board as the decisionmaking body, with at least one-third of the representatives of that board the representatives of the poor themselves who are to be served.

I believe very deeply that this move, this action by the committee, should be reversed in our deliberations in this Committee of the Whole. I shall offer an amendment to do that. It is an amendment that will bring the States in, in a coordinative way, and will bring in local government as a partner but not as the dominant master of community action.

The amendment which was adopted in our committee might well be called the bosses and boll weevil amendment because it is an amendment for the big city hall bosses and for the southerners to completely denude community action of its potential.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois briefly.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman would give us his interpretation of the language in the bill which reads as follows: "at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures."

Mr. GOODELL. I will answer right now.

Mr. PUCINSKI (continuing). "Adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served."

Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will. What you have done there is handed it over and said that the community action agencies are the local governments and are the State governments. Then you provide that the program shall be administered through what will in effect be advisory committees. That is all. You let the poor elect at least one-third to this advisory committee that is totally impotent. You have taken away the dignity of a decision from them, as a partner in the decisionmaking process.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How does the gentleman suggest we do it?

Mr. GOODELL. I just outlined that. We would have a community action board with at least one-third of the representatives of the poor selected by the poor—

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what is in here?

Mr. GOODELL. Who sets the priorities—

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what is in here?

Mr. GOODELL. No, it is not.

I do not yield further. The gentleman knows that is not what is in the Green of Oregon amendment. Let us not muddy the waters.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I suggest that the gentleman read the Green of Oregon amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. That is not what it is. You make a community action board there that is a charade. It is a little charade for the poor to go through that is meaningless.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How does the gentleman want to do it?

Mr. GOODELL. I want that community action board to have power. I want it to be representative of the whole community and be independent of city hall but with balanced representation from all elements of the community, including city officials.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Who would pick them? Who would select them?

Mr. GOODELL. At least one-third would be representatives of the poor. They would be selected by the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a high compliment. I thank the gentleman. I do not believe I will need that much time, except for yielding.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GARDNER. I hate to take issue with my colleague, but the reference to the "boll weevil" southerners certainly offends me.

I supported the Green of Oregon amendment in the committee. I plan to support it on the floor.

I want to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman apparently does not have much faith in the local forms of government. In the South we are perfectly able to take care of our own problems. If I remember correctly, the gentleman stood up and told us that under the Quie amendment the proper thing to do was to turn this funding over to the same governmental agencies, in order that they could best determine how the money should be spent.

I think we should do the same thing as far as this is concerned.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman's comments confirm my characterization of the amendment. I said it was a bosses and boll weevils amendment. I must say to the gentleman I have very little confidence that southern local government will undertake the innovation and the new approaches necessary to help the downtrodden Negro in the South. I do not have much confidence in that. I am sorry.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? You have sort of slandered us. I wonder if you will yield for a little observation on that point.

Mr. GOODELL. Did the gentleman say I slandered you?

Mr. GIBBONS. I certainly did.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly did not intend to, and I apologize if I seemed to. But I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida at this time.

Mr. GIBBONS. I get pretty excited about something like this. You dubbed us the bosses and boll weevils. That makes me laugh. I think the gentleman adequately answered it and I do not want to expand on that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODELL. I think he adequately answered it, too, if I may say so to the gentleman. I think he confirmed what I am saying.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman should know that there are many fine governmental agencies in the South. There are quite a few of them. I know some who have rendered service to this program responsibly and have involved all races and have done it on a very fine and proud basis. I do not want the impression left here at this time that there are not responsible, openminded governments in the South.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to respond briefly to that and say to the gentleman



I have great respect for local government and I have great respect for the ability and integrity of many officials of local government in the South. I just feel that the concept of community action and the new approach we are seeking here cannot be implemented in the way that the gentleman's amendment and Mrs. GREEN's amendment does it in community action, because it hands over the whole idea of innovation to people who really do not want to have that kind of innovation.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I think the gentleman's designation of his proposal as a crusade is quite accurate, because in the Middle Ages the crusaders set out to convert the infidels and they ended up by butchering and slaughtering them. I am not sure whether your crusade is for the poor or against the poor, but I think it is very well named.

Mr. GOODELL. I think it is well named, too, for apparently different reasons I will say to the gentleman. I suspect maybe the gentleman from New Jersey will agree with me on community action, will you not? Does the gentleman from New Jersey support the Green amendment in this bill?

Mr. JOELSON. I am considering it very carefully and weighing the debate.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, the so-called opportunity crusade before the committee, when we considered the legislation, H.R. 10682 provided for the transfer of the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Department of Health, Education and Welfare where it would not have any constituency. Now, if I understand you correctly, in your new substitute you are proposing to leave it just as it is but transfer all the functions away. Am I correct? Is that your new substitute?

Mr. GOODELL. Oh, no, no, no. We do not transfer all of the new functions away. We leave a great many functions in OEO. The community action remains in OEO. VISTA remains, and a variety of other programs. The legal services program remains. Most all of your new special emphasis programs and things of that nature remain in there. We transfer Headstart, the Job Corps, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. That is basically it. That is to be administered by existing agencies. The gentleman has correctly stated what I think should be the case and I hope will soon be the case, that we transfer community action to HEW.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 additional minute.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to conclude in 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members of this Committee will give serious,

fair, and open consideration to the proposals that we are making in the opportunity crusade. They are offered in a constructive and unpartisan way. We want them to be enacted because we think they will bring realism to this program and bring more help to those who so desperately need it.

From 1950 to 1960 we reduced the number of poor families in this country from about 30 percent to 20 percent. And, in the last 5 years that pace of reduction of poor families has slowed. It is now 16.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years we have reduced the amount of poverty by a lower rate than we did from 1950 to 1960. Something is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, as the poor could so eloquently put it, "I am as poor as Job, but not so patient."

Mr. Chairman, let us move to change this program before it is too late.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, much has been written and spoken in recent days about the war on poverty. It is obvious that this legislation is in trouble, but, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the war on poverty is in trouble, not because Congress is blind to the urgent problems of our cities, and not because Congress is deaf to the pleas of those in need, because if that were the case Congress would not have passed innumerable bills for the preschool child, the aged, the unemployed, the unemployable. We have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for programs to help those in need and to give a start to those who would try to help themselves.

For disadvantaged children—this year alone we appropriated over \$1 billion in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have appropriated funds for neighborhood facilities; for public housing; for model cities; for education for the handicapped; for vocational rehabilitation; for the public health service.

Over \$4 billion have gone in grants to States for public assistance; for maternal and child welfare; for the manpower development and training alone, one-half billion dollars. For school lunch program; for the food stamp program; for the school milk program; for rural housing for domestic farm labor; for aid to the blind; for aid to dependent children.

Mr. Chairman, this does not exhaust the list but it would be a disservice to this Congress and to this administration to have a message go abroad in the land that this Government is not concerned about all of its citizens and further than a disservice—it would be a misstatement of the facts. We can record by chapter and verse the great programs that have come from the various committees.

But today this program on which we start debate is in trouble because of other reasons than the indifference of Congress to the plight of the poor.

It is in trouble because money that Congress thought would go to the poor is

eaten up in high administrative costs or in some cases unaccounted for. It is in trouble because some of us on the committee could not even get answers to questions which we asked. It is in trouble because efforts are made to invoke executive privilege on studies that would give Congress needed information on which valid judgments could be made. It is in trouble because there is an absence of candor when honest people try to get honest answers.

These and other matters have given me great concern about the way the war on poverty has been administered.

Many of our people are caught in the eye of a social hurricane.

The schools of the District of Columbia, the schools of New York City, Detroit, Watts, Cambridge, Cleveland, are caught in that eye of a social hurricane.

Three years ago the Nation declared itself ready to try to do something about poverty. The opponent is an old, grim warrior, strong with years of neglect. That enemy, as I see it, is not so much outside us as he is a part of our individual values. The war on poverty seeks to attack specific evils, but it also helps to transform us as individuals and as a nation. For in daily battle we gain a truer picture of ourselves, a truer concept of the idea that to call oneself an American is tantamount to calling oneself "my brother's keeper."

Poverty, in one sector or one section of America, impoverishes all Americans. To be poor is to die a little each day as the dream of dignity fades down the years. Our war, therefore, must draw no lines of race, color, creed, or sex. Our enemy is everywhere, sapping all of the substance of humanity.

The legislation the committee brings you today is a measure of our resolve to continue the fight. In some areas, on some fronts, the results have been most encouraging and successful; on other fronts our efforts have not been equal to our task. Often our tactics have proved faulty. From these we must learn.

Mr. Chairman, I would argue that past mistakes must not and cannot serve as an excuse to abandon the war on poverty. To make changes in the program, yes; to abandon it, no. Other Federal programs have had their failures and we have not cut them off. Mishap and error in space exploration did not end their efforts in that area of Federal spending. The tragic death of three gallant men in an Apollo capsule did not signal the end of that program. On the contrary, we went forward, saddened by wasteful death, determined to eliminate the cause, but nevertheless forward.

And just a few weeks ago this Congress appropriated over \$2½ billion for the Apollo program and an additional \$315 million for Apollo applications. If we can afford—in this year of the tight budget—to spend these billions on such projects as putting a man on the moon, we can certainly afford to spend the necessary money on a few million of our children—on this corner of our planet—if in so doing their lives will be enriched and thereby our national life enriched also. The moon is very patient and, I am certain, could not care less whether it meets one of us in 1970 or 1980, but



youngsters are not patient and grow up in whatever ways are open to them; they stand still for no one.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Education and Labor Committee are determined that the waste of funds, the inefficient operations, the irresponsible actions are to be stopped—not just for the sake of economy, but so that the disadvantaged will, in fact, reap the benefits of good intentions.

Americans have left messy battlefields in all wars. Few would deny that there is not evidence that the war on poverty has not left a messy battlefield also. But the committee believes the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 will continue the battle with more precision.

But we do not, we cannot, use partial failure to justify retreat. To do so would be unworthy of our responsibility to evaluate and correct programs begun as an expression of this Nation's will to try to end poverty in America.

Let me turn now to title II and the change that the committee made in the bill. In many areas CAP worked well and they will continue to work well under committee changes. A few years ago President Johnson said:

Legislation should not be examined in the light of benefits it will convey if properly administered—but by wrongs it would cause if improperly administered.

It is to these areas that legislative changes in title II are directed. As I understood the original legislation—and I served on that subcommittee which drafted it—the Congress did not intend to create a new governmental structure of powerful political bodies with the luxury of millions of Federal dollars to spend and none of the responsibilities of raising any of that money. I do not think that Congress aimed to create autonomous groups to displace the decision-making process of State, county, or local governments or to fund with Federal dollars any groups intent on reversing the decisions of the duly elected school boards or county or local governments. No one challenges the right of dissent but many of us question the wisdom of requiring others to pay taxes to finance it. As I see it, the Congress clearly intended to attack an economic problem through political means, but it did not intend to legislate a revolution in American politics by establishing another structure of government at the various levels of political action in the United States.

This year's committee bill that makes community action agencies "a State or a political subdivision of a State"—having duly elected or duly appointed governing officials—clarifies the intent of the original Economic Opportunity Act as I see it.

It does not intend, nor do any of its provisions provide that "poor people" will no longer be able to help shape decisions affecting their lives. The opposite is true for the bill specifically provides that community action boards shall insure participation of the poor through giving poor people at least one-third of the seats on such boards. But it also provides that those who are helping to pay the bill—and who also live in this same community—shall have a voice through

their elected officials on how their money is spent and how programs can be coordinated with other existing programs.

I would also like to call attention to the provision encompassed in section 3(d) of title II—the so-called bypass language—if States or political subdivisions fail to develop program meeting criteria of this legislation. It reads:

3(d). The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a Community Action Agency other than a Community Action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the Community Action Agency serving the Community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a Community Action program which meets the Criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the state nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the Community Action Agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

But the bill does provide that State or local governmental officials shall participate—and for good reasons: Those who spend public money and initiate local projects affecting the entire community should and must be accountable to their fellow citizens through the democratic process, an election, and the electorate has the chance to reject those for whom private gain or personal power is of greater value than public service.

The bill does not blunt the attack on poverty through this provision. It helps to ensure that locally elected commanders will be responsible for local successes and local failures.

In this respect, I would ask what political alchemy at work in the United States has suddenly made Washington politicians and appointees above error or reproach, and State or local politicians incapable of making wise decisions for the constituents who elected them. In any area where Federal, State, or local politicians are unresponsive to constituency needs, blind to poverty, deaf to legislative pleas for change, then I would say the answer is to make it possible for the people to throw them out of office at the next election and not permit them to enjoy the luxury of seeking refuge in a nonprofit corporation—not subject to the same regulations as other public employees. In the last several days I have heard cries of alarm in regard to committee changes to title II. The cry usually is, keep the State or local politicians out of it, that local politicians are inefficient at best or nonresponsive or corrupt at the worst. But what they are really saying is: do not have the community action program in the hands of "elected" politicians. This does not keep the politicians who have been rejected by the voters out of it. This does not keep the self-starting politician, who dreams of empire building out of it. This does not keep the self-starting politician, who dreams of empire building out of it. The only complaint I have heard: somehow keep the elected politicians away. My answer is to bring the local elected politicians into it. Then we would continue to be able to measure their competence in the light of popular judgment.

And how many so-called local politicians, who have suffered defeat in State and local elections, have found a community action agency a convenient sanctuary from which they may sally forth—armed with Federal money and sanction—to further their own ambitions?

How many agencies are providing millions of Federal dollars to build local political empires for would be elected politicians—and those very politicians cry—"keep the politicians out."

Is it the purpose of this legislation to foment discord in our cities and in rural communities? Or are we not trying to stamp out ignorance, disease, and poverty in America? If it is the latter, it is the worth of the program that is important and not whether the poor are the architects. Are the able, are the compassionate, are the concerned the architects? For when the reckoning comes—and come it must—when the shouts produce no skills; when the marches deliver no meat; when the rallies yield no rewards; it will be the Government of the United States of America which is credited with the lie, and then there is no one left to believe.

The bill aims to insure that emergency measures to meet a genuine crisis do not become a pattern of government based on the assumption that all wisdom lies somewhere in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., or that there will be no local movement without Federal initiative.

I have heard in recent days that we may "throw out the baby with the bath." But that baby that is in danger of being thrown out is that fragile infant we call the democratic process. We are not defending the right of local majorities to oppress local minorities.

We are defending the right of local governments to make hard decisions on local problems. In fact, the bill demands engagement by local politicians so that they cannot avoid tough decisions on the battle lines of the war on poverty.

The bill does not abandon responsibility for national guidelines to insure that the purposes of the program are fulfilled and that there is representation of all the people in local decisionmaking. Nor does it take the easy path of building a neatly symmetrical pyramid of Federal power in which the foundation stones exist merely to bear the weight of those above them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we are fighting a war against the idea that "the poor shall always be with us." Our dedication to see victory increases our dedication to see that victory soon. Our dedication gives us the responsibility to make our tactics suit our strategy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, let me compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for one of the great speeches made in this body. In the past we have never involved public officials in the so-called Economic Opportunities Act to the extent that we should have. The explanation of the gentlewoman speaks for itself. We have made tremendous improvements in the legislation and we have got it in shape so



that we can eliminate waste. I am hopeful now, Mr. Chairman, that all of the membership of this body could support the bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEN. To my mind certain clarifications are needed to interpret section 211, for which I understand the gentlewoman from Oregon is responsible. First, What is the composition or the supposed composition or the intended composition of the community action agency under section 211?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The community action agency is to be a State or a political subdivision of a State or a private corporation that the State or political subdivision would so designate and the Director would designate.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Subquestion 1: Is that agency to be composed of a tripartite group, like the war on poverty?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That agency, either under a political subdivision or the State, is the community action agency. There will be a community action board. It is a tripartite agency, it becomes a community action board. If a private agency is designated as a community action agency by the State on a political subdivision of the State—then there is to be a community action “governing board.” In both instances it will be tripartite.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the community action agency may be either the State, the city, the local government, or their representatives, they in turn, as I understand, must work through a board?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I then come back to the original question: What is to be the composition of the agency which is the city, the local government, or whatever the government may be? What is the intention on that?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. One-third of the board is to be the elected public officials, one-third representatives of the community, industry, labor, education, welfare, and so forth, and one-third of the board would be representatives of the poor, elected in a democratic process by the poor.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Evidently I have not made myself clear. There is the top layer of the city or its appointed agency. Then there is the lower agency or the board. Is that correct?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There is no lower agency of the board. There is to be a three-party board for every community action agency: one-third public officials, one-third community and one-third the poor.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Let us assume there is only one layer. Under subsection (b), one-third are public officials, one-third are representatives of the poor, who are elected, but there is left in the air the composition of the center group, these officials who are members of business, industry, labor, religions and so on. How are they designated? How do they come into being?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the question is, how are representatives in the one-third group to be representative of the community at large to be designated, the answer is that the bill remains silent on this, and intentionally so. It was not any oversight by the committee. It was the desire on the part of the members of the committee to leave the maximum flexibility possible.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker explained her amendment to the bill that is before us, which is the committee bill. It greatly revamps the action of the community action program as we have seen it for the last 3 years. It also greatly weakens a provision I believe very strongly in, and that is the maximum feasible participation on the part of the poor. Last year I was successful in including an amendment to the bill which required in every community action agency at least one-third of the members of that board must be representative of the poor.

The reason I believe it greatly weakens the bill is that the first priority I can see in reading this bill is that the State can be a community action agency or if the State chooses not to a political subdivision of a State or combination of such political subdivisions can be community action agencies. In the event the State does not designate a public nonprofit private agency to be a community action agency but chooses to be the community action agency itself, section 211(a) reads that they shall administer their program through a community action board, but that board will not have the powers of a governing board as defined in section 211(e).

Section 211(e) provides:

The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

I would assume that since these powers are given only to the governing board of community action agencies, a community action agency which does not have a governing board because it is a political subdivision, retains these powers for the mayor and his council. The three-legged stool or the tripartite board would be only an advisory board in the case the State or political subdivision chooses to be the political action agency.

Some say, as the gentlewoman from Oregon just indicated, that section 210(d) will prevail in case the State and local political subdivision does not operate a program the way the Director wishes, and that he can then designate another community action agency, private nonprofit agency, in order to run the program. But I have seen enough of the political pressures that cities can make on the Federal Government, and I doubt that the director in a number of instances of big cities would say to them, “We do

not like your program. We are going to turn this over to another private, non-profit agency in your city.”

So in this instance, I believe the bill effectively removes the participation of the poor that has been very difficult to achieve so far. The poor have had very little experience in self-government. In the big cities of the Nation, the poor in their neighborhoods are as far away from city hall and the mayor as the people generally are from the State government or even the Federal Government. These people need to learn how to exercise their responsibility in self-government. The community action agency has been an effort to achieve that. It has been difficult. It has been slow. But in some areas this has been achieved. They have made substantial progress. Three years have seen that progress.

I have seen it occur in my congressional district. I have seen it occur in some areas of the country and in some cities of the country.

Where elections have been held, it has been difficult to get the poor to participate in the elections. They had never had a meaningful voice before. They would not believe they had a meaningful voice now with this bill.

Do the Members suppose that we can sell them on the idea of a meaningful voice in the future if they have only an advisory capacity, when their advice has never been accepted before?

When we look to the section of the bill providing for three groups, who will select those who serve on the board?

The first group will be the one-third who are public officials.

The second group will be:

At least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served.

If a mayor appoints a person from an area of the city where poor people reside in large numbers, is that a democratic procedure? Some Members have said to me that is a democratic procedure, and an appointment by the mayor would be sufficient.

That would greatly weaken what we have anticipated as the responsibilities and the opportunities of the poor in this program. I believe that the poor themselves ought to select the person to represent them, and no one else should appoint a person the poor do not select.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Let me finish this, and then we can come back to it.

The poor themselves need to know that the individual they select, whether he is acceptable to city hall or not, is their representative. They need to know if he does not do a good job for them they can turn him out and put somebody else in.

There should be no fear of this by public officials and my colleagues, if the poor have only one-third membership of the boards. In fact, the mayor of Seattle said the poor have more than half in Seattle, and he thinks it is great. At least there is no danger, because we are only insuring that the poor have one-third.

As to the other leg of the stool, the remaining members who are not public officials or representatives of the poor,



they are the members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups.

But this does not provide that they will choose their representatives on the board either. I anticipate that the public officials will appoint the representatives of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups, and therefore they will be answerable to the public officials.

I believe that if we are going to have these other people on the board, as we should have, they should be answerable to the groups who send them. The business group ought to have an individual answerable to them. Organized labor ought to have an individual answerable to them. The welfare group ought to have the same thing.

Each one of those groups ought to select its own representative for the board. In this way I believe we will have effective local government in community action.

Some people have said that always, when there is Federal assistance to the local level, it be given through the State governments and local governments. But this will not be effective for poverty programs, because the poor people to date have not been actively participating in the city governments. We should permit a State to appoint a State commission to develop a State plan. But at the local level city hall is not the best agency to go through.

Rather, this ought to operate, as I have said many times, in the way the rural programs with Federal assistance do, which we have had for years and years, and which are practically sacred. If anybody should try to touch them, woe unto him.

Those are in three areas.

One is cooperative extension. In cooperative extension the boards are representatives of the farmers, who are selected by them.

Another is the Soil Conservation Service. Through the election process the farmer participates in electing a representative, a soil conservation district supervisor, to make broad policy decisions.

In the ASCS committees, again on a township level the farmers elect the township committeeman, and the committeemen join together to elect the county committeemen. This method has proved effective in the rural areas.

I should like to see the people in poverty, be they in the rural areas or in the cities of the country, given the same effective voice in selecting their representatives to make the broad policy decisions for programs in their areas, because no one knows what a poor person is thinking of, as he is caught in the ghetto and cannot escape.

There is no way of understanding that. None of us can visit there or spend a week there and understand that. These policymaking boards need individuals to represent the poor who are caught in that helpless state. The poor should select men as their representatives to speak on these boards. There is a gross failure in the legislation we have before us.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to ask the gentleman these two questions and see if he will answer them. I would like to know, first, how he interprets the language on page 174, and I invite my colleague to that language. It appears on line 23.

Mr. QUIE. Will you give me the section? I have the committee report in front of me rather than the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The section is 211(b). It says:

At least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served.

This is relating to the composition of the board.

My second question is, the gentleman has made many, many statements on this floor over the years on this subject, but he has never spelled out nor has his colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], spelled out precisely and specifically how you propose that these people be chosen. If you are for elections, why do you not say so? How do you propose it? What is your formula? Forget about our formula. Tell us, What do you propose to be the accepted procedure for selecting the one-third representatives of the poor in the community served?

Mr. QUIE. I will be glad to tell the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you.

Mr. QUIE. There are two methods that can be used that I believe are effective. One is election. Election in the cities of the country where the poor reside in an area such as a census tract where 80 percent of the area are poor. I would say let everybody in that area vote. Let them all vote and decide who are to be their representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How do you decide who will be a qualified voter?

Mr. QUIE. Anybody who lives in that area can vote.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will you say I am poor and therefore I can vote?

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will listen to me instead of talking at the same time, he would understand what I said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Go ahead. I would like to hear it.

Mr. QUIE. I said in the census tracts where more than 80 percent of the people are poor everybody in that area can vote. You do not have to prove you are poor.

Now, in the rural areas and where they are more widely distributed, the poor people who will benefit from the program and are interested in the program, can come together in neighborhood meetings. This has been done effectively so far. At the neighborhood meetings they can select the person to represent the poor in that area. If they do not choose wisely, the next time when there is such a neighborhood meeting to select a representative, the ones opposed to the representative can come to the meeting and who ever the majority wants.

Those two methods are effective so far for the poor to select their representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman, but I must say this is a heck of a way to run a railroad. The gentleman saw the disaster we had in this country when we tried this method in Philadelphia and in a few other cities.

Mr. QUIE. Philadelphia was not a disaster. Philadelphia was not as successful as they believed should have been the case, but it was not a disaster. It was an attempt, and they made greater progress the second time they tried it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman answer the second question? How do you interpret this language in the bill which provides that they shall be chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served? How do you interpret that language?

Mr. QUIE. Nobody has given me guidelines or rules and regulations that will be followed to implement this program. I assume it would permit a mayor to appoint them from the area where the poor reside. The appointment method has been considered a democratic process before, but I do not approve of that method of selecting representatives of the poor.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York once again raises this in a context that would confuse the Members. I think it should be emphasized the requirement for a board where one-third are selected by a democratic process to represent the poor is for a community action board that is totally and completely subservient to and a creature of city hall. So that it is a facade. There is a clear involvement of the poor, or else the board itself will not be the decision-making creature. It is a creature of city hall and it does what it tells them to do.

So, if you leave all the representation to the poor and assume that they will be democratically selected, they end up on a board that does not do anything that is meaningful.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield further, and if the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] would be good enough to give me the basis for his interpretation under the law. As I read the law, one-third of them shall be elected officials and one-third of them shall be individuals who are considered to be poor.

Now, let me tell the gentleman how they are elected in New York City. I am unaware as to how they are elected elsewhere. Individuals in a particular area can be elected to this poverty board by petition. As we have it, and as I envisage this specific proposal involving this particular situation, I can see no basis that "city hall" will control it.

I wish the gentleman from New York would clarify that particular situation.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] is talking about the present law. We are talking



about the bill that comes out of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I would quote from page 171 of the bill, line 7, and thereafter:

#### COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to further ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]—

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], in further answer to the gentleman's question, if you will follow on from the language which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] just read, section 210, over to section 211, it says that there are two different kinds of community action agencies. There is the one which is the State or political subdivision which shall administer its program under a community action board. But the other community type of community action agencies are ones designated either by a political subdivision or combination of political subdivisions or designated by the Director of OEO, and the governing board's powers are defined in section 211(e).

So the powers given the poor, as well as the other two classes on the board, meaningful power, are listed in section 211(e). But those powers are not given to the community action board where the State or the political subdivision is the community action agency, but, rather, are retained for the political subdivision itself.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this brings about a community action agency governing board. Now, are there two layers or is there one layer of government?

I tried to determine that from questioning the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. QUIE. It is evident that there are two layers. The top layer is the Government, the other is the board appointed by the Government, whether it be city or State appointees.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my question is, How do they come into being? Does this top agency come into being pursuant to the law which does not actually say how it is to come into being? Is it the intention that the agency be composed of a tripartite group, and is the lower level also to be composed of a tripartite group?

In other words, is the top agency just created by law; that is, the mayor or the local council, or the Governor, and the legislature? As I see it, how is this top agency to come into being?

Mr. QUIE. The top agency is not selected by a political subdivision, but the political subdivision which accepts the designation itself, and by following the

law they shall be the "community action agency." The Director, of course, must designate them as the community action agency. But if they designate somebody else—another public or nonprofit agency—then there is only one top group or board which receives full governing powers.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Let me see if I understand this correctly, because I believe it is beginning to make sense. It is either the mayor or the council or the Governor or the legislature who are to act as the agency?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Representing the Office of Economic Opportunity, let us say?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Thereafter there is this lower agency which is composed of a tripartite board, although the governing agency or the first agency does not of necessity have to be composed of a tripartite group; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. So that in event that the Governor and State legislature refuse to act, and they designate individuals, then there must be a tripartite group; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. Then there must be a tripartite group that has governing power. However, in the first instance they shall have the tripartite group as an advisory group.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Just one moment. If they designate the tripartite group then there will be two groups that will be composed of people in political life or public life, civic groups, and representatives of the poor.

Mr. QUIE. Right.

In that instance there would be two groups which would be composed of public officials; the ones who have the governing power is the State or political subdivision, and their advisory group through which they say they shall administer the program is the three-legged group.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not understand it to be an advisory group. As I understand—and I would like to be enlightened if I am wrong—is that first group, or the top group, designates, a board through which they act if they so desire. If they do not desire to designate, they act as both the advisory agency and the board.

Now, a board must be composed of, as I understand it, a tripartite group, and they in turn carry out the functions of the agency. To determine whether or not this lower group is to be influenced at all, I inquired and I asked wherein is there any statement showing authority by anyone to designate the central group or the civic agency. It would seem to me that there is nothing in the law that says the top layer shall appoint them, and there is nothing to say any other body shall appoint them, therefore it would appear to me that the central agency should be elected also just the same as the poor are elected.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four

Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 372]

Abbott	Gallagher	Pettis
Addabbo	Garmatz	Pike
Anderson,	Gialmo	Reid, N.Y.
Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Resnick
Annunzio	Griffiths	Rhodes, Pa.
Ashley	Gross	Rogers, Fla.
Barrett	Grover	Ronan
Boggs	Hagan	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Halleck	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Brown, Mich.	Hanley	St. Onge
Bush	Hays	Smith, Calif.
Button	Helstoski	Smith, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Stratton
Clark	Hosmer	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Howard	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	Hutchinson	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Irwin	Tenzer
Dent	Jacobs	Utt
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Vander Jagt
Doie	Kupferman	Watkins
Dow	Madden	Watson
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Watts
Dulski	Mathias, Md.	Whalley
Eilberg	Meskill	Williams, Miss.
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Williams, Pa.
Eshleman	Moorhead	Willis
Everett	Morgan	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	Charles H.
Fallon	Multer	Wolff
Fino	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
Flood	Nix	Wylder
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neill, Mass.	Zion
Fountain	Ottinger	
Friedel	Pelly	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2388, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] had 4 minutes remaining of the last 10 minutes allocated to him.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, just a last comment upon the colloquy which we had before the quorum call was requested, and this has to do with the language which appears on pages 46 and 47, wherein we see the explanation of subsection (e) defining the powers of governing boards.

Subsection (e) of this section specifies that "community action governing boards" must have the power to select persons for senior staff positions, determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, approve overall programs, establish priorities and assure compliance with conditions of this title. Does not specify the powers to be delegated to "community action boards" when the State or political subdivision itself has been designated as the community action agency.

And, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated previously, under section 211(a), the State or the political subdivision, if it is a community action program, does not have a governing board. But it states in the phraseology of subsection (e) of subsection 211 that this section does not specify the powers to be delegated to a community action authority when the



State or the political action group has been designated as the political action agency.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, head of Metropolitan Applied Research Center in New York, in his recent study of community action programs in 65 cities noted that:

Programs directed to community action were successfully implemented only when they were basically independent of political control or, occasionally, and very rarely, supported and protected by an emphatic progressive local government, and

That, generally, local governments and, when challenged the OEO, were alarmed when the poor took the anti-poverty community action program seriously, and tended to resist or to seek the defeat of such programs when their programs challenged the status quo directly.

He further noted:

Where the local community has resisted the organized program of the poor, the Federal Government has not proved able to support the program effectively over such resistance.

A recent effort in St. Louis to turn control of the board over to the Mayor by giving him power to appoint 10 of the 15 board members. In regard to this attempt, the regional OEO director Don Thomason said:

The Mayor's power to appoint two thirds of the board would create such a concentration of power as would tend to develop loyalties and antipathies which probably would deprive the community action agency of the greater wealth of talent and resources attendant from the whole community.

The AFL-CIO and others attack this proposal asking that the Human Development Corporation be "kept above politics."

Another said:

The War on Poverty is too serious a business and critically affects the lives of too many of our poorer citizens to allow the program to become bogged down in political maneuvering.

Well, I brought this question up of the involvement of the poor because I believe that this is a key feature, the real genius to the poverty program. There is not much else which is really new in the poverty program. The Job Corps and the NYC are not new. Other agencies could administer them just as now the Department of Labor actually administers the NYC, but involvement of the poor in the programs that the Federal Government administers is an ingenious feature that I strongly support which has been operated in the poverty program, and I would hope that it would continue into the future. I dislike seeing it hampered, as the amendments that came out of the committee will do.

I believe there are a number of programs that have functioned well. Some of them are the Headstart program, the new addition of followthrough, I believe is excellent, and should be supported, and there are other programs like foster grandparents, and the Green Thumb, that really have made significant contributions to the war on poverty that have been attempted in the crusade that I would like to see us get into.

The special genius of Headstart has been the recognition that the pitiful poverty cycle can best be broken at an early

age. The opportunity crusade places far greater emphasis on Headstart and a more meaningful followthrough program in the first three grades. I believe also there should be a continuing and expanded foster grandparents and Green Thumb programs.

However, the major difference between the Democrat and Republican approaches is that Republicans place emphasis on creating real jobs for the poor, while Democrats continue to fund make-work jobs which lead nowhere. The key to ending poverty has always been finding ways to assure men and women of good jobs. Our Industry Youth Corps and other educational and training programs are designed to prepare the underprivileged and undereducated for jobs with dignity.

The opportunity crusade will truly involve business and industry in the war to alleviate poverty. Hiring a few firms to run Job Corps camps is not true involvement of America's No. 1 generator of jobs—private enterprise.

Let us remember the needs of the poor and the deprived. The hard reality of poverty will be with us far beyond the elections of 1968. Democrats and Republicans should join forces to write a bill which will truly begin to end the tragedy of poverty in this land of affluence. Republicans are more than willing to take the best of the administration's program along with the best in the opportunity crusade and combine them into a strong program. Poverty is too critical a problem to be the victim of partisan struggles.

I believe that the Opportunity Crusade would make some meaningful changes in the program to enable it to function better. For instance, in Headstart, Followthrough, and Upward Bound, we propose that those be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, then they could be coordinated with similar programs that are presently being operated by the Office of Education today.

There is title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, which is funded over \$1 billion, that can be used for the purposes of preschool education. Since OE is administering that program, certainly Headstart would function much more efficiently and have the same advantages that are enjoyed by the same Department of the Government, this would permit these two to be coordinated. However, I will point out that when we suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administer project Headstart, that we do not mean that the community action agencies would be divested of their responsibilities that they have had heretofore.

The way that private organizations can participate in Headstart programs is to permit money to be administered through community action agencies. In the opportunity crusade, State agencies broadly representative of all the groups who are interested in this program, will set a State plan and develop State policy, and the money will go through the community action agencies if a qualified community action agency is in

existence, otherwise it would go through Headstart agencies or any other means whereby the young people who definitely need the assistance of a Headstart program can benefit from it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would be possible for a bill to be developed which would take the most important features of Opportunity Crusade, and blend them into a bill that would enable us to finally write a bipartisan poverty bill.

As was stated by my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the poverty program started out in politics. In 1964 the President did not want any Republican amendments to it. Evidently he wanted to make certain that the conglomeration of the Kennedy proposals that they put together in the war on poverty would carry his stamp, and his stamp alone for the 1964 elections, and there were enough Democrats in that Congress to do it without any Republican stamp to it at all.

In the fall of 1966 issue of *Columbia Journalism Review*, Erwin Knoll and Jules Witcover had an excellent article entitled, "Maximum Feasible Publicity." They stated that:

President Johnson, leafing through the pending-business basket of the Kennedy Administration for something dramatic to call his own, seized on the poverty problem with characteristic zeal. Tentative Kennedy titles—"Human Conservation and Development," "Access to Opportunity"—were discarded as "bloodless" and Johnson declared "unconditional war on poverty" in his first State of the Union message.

The article is mostly about, however, the amount of publicity that emanates from OEO. Quoting from Knoll and Witcover again:

In the Johnson Administration's War on Poverty, nobody—not even the poor—gets more attention from Sargent Shriver's GHQ than does the combat correspondent. Except for the Pentagon, where more than 200 government publicists labor to explain or obscure details of the administration's other war, no federal command post puts greater emphasis and energy into psychological warfare for and against the press.

But not since New Deal days has Washington seen a coordinated hard-sell for a relatively small program to match OEO's merchandising of the effort to combat poverty.

But I think most of us remember when there was a meeting with the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty. A number of the poor saw through Shriver's avalanche of propaganda. Knoll and Witcover again state in their article:

Only one misfortune has marred Shriver's record as his own, and OEO's, best PR man—the Washington convention last spring of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty at which he was booed off the stage and out of the hall by delegates who were angry, disillusioned, and poor. There were two immediate casualties—Shriver's image and Kramer's left shoulder, which was bumped in the melee. There were also significant implications for OEO's publicity effort. Newspaper stories on the incident jarred the office of public affairs. Particularly resented was the front-page story in *The New York Times* by



Nan Robertson, whose account of what had happened differed in no significant respect from other newspaper and wire service reports. In New York, Turner Catledge, the executive editor, received protests against the story. In a long telegram, one prominent citizen informed the *Times* that "I resent and object to today's news story," and went on to praise Shriver as a man who "to the best of my knowledge has never ducked out of any meeting in his life including yesterday's." Another, shorter telegram advised the *Times* that Shriver had "conducted himself with calm, dignity and decorum." Neither sender mentioned the fact that his message to the *Times* had been encouraged—in fact, solicited—by OEO, or that others had been impetioned to send similar protests, but had refused. The handling of the episode had become a matter of controversy—some of it openly expressed—within the public affairs office. Shortly afterward, Kramer's deputy, Jim Kelleher, resigned.

Shriver blamed "professional demonstrators" for the incident, but there were other appraisals that laid the cause closer to the door of OEO's in-house advertising agency. Walter Reuther, the chairman of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, was quoted as pointing out that the demonstrators started booing as "Shriver was trying to overwhelm them with success statistics. They released their anger and their deepest frustrations at not seeing results." The shouts of the protesters lent weight to Reuther's assessment. "Tell us where the poor are being helped," one woman screamed. "It's just a big publicity deal." "Shriver tells us what has been done, but what about what, hasn't been done?" another shouted. The Washington Post commented in an editorial that Shriver "was hearing from the people who have taken literally every word of every official pronouncement. These true believers now consider themselves betrayed, for the performance turns out to be less splendid than the promise."

I understand that \$2,400,000 has been expended per year in public relations by OEO. In the hearings before our committee on page 881 my colleague, CHARLES E. GOODELL, asked Sargent Shriver about this expenditure. The colloquy is as follows:

Mr. GOODELL. If you are referring to the series of investigative reports we made last year, none of which were contradicted in their essential facts, then I think it is a very unfortunate reference. Glib terms like "throat slitting," "professional hatchet job," which don't advance the cause of good legislation at all. We were very careful with those memos to stick to the facts as we were able to establish them with our professional investigators. It seemed to us that those facts should be brought out.

Part of the problem with this is the so-called ballyhoo budget that you have at OEO. Is it true that you have \$2.4 million allocated to public information and public relations at OEO?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know that specifically.

Mr. GOODELL. You have 46 employees in your public information office and a \$2.4 million budget. This troubles a good many of us. According to a recent AP story, \$42 million is spent by the Federal executive agencies on self-pleadings, if you will, publicity or public relations. At OEO \$2.4 million for a ballyhoo budget really does bother us. Is that much money really necessary?

Mr. SHRIVER. I would be glad to compare our budget for publicity with any agency carrying on a comparable program under President Eisenhower.

Mr. GOODELL. You have all sorts of reservations.

Mr. SHRIVER. I will be happy to compare it to any program with the same amount of money.

Mr. GOODELL. You don't think \$2.4 million is too much?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know about the figure. All I know is that our Department of Public Information is working night and day trying to keep up with requests for information about the program. It is a small office for an agency of this size and compares very favorably with any agency that I know of, or any business concern of comparable magnitude. There are 47 people including all the secretaries that work in that division and they have an annual pay of \$975,000 for them all. Now the additional money probably is to pay for printing of reports that are required here by the Congress and by others. We have to have information on hand about the program. For example, when we launched Project Headstart we had to put out five little pamphlets, each one of which was essential for every community in the United States to have. One was about nutrition, another about the kind of teaching equipment you needed, or materials in the headstart program. We had to pay for all of that out of our money.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that information pamphlets have to go out but it seems to me that \$2.4 million is an excessive amount of money for public relations for an agency that size.

Mr. SHRIVER. We would be delighted to have the amount of money that we spend for that purpose up here for a complete analysis by this committee where the men in charge of it will show you everything that is being spent, who gets paid, and then I think you can compare that with the expenditures for any agency of the U.S. Government, any private business, or the Red Cross, or any other agency.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason for our concern about this is that many of us feel exaggerated statements of results accomplish nothing constructive at all. This concern has been shared by many conscientious observers including Haynes Johnson of the Washington Star who wrote articles on the poverty program. He said:

The program has suffered from too much and too effective salesmanship. As a consequence, it is, in part, a captive of its own promises.

I could give you a number of quotes from other people who basically favor the war on poverty. In a war on poverty it seems to me it furthers no one's case to exaggerate and go through a bayhoo routine which points up and exaggerates alleged good features and leaves out the bad features. As a matter of fact, I have before me an article in which this problem is discussed and an OEO information staff member is quoted.

An OEO information staffer says that: "With Sarge when something goes wrong with the program you step up public relations." Unfortunately there are a good many times when legitimate, constructive criticism has been made and each time it does seem that the thin-skinned reaction is almost a flashback. OEO denies everything and then comes through with great exaggerated claims for what has been done. There have been a number of cases where the poor themselves have risen up and objected to this kind of high promise which far exceeds performance.

Mr. SHRIVER. I will just respond by saying that first of all we welcome the criticism whenever it is constructive. Second, we have not exaggerated our claims for success but, in fact, have minimized it. With Project Headstart we have only reached 32 percent of the kids eligible. In other programs we are very, very low in terms of reaching the people who should be reached by the program, so that I would like to say for the record that we are interested in constructive criticism. We are not exaggerating what we have done. We do try to dramatize the needs and will continue to, because the needs of the poor

are always overlooked and their needs need to be dramatized. That is where we are concentrating our effort.

Mr. GOODELL. We have heard these claims about 4 million of the poor touched or 8 million touched or affected by this program, technically I guess you could say that is not an exaggeration. However, when you take an impressive figure like 4 million or 8 million people who have been touched and we don't know what the Dickens "touched" means—it certainly doesn't mean meaningful impact—then your claim exaggerates the real effects of the war on poverty. It seems to us that this doesn't serve a particularly good cause.

Mr. SHRIVER. Those figures are compiled by the research and planning department. Sarge is not putting them out. They come from there.

Mr. GOODELL. It is your agency.

Mr. SHRIVER. They are the best figures it is possible for us to obtain. Everybody likes to know what the figures are, what are you doing? These are the best figures we could come up with. Suppose we had touched 6 million of 5 million or 7 million people. That still leaves five times as many people untouched and that is what we are talking about all the time. If there are 32 million people in the United States that are poor we are not touching even one out of four with 8 million.

Mr. GOODELL. Reached, affected, served, touched, all of these words are misleading. I quote another outstanding authority who has made many of these studies and he said: "Unsupported claims of achievements and exaggerated official promises for the Federal war on poverty regrettably have serious repercussions."

Mr. LEVINE. On that 7 million or 9 million people, it should be clear that neither my Department nor Mr. Shriver has ever claimed anything for that figure aside from what you have said. There are people who have passed through that we don't know how we have affected.

Mr. GOODELL. What does touched mean?

Mr. LEVINE. It means perhaps they have been in a neighborhood center. In fact, Mr. Shriver never meant anything but that.

But as I have looked at programs in the past and seen them develop from a committee, the real strong programs that continued without a great deal of controversy are the ones that have had bipartisan support when they came out of the committee. For that reason I believe that there ought to be some major changes.

Some of the major differences of the opportunity crusade will involve private business to a far greater extent than does the committee bill.

I am convinced that the only way we are really going to solve the poverty problem in the United States is to enlist private business in the activity so that private business can give meaningful jobs—real jobs—that can carry these people on year after year.

You talk to the people in the ghettos and talk to the poor people and ask them what they want. They want jobs—good jobs—jobs with dignity. If we will give them the benefits of the educational training programs and an opportunity to find jobs in private business the anti-poverty efforts will be worth the money expended.

The Industry Youth Corps, which we advocate, will enable the Federal Government, through a much smaller expenditure of money per individual, to give poor youth a better opportunity for meaningful jobs.



The National Youth Corps now requires a 90-percent Federal share in the wages of the youth. Under the Industry Youth Corps the Federal Government will only need to contribute 25 percent of the wages of the youths, enough to enable private business to utilize such young persons and teach them skills during the period of time that their skills are not commensurate with the wages that have to be paid.

This subsidy would enable us to reach many more young people with the same amount of money and give them much more meaningful jobs than they could secure either through public or private nonprofit employment.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, if we will strengthen the private enterprise portion of this bill and transfer those parts of the program that obviously ought to go to existing agencies for the operation of such as the Job Corps going to vocational education, and Headstart and Upward Bound and Followthrough to HEW and make certain of a more meaningful voice for the poor in community action, we will then have the kind of strong economic opportunity bill this year which I believe we could all support. It is toward that end, when we are considering the bill under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, that I will be working as one Member of this body.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. ROBISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to commend the gentleman on his statement and on the position that he has adopted and to advise him that I support it wholeheartedly. I am looking forward to success in the effort that he will be offering to us to improve this program.

Mr. Chairman, if one can accept that which is said editorially by the New York Times as being accurate and objective, then—on the basis of its lead editorial this morning—Julius Caesar would have to stand corrected for “all Gaul” would now apparently have to be divided not just into the traditional three parts but into five parts, with the two new divisions being reserved for our two colleagues on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

This is because—though one has to change the spelling of “Gaul” a bit—the Times has chosen, wrongly and unfairly, I believe, to attack these two of our colleagues for advancing their “opportunity crusade”—as they call it—as a substitute for the bill, S. 2388, now before us.

To quote the Times:

It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a “crusade” but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy enough to get emotional about subject matter such as that we are now beginning to consider—anyone can do that and many of us here probably will before this debate ends—but I believe that the Times has gone way off the deep end in this respect and I,

personally, resent and object to the line its editors have thus taken. I resent it and object to it, not just in behalf of these two of my respected colleagues who have so been singled out for attack, but I resent it and object to it in my own behalf and in behalf of all those others here who, regardless of party, have voted against prior antipoverty legislation, not because of any lack of disregard for or understanding of the problems of America's poor, but because we disagreed with the approach—or some portion of it—as embodied in those earlier bills and offered as a solution to those very real and urgent problems.

The situation, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is very much the same here again today.

For the question we all have to decide is not whether the poor have problems—or whether those problems are worthy of our attention—but how best can we, how best can this Nation, get at the root causes of those problems; how best can we devise an antipoverty program that will produce more for America's poor than a rising tide of expectations that—once dashed against the hard rocks of reality—will smash back in against us all in a flood of disappointment and disillusionment that could carry with it the seeds of revolution.

Now, I am far from an expert in this field. In point of fact, I doubt that anyone really is, given the truly experimental nature of what has been attempted in this war on poverty that—Government directed and Government led—has been devised to supplement and spur on the similar war that the individual American citizen has heretofore been carrying on, mostly on his own, and with generally outstanding success, ever since this Nation was born.

But, as the same time Mr. Chairman, I have done the best I could to familiarize myself with the manner in which this new and focused war has been conducted in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. I have visited and talked with the paid professionals who have been selected in our several communities to head this war, and I have—within the limited time given me—also visited and talked with as many of the so-called poor, themselves, whom this program was intended to encourage and to assist, as I could.

From this experience, Mr. Chairman, I know that this program has accomplished much that is good and useful in my congressional district, and I believe that this is an effort that must now be carried on—and I now announce that I hope we will vote to carry it on but, at the same time, this experience has convinced me, too, that the program can and must be improved in several respects; that it needs to be tightened up and to be subjected to better overall administration, and that in this respect the suggestion made by the Goodell-Quie substitute for a transfer of certain of the OEO's programs to other, preexisting Federal agencies, makes good sense to me and, far from “gutting” OEO as this proposition has sometimes been pictured, this would permit OEO to move back toward what ought to be its primary function—that of

coordinating and spurring antipoverty efforts on both the Federal and local levels.

For it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that though less visible and less dramatic, certainly, than the running of national antipoverty programs, this coordinating role—the overseeing role—that OEO ought to have, if this overall program is ever to succeed, is of vast and heretofore mostly forgotten importance. For, as we have already seen all too often, when OEO attempts to operate programs itself—outside of the community action program which it ought to retain—it inevitably acquires a vested interest in continuing those programs, regardless of their merits or lack of success.

The prime example of this is, of course, the Job Corps which—as the minority points out in the committee report—has, unfortunately, been “as tragic a failure as anything attempted under the Economic Opportunity Act.”

I was especially impressed, some time ago, by the views of Richard Boone in this connection. Mr. Boone, a former director of the Program Policy and Development Division of the OEO's community action program, suggests that OEO was intended by its original planners to serve as a “catalyst for the development of leadership among those who have been traditionally excluded from local decisionmaking, its funds to be used as ‘cement’ in bringing about the coordination of local groups that ordinarily might never work with one another.”

But, then he adds—as has so painfully been true about so much of this originally oversold war—that “we promised much more than we could produce,” and he goes on to further suggest that, in large part, the failure of OEO to produce better results has been because it has only partially fulfilled its role as a catalyst, saying:

I doubt whether the Office of Economic Opportunity can remain responsive to its policy goals and new operational strategies while continuing to expand its direct operational responsibilities. If Federal agency history is any guide, as OEO increases its direct operations (through administering bigger programs and adding new one), it will find its ability to innovate, criticize, evaluate and mobilize decreasing. As it increases its operational “domain”, its constituency will shift from the poor to middle men, the carriers of its programs, and to those who help to designate the carriers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the concern thus expressed by Mr. Boone to be most worthy of our consideration—and it is, as I understand them, the same sort of concern that now has motivated the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] in devising their substitute.

I am also especially gratified to note that, in that substitute, these gentlemen of the committee do not adopt that portion of the reworked committee bill which would tend to put local politicians—no matter how worthy and understanding they may be—firmly in control of the community action program, for I think this would be a very large mistake.

If there is promise anywhere in this whole effort, that promise—in my judg-



ment—lies in the concept of community action, a concept that, to succeed, must remain flexible and innovative and, thus, fully responsive to local needs and conditions, and that, above all, must also involve to the fullest extent possible the poor themselves.

This is an issue that, I know, will be further developed as this debate moves along, but as of now I am squarely on the side of the Goodell-Quie substitute in this respect, just as I am on its side where it eliminates the proposal made by the committee requiring that at least one-half of each local community's contribution toward this program must be in cash. If one really wanted to gut the program, I do not know how it could be accomplished any more quickly than in that latter fashion because, bad though the Federal budgetary picture is, the local and State picture is, if possible, only worse.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express these preliminary views. I do not know, nor do any of us, what the outcome here this week will be; but I do wish that the Nation's press—that ought to be more objective about such matters as this, even on its editorial pages, than it has been—would take note that not all those who seek to preserve but improve, the war on poverty are its enemies. The Goodell-Quie substitute may not be flawless—but, then, neither is the committee's product, and it is our common task here this week, as responsible legislators, to do the best we can with the best of both; and this, I trust is what we will do.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, poverty is a pitiful state sometimes caused by circumstance and sometimes, we are told, passed from generation to generation almost as though by heredity. There can be little doubt that a war on poverty will find favor in our society. The Government, as an instrument of our citizens, has a rightful role in ministering to their broad problems. And so, I would say that there is little disagreement on the basic objective before this body—to approve a proper and successful way to alleviate poverty.

Nevertheless, we are undergoing extensive debate, over a period of several days, on this very point. In a few words, we are attempting to determine the best way to help the poor permanently.

I have been one who was skeptical. My constituents have related to me charges of direct political campaigning by antipoverty workers employed with Federal funds, suspicions of labor organizing with these same funds, even importation of hippies into certain areas to create pockets of poverty and require an antipoverty program. I am one who encourages political action and supports the need for labor unions, but I do not be-

lieve that public funds should be used in a partisan way to further these institutions.

Many of these problems have eased. Further, programs such as Headstart, Follow Through, Foster Grandparents, and Green Thumb have succeeded in areas of great need. In short, I consider some of our Office of Economic Opportunity programs, especially Headstart training for preschool youngsters, to be among our finest social programs.

This week we have before us a proposal to continue the war on poverty at an increased level of \$2.06 billion, an increase of \$460 million over the present program. In view of our present tight fiscal situation caused by the Vietnam war and heavy domestic spending; in view of the serious problems still existing in the present program; and in view of basic philosophical fallacies in the present program, which I will detail a little later, I cannot agree to continue this program in its present form, nor to substantially increase its authorized funding.

Instead, I will support a detailed program to redirect this poverty war into more constructive channels. We must develop the strengths, not perpetuate the weaknesses of the poor. We must inspire and incite them to self help rather than soothe them in the status quo with handouts and lack of incentive. We must bring the private sector into this effort to help the poor rather than load it all on the backs of our taxpaying citizens.

The vehicle for this change of direction, hopefully toward much greater success, is the opportunity crusade. I will support this new approach because it provides the following necessary changes:

First. It would cost the Federal taxpayers \$660 million less than the administration program now before us.

Second. It would continue community action programs under OEO but with greater emphasis on job training, strong representation of the poor, and would require State plans to administer the program within each State.

Third. It would prohibit political activities by all antipoverty employees.

Fourth. It would create new programs to attract wider participation from private industry for job training.

Fifth. It would shift all educational programs—Headstart, Job Corps, Upward Bound, and In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps—to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sixth. It would shift manpower and vocational training programs to the Department of Labor and eventually phase the Job Corps into State vocational education programs.

Seventh. It would establish military career centers to upgrade young men to meet military service requirements.

I firmly believe that an antipoverty program of this nature must appeal to the strengths of our citizens rather than to their weaknesses. It must be our goal to provide programs which will motivate people to help themselves improve their lot rather than to encourage dependence on others or to reward idleness, sloth, or immorality. In addition, any program should include provisions which will en-

courage individuals to help the poor and disadvantaged through a sharing of their knowledge and talents.

If we do otherwise; that is, if we establish programs which convince the poor that they are in for a free ride or that they will be taken care of by a benevolent society without any effort on their part, we cannot possibly realize any long-term gain, and I am certain that we would only succeed in placing a damaging and, perhaps, disastrous drain on the human and financial resources of our society.

I think the experience we have had with the Office of Economic Opportunity over the past several years has substantiated this point. The one great failing of the war on poverty to date is that it has attempted to solve deep-seated and longstanding problems with a simplistic handout of easy Federal money. I say simplistic because it has stemmed from a desire, conscious or unconscious, to take the easy course and to refrain from admitting to the real problems which cause poverty and the related feelings of cynicism, bitterness, and hopelessness which the poor feel, and which cause them to believe they are unable to help themselves. They think society, rather than their own shortcomings, holds them back from improving their lot.

The unlikely combination of Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, and conservative William F. Buckley, Jr., has joined in recent years to point out that our society is unwilling to admit, and consequently ignores, many of the problems behind chronic poverty, particularly among poor, urban Negro families, which are far beyond solution by Federal grants. In many cases, political norms run counter to accepting and attempting to solve these problems.

Thus, I believe creative programs must be developed which come directly to the root of the problem. The past history of the Office of Economic Opportunity shows that it has failed to meet these problems and, in many cases, only increases bitterness and frustration among the poor. We need to provide the proper motivation.

I believe it is possible and effective to use the tax structure to help create incentive for people to advance their way in life rather than to destroy their initiative through excessive taxation or reliance on easy governmental grants. As we seek means of improving our education, employment, and other programs for social progress, we must seek positive means of making the tax structure a constructive tool in our way of life, not a destructive tool. Proper tax reform is an answer.

Rather than taking away initiative by way of free money and help, people should be encouraged to become motivated volunteers by permitting them to take measured tax deductions if they, in turn, accept certain responsibilities.

I think the tax structure can become the focal point of our efforts. Also, in keeping with the philosophy embodied in the tax reform proposal, we should make certain that other programs for social upgrading be based on providing motivation, both to those who need the assistance as well as to those who are able to provide it. The more socially dis-



advantaged persons we can motivate and the more successful persons we can motivate, the more far-reaching and long-lasting any program will become. Additionally, any successful effort of this nature will become self-prolonging and self-sustaining.

A successful program, to my mind, must draw from the resources of all levels of government, from the private sector and from the independent sector of religious groups and charitable organizations.

If we can muster up the courage to acknowledge and accept the true sources of the problems of the poor, if we can develop intelligent programs designed to encourage greater motivation toward self-help and, if we can involve all segments of our society in this vast effort; then, and only then, can we begin to make significant improvements in the lives of our disadvantaged people. Further, any program which does not meet these criteria will be an unfortunate waste of time and money and will cruelly raise the expectations of our poor without any hope of fulfilling them.

We have a responsibility to the poor to help upgrade their lives and I hope this Congress will live up to that responsibility. However, a poorly conceived effort could become a tragic hoax, and I hope that wisdom and judgment will be used in developing an efficient, successful effort in this field. In respect to these thoughts, I believe that the opportunity crusade is a significant improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity and urge its support.

In its formative period OEO did not function perfectly. However, as time progressed, many cogs were eliminated and greater efficiency achieved. The program is still not without fault. However, its continuing improvement justifies our approval of its work.

Basically, I support OEO for two reasons. First, I believe in the fundamental concept of rehabilitative services in contrast to Government handouts. The active participation of highly skilled personnel working with the individual helps him break the cycle of poverty. It provides the individual subsistence level, enabling the individual to attain the essential motivation and self-respect to become a contributing member of society.

Second, I have observed the programs in my district. OEO programs in Cleveland deserve praise. OEO funds in Cleveland have been well spent. Thousands of people have been benefited by these programs.

It is imperative that OEO continue. The war against poverty must be fought

on many fronts, but there must be essential coordination between these efforts. This can be best achieved by all programs being a part of OEO. Extensive hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor show unanimous agreement by almost all sectors of society—business, labor, charitable organizations, and government—that OEO should be the central guiding mechanism for the war on poverty.

[Mr. GIBBONS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2388. I do have one point I would like to make relative to the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUINN]. I do have to agree essentially with what he said, relative to adequate representation of the poor on the community action boards.

Mr. Chairman, the need for a meaningful and effective war on poverty has at no time been more critical.

We are just beginning to realize the dimensions of the problem facing us—in terms of numbers and in terms of the kinds of needs that must be met.

We are just beginning to make good on promises too often only spoken and to realize the rights and hopes which have too long been deferred.

My belief in the need for a meaningful war on poverty is not without the qualification that in all too many instances it has suffered from serious maladministration on its several levels.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of us—especially those of us who have not supported antipoverty legislation in the past—should take a moment to reflect on the issues before us today.

Despite popular statements to the contrary, a vote on our committee's bill is not a vote for or against the war on poverty.

It is a vote for or against changes which would improve much of what has been wrong with the war on poverty.

I have been numbered—and will probably continue to be numbered—among the most severe of OEO's critics.

But it is because of such criticism that we have before us today a constructive piece of legislation—not perfect by any means, but a great deal more constructive than anything we have considered in the past.

This bill constitutes an acknowledgment by OEO's most vigorous defenders that criticism has in fact been justified.

I have joined with my minority colleagues on many occasions in attacking such faults as the inordinately high cost per Job Corps enrollee.

This legislation would reduce that cost.

I have protested the use of taxpayers money in partisan and nonpartisan political activities by antipoverty workers.

This legislation would finally restrict such activities.

I have seen and been critical of serious fiscal abuses in community action programs.

This legislation recognizes such abuses and provides strengthened auditing requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to slice up the antipoverty program.

I know that many have said the Nation is running through a period of conservatism, that the people want to slow down, not spend money, and so forth; but, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the American people believe this insofar as the urban ghettos are concerned or the poor in the ghettos, or the poor in areas such as Appalachia. I believe that to say they are opposed fighting poverty would be misreading their sentiments. The American people do recognize poverty as a problem, a disease, and despite the condition of the thinking of the American people today, which one might say is conservative, I believe the American people want to do something about this very severe problem.

If we should kill this bill, poverty areas are going to interpret it as—as an attempt to turn our backs on the urban poor. I believe that it would be a very serious mistake for either side of the aisle, to take that position.

This is the time to strengthen it.

The war on poverty has only just begun.

We have failed so far to put sufficient emphasis on the paramount need for on-the-job training in jobs of substance in the private sector.

We have failed adequately to utilize the largely untapped resources of private enterprise.

It is essential that this house lift its sights to meet the expectations of the American people.

We must take action of real significance—rather than turning our backs on the cities and dashing the hopes of our youth.

We must do so now—not because it will cool the cities, not because it will prevent riots—but because it is right, and long overdue.

We have a commitment to the ghetto dwellers, to the rural poor, to the young people of this country.

That commitment, to be meaningful, must be enlarged, not cut back.

It must be streamlined, not shuffled into further confusion.

To do less could destroy the hopes of those who have little left to live on but faith.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. Does the gentleman know, either from memory or from checking either with the majority or minority staff, whether in the consideration of this bill in the committee there ever appeared representatives from the Salvation Army, one way or another?

Mr. BELL. I do not recollect whether they did or not. Perhaps the chairman of the committee could answer that question.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not believe they did.



Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] for his outstanding work in the legislation. He worked diligently and untiring in his effort to bring a decent bill to the floor of the House, and gave the Committee his most active support in writing the present legislation. Numerous amendments the gentleman proposed were adopted. He has made a great contribution.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill as amended. I believe it will go a long way toward continuing the war against poverty in America.

It is the irony of our time that while this Nation enjoys its eighth consecutive year of economic prosperity, there continues to be millions of Americans who live under poverty conditions.

I would agree with my colleagues in the minority that the first goal of this legislation must be the ultimate attainment of a job for the victims of poverty. There can be no question that a poverty program that does not ultimately prepare those in poverty for employment fails to meet its mark.

But it would be my hope that my colleagues would not view the poverty program as a program within itself. If we were to view this effort as a single-shot operation, only within itself, then I would say the poverty program is destined to fail.

I suggest that we view the Economic Opportunity Act as only one weapon in the arsenal of the war on poverty and apply it to the totality of the problems being experienced by those in poverty.

The poverty program supplements and adds to the program of the model cities, Federal aid to education program, manpower retraining, and the various efforts to improve housing for the underprivileged, together with the massive efforts now being worked out both by the Government and private industry to eliminate slum housing; the huge effort being made by local governments to improve education, all of these things—moving together—in their own way play a key role and will lead to the elimination of poverty in America.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake for us to view the legislation before us today as a total answer to poverty; this poverty program must be viewed as only one segment of the total effort to eliminate poverty. Those of us who support this legislation are part of a national effort for America ultimately to be the first nation in history to reduce and hopefully eliminate poverty. This is the great promise of a free America.

There are those who have expected miracles in the short time this program has been alive. And, indeed, in many parts of the country in many of the community action programs, miracles have literally been performed.

Unfortunately, there have been many shortcomings, and those shortcomings are the ones which have received the greatest public attention.

The committee has labored honestly and fairly and sincerely to eliminate those root causes which brought about the conditions which produced the criticisms.

But all in all, when you view this program in its entirety and understand those fundamental objectives, and that is to deal with the total problem of poverty along with all the other programs now on the books, only then can you fully appreciate this effort.

It is a hollow effort to say that you want to create a job for an unemployed person in poverty when in reality that person in his present form is totally unemployable. It is not easy to find jobs for those who have migrated to the big cities and to the small communities in rural America because they were automated out of their sharecropper role, or from the forests in the deep South where they have been automated out of a job, or from Appalachia where they have been literally dislocated and forced to move because of abject poverty, when none of these families have even the more basic experience for individual employment.

In many instances these tragic victims of poverty do not know how to distinguish between a mens and womans washroom in a factory because they cannot read the signs on the door. People who are totally unemployable because they cannot recognize simple signs like "Danger" and "Stop" and "No Smoking."

People who have had absolutely no experience in any kind of factory or service industry.

How can you expect Headstart alone to make an impact on youngsters who are offered this marvelous educational assistance when they are returned to a home or a mother coming to the big city or urban rural America with no concept of life in urban society. She walks into a supermarket and aimlessly wanders through the aisles, unable to read the labels on the cans. She knows nothing about urban life, nor does she know anything about the problems of urban communities. This woman needs a great deal of assistance. Yes, she needs assistance on how to run her house. It is difficult for Americans to appreciate this and understand that in this great and beautiful America of ours there can be people like that. But the harsh reality of life is that they are with us, and until we can reach the total problem of these people and until we can help them at all levels to resolve their individual family problems as well as community problems and train them and prepare them for employment, piecemeal and fragmented approaches to the problem of poverty must end in failure.

This is why the community action program has been so successful in so many communities.

I am aware of the opportunity crusade proposal, but I suggest to my colleagues that it does not face up to the reality of the problem before us.

It is superficial in that it presumes

that all you have to do is find a person a job and somehow all of the problems will disappear.

I am amazed that my colleagues who have spent so much time in studying this whole problem of poverty and the deep roots that it presents to us would try to oversimplify the solution by proposing their opportunity crusade.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has recognized that poverty has many roots and until you deal with all of these roots individually and collectively, you are not going to make any significant contribution to eliminating poverty.

Let me cite you the most recent study made of five exceptional schools in the city of New York which have been partially financed under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All of the most modern techniques of teaching were moved into these five schools and these youngsters were exposed to the finest kind of teaching ever developed by man. Small classes; special teachers; highly trained teachers; all of the visual aids; special tutorial services; high-density counseling; psychiatric and psychological assistance, and all of the other things that modern-day educators believe are needed in order to raise youngsters to an appreciable educational standard.

After 3 years of this high intensity teaching, Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that an impartial study of this experiment shows that the youngsters attending these special schools have achieved no greater academic standards than the youngsters who did not have this kind of assistance.

What does this mean, it simply means that there are a great many other factors which must be brought into play if you want to improve the academic standards of children in poverty. It cannot deal with this problem on any single-shot, single-method operation. Obviously, the problem was that while these youngsters received an inspiring education in school, after school hours they returned back to the same morbid poverty-stricken conditions in their homes and family environment. And so, Mr. Chairman, this poverty program is designed to close that gap of family life which contributes so much to the many social problems, including rioting which plagues the streets of America today.

Let me give you another example, Mr. Chairman.

This Nation is now spending in excess of \$2.5 billion every year on support of the ADC program—the aid to dependent children program.

This figure is constantly growing, despite all sorts of effort at the local level to deal with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for us to condemn the problem and say that we ought to tighten up the rules. This problem is going to be with us for a long time to come unless we do have an effective antipoverty program which deals effectively with these young women, and helps them develop higher social values. I read an excellent article by Miss Lois Wiley of the Chicago Daily News on this entire subject and if ever anybody needed any persuasion to support the continuation of the poverty program, and within



it, the very important planned parent-hood provisions which make possible intelligent programs for these young women within the community action program, let them read the article by Miss Wiley.

Mr. Chairman, the minority says that it wants to reorient this program to bring in a greater degree of the private sector and private industry of our economy. I could never find any quarrel with that concept. I also read an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun Times dealing with the very problem of how private industry today is more and more taking on a key role in the elimination of poverty. We read with great pride and admiration a statement by Mr. Henry Ford that the 5,000 workers who quit to find other jobs during the recent Ford strike will be replaced by workers from poverty areas who will be trained by the Ford Co. to be eligible for these jobs. This is a magnificent and inspiring example of how private industry now is moving in with its own resources to deal with the problem.

We also read with great admiration how the private insurance companies of America are providing more than a billion dollars in financial assistance to deal effectively with slum housing.

In Chicago, the U.S. Gypsum Co. is engaged in an exciting program to renovate 1,500 slum housing units in order to make them habitable for people in poverty.

We also see a huge effort being made by the Federal Housing Administration to encourage homeownership among the people in poverty, giving them guaranteed housing and home improvement loans in order to speed along this progress.

It is because we realize that poverty has many roots that a tremendous coordinated effort is being made in this country to deal with the problem of poverty, and it is for this reason that I sincerely hope my colleagues in this Chamber will set aside harsh judgments, will set aside parochial views, will set aside personal animosities, will set aside lack of understanding and look at this program in its entirety. More important, Mr. Chairman, it is critical to view the poverty program as one aspect of a total effort being made today by local governments, by State governments, by private organizations, by not for profit agencies and organizations, by private industry, and yes, the Federal Government—all of us moving together in unison in an effort to eliminate poverty. I honestly believe that we can be the first nation in the world to eliminate poverty.

It is for this reason that I believe the Education and Labor Committee amendments to the act have made a significant and constructive change. The gentle-lady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has offered two very significant amendments which I hope will be retained in the bill.

They are not amendments to give this program back to city hall.

This is a statement that will not stand up to the facts. In those communities where local governments are now very active, and actively participating in the development of these programs—and thus including more of the big cities—

we find the most successful programs in America. The criticism of these programs has come primarily in those areas where public officials have for various reasons been disengaged from this program and have avoided any responsibility for its management.

An amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] would make sure that all Federal funds must flow through an agency of government as a community action agency—either a State agency or a county agency or a municipal government. But the amendment clearly and specifically and unequivocally requires that this agency must be governed by a community action board whose members equal at least one-third of those representing the poor in the community, one-third elected officials, and one-third interested parties. The amendment specifically provides that the poor cannot be handpicked by the mayor or by the Governor, or by the city manager or by the county board president based on their political beliefs or how much help they can give to the local political organization.

On the contrary, the bill requires that this one-third of the representatives of the poor must be "chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served," and I am quoting from the bill, page 174, line 23. In other words, the committee bill in no way disturbs the present method of selecting members. All we did was put the money in the hands of the community action agency.

I hope this House will reject the irresponsible statements made by those who try to create the impression that somehow Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment is designed to give this program to city hall. I invite your own careful study of the language of this particular provision. You will see from reading the language that these statements are just not consistent with the facts.

The other very important amendment is the amendment which would bar direct funding from Washington to these various "fly by night" organizations that few have ever heard about. This has been an area of great and serious criticism. Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment provides that only programs approved by the community action board—and keep in mind this board must have a minimum of one-third members of the poor on it—can be funded out of Washington. Heretofore, we have found instance after instance where somebody here in Washington, without even consulting the local community or the proper people in that community went ahead and funded programs directly out of Washington. This has created many problems; serious problems.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot argue on the one hand that you want maximum feasible participation of the poor in the planning of these programs and then on the other hand allow the bureaucracy here in Washington to make its independent decisions on the funding of these programs that do not go through the local community action board.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment would provide that hereafter all such

funding must go through the local community action board, or after it is approved by the community action board, it can then be funded directly out of Washington.

All over this country, decent, legitimate, experienced, effective, private organizations and nonprofit agencies which have been dealing with the problems of poverty for a long time and whose only shortcoming over the years has been that they have been plagued with a shortage of funds, are asking how come they are being required to go with their programs to the local community action board of a given community to share in the limited funds available to the local CAP agency when certain elite can come directly to Washington and get million dollar financing without ever clearing with the local board.

Mr. Chairman, if you really want to preserve the structure of private—not for profit agencies—participating in this war on poverty, then I say you will accept the Green amendment which bars the bureaucracy here in Washington from choosing at will those private agencies that tow the line of those who have their own design on America here in Washington.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment in no way interferes with the participation of private, not-for-profit agencies in the war on poverty. All it says, is that programs or proposals devised by private agencies shall first be submitted to a local community action board and the people of the local community will have the final decision whether or not this particular program fits into the comprehensive plan they have devised for their community with the assistance of the poor in that community to attack poverty at all levels.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment makes a lot of sense to me, and I hope that this House will support her in this endeavor.

There have been many other amendments that the committee has adopted which, in my judgment, make a more effective bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the committee bill.

I hope we reject efforts by the minority which would seriously reduce the funding of this program. All over this country local communities have worked out effective programs which are starting to have impressive results.

In the city of Chicago alone we have been able to remove more than 22,000 families from the public dole with this poverty program. The savings to the taxpayer in the long run are huge.

America now is spending an estimated \$44 billion on various forms of public assistance to the people of this country.

This cost is second only to the cost of our defense commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that my colleagues will dispassionately look at this poverty program. Talk to their local officials, and recognize that for any appreciable reduction in expenditures, in the war on poverty now will have a profoundly adverse effect all over the country. This is false economy. You would have to phase out programs that have cost us a substantial investment of pub-



lic funds to establish. You are really wasting money when you try to reduce the expenditure at this time because sooner or later, Mr. Chairman, you are going to have to restore these programs.

This poverty program has many facets—all of them directed at eliminating the menace of poverty.

I sincerely hope the House will sustain the committee in its honest effort to make the war on poverty an effective instrument for the betterment of America.

Thank you very much.

So I say to the Members the two amendments, approved by the committee and offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], strengthen this program, and will help us move forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the gentleman from Chicago that this will legitimize the control which Mayor Daly now has over the program in Chicago. The same thing will happen throughout the country in the other big cities as far as their programs are concerned. Such as Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, who has dominated the Los Angeles program, now he will have control completely. There will be no programs which they disagree with funded because they will control all programs through the local councils, they will disperse the money, they will have likewise a community action board that is a central place where the poor can represent themselves and make no decisions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me comment on that. I have invited the gentleman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]—

Mr. GOODELL. I have been in Chicago.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have invited the gentleman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] to come to Chicago and investigate our program and I told them they would find the best program in America and all of you gentlemen have gone through the whole Chicago program from top to bottom. You had investigators over there who cost the committee hundreds of dollars. We gladly paid these expenses so that you could see what was going on in Chicago, and there was not a thing that you found down there. So let us cut out this foolishness. We have full involvement of the poor in planning and executing our programs.

Mr. GOODELL. You have the involvement of the city government in Chicago, you do not have the involvement of the poor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to examine firsthand the operation of various antipov-erty programs in my congressional district in Pennsylvania, and I am happy to report to this House that many splendid things are being accomplished by these programs. In particular, I have seen many of our youths receive training that equipped them to obtain gainful employment. This has brought dignity to the individual and benefit to our society. I have also seen programs of doubtful value.

Unfortunately, as the record shows, most of the other antipov-erty programs operating throughout our country do not operate with such a high degree of efficiency. It is my understanding that, in some areas of the country, fully 75 percent of the funds in these programs are used for administration purposes, leaving only about 25 percent of such funds to filter down to the people where they are needed.

Why are these programs in my congressional district so successful? Mr. Chairman, they are making a positive contribution because they are being supervised by highly responsible people who have an interest in having these antipov-erty efforts bring beneficial results. The programs are operated not to pay off political debts or to provide political favors but, instead, to accomplish a bona fide public good. This type of responsible management promotes positive results.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that most of the antipov-erty programs in the country do not follow the lead of the programs in my congressional district in worthwhile achievement. If they did, there would be an altogether different and improved tone to the program, and it would win wholehearted support rather than abuse.

Mr. Chairman, nobody can argue with the intent of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, but plenty of argument can be marshaled against the general results—particularly, the object of this legislation is admirable, and, generally—with the exception previously stated—the administration of it is deplorable.

Mention has been made of the so-called Green amendment. I want the RECORD to show that those responsible for the administration of the program in my area are violently opposed to this feature of the bill. If enacted as now written, many features of a working program will be destroyed.

Under unanimous consent I insert a letter at this point, written by one of the directors of the Community Progress Council:

COMMUNITY PROGRESS COUNCIL,  
York, Pa., November 4, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE A. GOODLING,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: I want to thank you for meeting with Mr. Robert Erdos and me this morning and discussing the pending amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. We also appreciate your suggestion that we submit our thoughts to you in writing.

The York County Community Progress Council is a non-profit corporation organized under Pennsylvania law in April, 1965. It is the duly authorized community action agency in York County for the development,

conduct and administration of authorized programs under the E.O.A.

Ever since its organization the C.P.C. has followed a policy of involving as many community resources in its activities as possible. It has tried to maintain contact and communications with local and county public officials; it has involved existing health, welfare and recreational agencies as delegates in the actual operation of program; and it has striven to involve as many representatives of the poor, both in policy-making functions and program activities, as is possible. We believe we have had reasonable success in all of these efforts and that the many varied programs which have been developed and put into operation in York County have met with public approval and have produced significant results in terms of the objectives of the E.O.A.

Unfortunately, we believe, some of the proposed amendments to the E.O.A. will seriously impede continued progress of our program in York County. We are particularly concerned about two proposed changes.

First, it is proposed that agencies involved in E.O.A. community action programs be directed by a board at least one-third of the members of which are public officials or their representatives. In York County we have had excellent cooperation from existing public officials. Both the County of York and the City of York have made cash contributions to C.P.C. to assist in its operations. Various public officials have served as members of the corporation, and one has served on the board of directors. I believe I am accurate in stating that these officials have no desire to add the responsibility for governing the county's community action programs to their existing heavy duties.

Even more important is the effect this change would have on our delegate agencies. For example, one of our major programs in the City of York is being conducted under the sponsorship of the York Y.M.C.A. It is most unlikely that the Y.M.C.A. would be willing to revamp its own organizational structure in the way required by the proposed amendments to S. 2388. The only logical effect of such a change would be to make it impossible for C.P.C. to receive continued support and assistance from the many community agencies which have been so active in the program.

Second, the suggestion that at least one-half of the local contribution must be in cash will produce an equally great hardship on these agencies. So far, they have been able to meet the local contribution requirements by in-kind contributions and by mobilizing volunteer assistance throughout the County. We believe that this approach not only allows communities to conduct programs which, otherwise, it would be unable to support but also serves the positive goal of involving as many members of the community in the program as can be used. A requirement that local cash be supplied will undoubtedly work a hardship on the program and subvert one of its beneficial purposes.

We believe that the E.O.A. program has been a good one for York County and is working well here. We urge you to do what ever is possible to insure its continued operation and funding in a manner consistent with its original purposes. Your support in this effort will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. RUBIN,  
Member, Board of Directors, C.P.C.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to enter the sticky wicket that has been created by those



who support the so-called Green amendment to provide for domination by city hall of community action. I would, however, ask that some consideration be given to a study that was done by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., on behalf of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among other things in their study of some 10 communities, the Yankelovich study urged the Office of Economic Opportunity to give more attention to programs aimed at breaking the cycle of poverty, and at deemphasizing services that simply mitigated poverty. But they went on to point out that in most communities "the poor are included in even greater numbers on policy boards which govern individual programs. Thus, there is abundant evidence that the poor are in a position to contribute to the direction of the program. But there are significant differences of opinion about the effectiveness of their contribution."

It should be stressed, finally, this report goes on to say, "that the leaders of the poor—and to some extent the poor themselves—consider CAP's stress on giving the poor an opportunity to be heard as one of its most important innovations."

It is my judgment that it would be exceedingly difficult to continue this kind of innovation were the committee's amendments to title II, the community action title, to be adopted by this House.

The report goes on to ask, in question No. 13, on page 21:

Why can't CAP do a better job of keeping the political and government leaders informed of its activities?

The relevant findings were these:

This appears to be a major problem. It is a cause for adverse criticism in many of the communities studied. In some of these communities there is little or no contact, because there is no representation of the local administration on the CAP Board. This deficiency appears likely to be remedied in the future by changes in OEO law.

I concur this is a major problem, but what would be most regrettable would be to have the solution be regressive rather than progressive. Instead of moving to provide for meaningful participation the committee bill provides for complete domination of the CAP Board by city hall.

The committee bill is in contrast to what the Opportunity Crusade would provide which is the opportunity for complete participation both by the local administration and the citizenry.

There is, however, one further amendment in the committee bill which has not received a great deal of attention thus far to which I would call the committee's attention.

It is that part of the committee bill which will require that 10 percent of the local contributions for community action programs shall be in cash rather than in kind.

I have already placed in the RECORD on two separate occasions letters from people around the country who have been exceedingly critical of the 10-percent cash provision.

I got a letter dated November 3 from the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin in which they said:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WISCONSIN,

Madison, Wis., November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: The League of Women Voters of Wisconsin wishes you to know that we are very concerned about the future of the Community Action Program. We feel the two changes proposed by the House Committee on Education and Labor in the present Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act will alter the self-help concept of community action. We hope you share our concern and will help to defeat these amendments.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. F. A. MOTE,  
President.

Prof. George Hartung, University of Wisconsin, wrote to me and said:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,  
Madison, Wis., November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: In my position as chairman of the English Department of University Extension I have had an opportunity to work closely with administrators and parents in Head Start. University Extension, in cooperation with Head Start, has set up a program to give parents a chance to remove themselves from the public welfare list, and to develop a more responsible attitude toward their children. We feel that we have been making some headway.

Now the program is in danger because of proposed legislation that will affect O.E.O. programs. The amendment that would require communities to provide 20% of funds, 10% in cash, would severely cripple Head Start in Dane County, which has been one of the national leaders in innovation and planning. I feel very strongly that a commitment has been made to the disadvantaged and that to escalate in the area of one national commitment while we deescalate in another is a gross inconsistency, particularly when the long-run effects are going to be upon American children.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HARTUNG,  
Associate Professor of English.

The First Methodist Church of Madison, Wis., pastor J. Ellsworth Kalas, wrote to me as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and said:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,  
Madison, Wis. November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: I am writing you because of your position on the Health, Education and Labor Committee. I'm concerned that an amendment now before the House would require local communities to provide 20% of the cost of the Community Action Commission, 10% in cash.

I thoroughly favor that a great part of the burden be carried at a local level by contributions in-kind; I'm afraid that a cash contribution would kill the program in the very communities that need it most.

The church of which I am minister currently houses a Head Start Project. We have chosen to do so with no remuneration for rental or janitorial service; in fact, we did not seek even enough remuneration to pay for the several hundred dollars of fencing required to make our parking lot suitable for usage. I think this kind of contribution ought to be made by local agencies, to keep the program "local." But I'd hate to see the program suffer in the communities of greatest need simply because those communities

would not be able or willing to get behind the program financially.

Sincerely,

J. ELLSWORTH KALAS.

In addition, I have heard from the following, each of whom expresses the same concern about the committee amendment to require that 10 percent of the local contribution be in cash:

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.,  
November 5, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: The League of Women Voters of Sheboygan is opposed to two changes the House Committee on Education and Labor has made in the Administration Economic Opportunity Amendments. Placing the Community Action agencies under control of state and local governments would effectively put Community Action Programs directly into the hands of the local political groups, some of whom are not at all sympathetic to the program with its attendant participation by the poor.

As the amendment is now written, a private, non-profit organization may establish a CAP agency only if a public agency does not establish one. However, the private agency may be much more interested in sponsoring a program. We would like to point out that Sheboygan has had a Head Start program the past two summers only because of a few strongly interested individuals. We wonder if a city program would have been as well supported by the volunteer workers.

The committee amendment which increases the local contribution from 10% to 20%, of which half must be in cash, will effectively prevent Sheboygan from having a Head Start program next year, since the application is again being made by a small group of private citizens, under the sponsorship of the Sheboygan Human Rights Association. We were pleased to read in the *Sheboygan Press* Nov. 2, 1967, that you oppose the 10% local cash contribution. We feel that the amendment should be changed.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED GRUBE,  
President.

NOVEMBER 3, 1967.

Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: Since you are a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am writing to you about House Bill S. 2388 concerning the Economic Opportunity Act.

I hope that you will work to keep the local Community Action Agencies under the control of concerned citizens, because I hear that elected officials (of state and local government) are given too much control under the proposed amendments.

Also I understand that local communities would have to contribute 10% of the funds in cash. The danger of this is that the communities with the greatest need are no doubt least able to raise this money. I hope this amendment will be eliminated.

My concern and interest are derived from my experience as a volunteer in the local Headstart program.

With best wishes,

TED PAGE.

NOVEMBER 6, 1967.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: I am writing as an interested member of the Dane Co. Citizens' Assn. for Children & Youth and a volunteer working with a group of Headstart mothers.

In reference to the House Bill S. 2388, please do all you can to fight for: citizen control of OEO programs, abolition of the



requirements of 10% in cash donation from communities.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY BATT.

MADISON, Wis., November 4, 1967.

Re: House Bill S. 2388.  
Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: We are greatly concerned about some of the proposals in House Bill S. 2388 as we feel it will weaken the Economic Opportunity Act, something our nation can ill afford.

We feel it is of utmost importance to maintain citizen control of OEO programs for most effective operation. We are opposed to the requirement of 10% in-cash donation from communities, as this would result in OEO programs being denied to poor communities.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES E. LAKE.

MADISON, Wis., November 2, 1967.

Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I am writing in reference to House Bill S. 2388, the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Madison presently operates a Head Start program and a neighborhood youth corps, both projects in large part funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have been directly involved in the Head Start schools as a volunteer and have found it a very rewarding experience. The importance of the Head Start program and the other possible OEO projects I believe lies to a great extent in the participation of the average citizen who through these programs can acquaint himself firsthand with the problems of poverty. I think it would be tragic for the program if strings were attached making cash donations from the local community mandatory in place of the previously allowable contributions in kind for the local share. Secondly, I think the participation of the community itself in the planning and organizing is vital. Oftentimes, the political figures, those elected officials, are not willing to take the necessary steps toward elimination of poverty. I could here cite the reluctance of the Dane County Board in taking advantage of the federal program to train ADC mothers for work on the grounds that in the short run it might cost the County a small amount of taxpayers funds.

Yours truly,

REBECCA YOUNG.

I happen to share their concern about the 10-percent cash amendment and I hope the House will not continue with that provision.

As to the opportunity crusade which my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, discussed in some detail, there is a very important and I think meaningful provision which deserves further discussion.

It provides for the transfer of the Headstart program from OEO to the Office of Education.

One of the most severely criticized aspects of the Headstart operation has been the program's administration.

Unfortunately, there has been a severe time lag between application approval and funding in many instances.

I would like to call to the committee's attention that in a sampling question-

naire to Headstart sponsors by Congressman QUIE, the following facts were revealed.

Of those answering, over half—84—favored the transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education. Some of their comments were as follows:

Application was made in December 1965 and it wasn't until June 10, 1966, that funds became available. This was two weeks after the start of project. This program could be administered more efficiently if we were responsible to the State Department of Education.

By the public school system since there is a greater understanding of the purposes of pre-school education and most of the administrative machinery would already be in operation.

This program is definitely in the realm of education and should be handled by the public schools. . . . Headstart, in my opinion is a sound program and does a great deal of good for the less fortunate youngsters. It should be operated through the U.S. Dept. of Ed. and be handled locally by the public schools. As it is now operated no one seems to know what the other fellow is doing. We are asked to fill out numerous forms that are probably worthless.

Should be public school administered with strong safeguards to insure the objectives of Headstart are carried out.

Since this is an educational program for children, it should be administered locally by qualified, licensed early childhood specialists. Much red tape could be eliminated and funds received on time if all funds were administered by the same source.

A program such as Headstart is an educational endeavor more than an economic one, therefore I believe it should be administered by the Office of Education. . . . Under present arrangements, we have been answerable to three agencies (1) local school board, (2) OEO and (3) ESEA, Title I. Can we cut down on duplication of paper work?

The Headstart program is good and should have a secure place in our educational system, with the assurance that funds are available from year to year.

Other agencies (not public school) are not close enough to the opportunities and problems.

Concerning existing funding procedures, the following comments were made:

We have not been notified of funding yet—This is ridiculous . . . trying to guess a program out while waiting to be funded. The tardiness of organization whoever is at fault is comical and tragic. But we still function effectively.

Discontinue such procedures as a firm in Oklahoma assigning preschool training programs for teachers in New York State.

Funding should be assured earlier in the program—We were funded on Friday and had to open 400 classes for 6210 children on the following Monday. This made innumerable problems concerning personnel, recruiting and equipment. We could not officially hire aides, doctors, etc., until we were sure that the funds were available. We could not order materials for the same reason.

(Changes). That OEO hire competent people to handle the administering of Head Start project. Many times people in the capacity of Head Start Area Evaluators had no knowledge of school, classroom procedure, and children in general. It is well to be an expert in stipulation set down by the OEO but most important that evaluators and technical assistance people be aware of the overall program and the objective.

One reason for the delay in funding has been a confusion over the source of funds to be used for pre-school-age programs. Headstart type programs can be financed under funds from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as the Economic Opportunity Act. On August 10, 1965, Francis Keppel, then Commissioner of Education, and R. Sargent Shriver wrote to summer Headstart grantees and school supervisors urging them to follow up summer programs. Their joint letter said:

Both the Economic Opportunity Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act can be used to finance both programs. (followup and summer programs)

Either Act can be used to finance full-year programs for pre-school children of the poor, except that the Education Act is limited to programs under the administration and control of public educational agencies.

Herein lies the source of much confusion. There are numerous instances of applications being shunted from agency to agency while each claimed the other should finance it. In some instances, both agencies have jointly financed a program. However, OEO does not consider the role of the Office of Education when making projections of future Headstart program needs. They do not even maintain information on how many projects they are funding jointly with the Office of Education. As one OEO official put it:

You can't legitimately say there has been a close relationship between the Office of Education and OEO. There has been a spirit of competitiveness.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, approximately 4.9 percent of the total of \$778 million provided in fiscal year 1966, or about \$38,179,000, of that title has been used for preschool and kindergarten programs; 5.8 percent of title I participants are utilizing the program under funding provided by ESEA which is similar to that funded by OEO.

I believe that it would make a great deal more sense to take the approach of combining these programs in the Office of Education to fight duplication and to fight overlapping and waste so that everyone will know exactly where to go to get this program.

I want to make clear, however, that the local community action agency would have the responsibility for determining how and by whom the program would be run. If there is no local CAP agency, of course, a nonprofit Headstart agency would continue to be eligible as the sponsor at the local level.

Thus, the opportunity crusade would basically be aimed at a shift only at the Federal level.

This is what is provided in the amendment that will be offered for the consideration of the committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], to insure that there will be coordination—something which is now lacking.

I want to pause here, Mr. Chairman, to pay tribute to the Fond du Lac County Office of Economic Opportunity, the Fond



du Lac Area Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc. Under the able and dedicated leadership of the director, Mrs. Rosalie Tryon, and her staff and board of directors this community action agency has proved to be an effective agency in mobilizing the resources of the Fond du Lac area in working to meet the needs of the people of Fond du Lac County. Donald Flanders, a member of the board of directors of this agency, appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor and did an excellent job in providing insight into the operation of a local CAA.

I have had the privilege of viewing firsthand the programs being carried out in Fond du Lac County. Their operations are well run and well managed and it would not be most unfortunate if this program were to be jeopardized by the failure of this House to provide the kinds of changes necessary to insure that the program can be strengthened, not weakened, in the time ahead. My fear, Mr. Chairman, is that the constructive amendments which will be offered in the days ahead will be turned down, that there will continue to be an unwillingness by the majority and OEO to move to correct the errors and mistakes which are so readily apparent. But, Mr. Chairman, if this program is not substantially redirected then the good programs, like the one being carried on in Fond du Lac County, will suffer.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. What I do not understand, to engage in some forensics with my colleague, is why they will not accept success. When we established the poverty program, was it not to effect just exactly the competition that you describe as existing between the OEO and the Office of Education—the goad, the stimulus, the challenge, the competitive pin prick to the existing agencies in the executive branch to do the job with the poor that they have not been doing, and if the Office of Education now feels that they have felt the pin prick of competition and are now themselves engaged in the job that they had not done before; namely, to reach the kids in their preschool years and to adopt from OEO the concept of Headstart in an effort to get the local public school agencies of our country to reach down to preschool years, to reach into the homes and get to parents; is that not the hallmark of success of the poverty program?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. In my judgment, competition in many cases can serve, as the gentleman from New York has said, as a pin prick for the purposes of upgrading and improving the policies that may operate in another agency.

Mr. SCHEUER. So the program then has been successful?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I do not think that is the case, and what bothers me is that it has not achieved success. It has achieved duplication. In my judgment, that is not to be desired as a goal either in OEO or in the Office of Education.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I have but 10 minutes and I cannot yield further.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I merely wish to make one brief observation. It is always the same line that comes up here. They were not doing it before. They have success now because we have given them all this money. The basic point here is that the Federal Government, never before 1964, set up a program for preschool education. Many of us were urging such a program prior to 1964. That question is entirely irrelevant as to the proper agency that could administer this program effectively. Had we set the program up initially in the Office of Education with a good structure down through it to coordinate with existing programs and existing education efforts at the Federal level, with this money we would have a far more successful program today, and we are urging the Congress to take that action belatedly, 3 years later.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. There are two other points upon which I wish to make comment. One relates to the amendment that the committee adopted, and which is contained in S. 2388 for title IV. It is an amendment that I offered during consideration of the bill by the Committee on Education and Labor, and which has come under some criticism from those who think that this provision would be an invasion of the responsibilities and independence of the Small Business Administration.

May I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that this is not the intent, the substance, or the purpose of the title IV amendment. In my view, title IV contains a significant breakthrough in the necessary struggle to help our major metropolitan areas, and in particular those who reside in ghetto areas. Title IV contains a program to develop businesses in those areas and to provide the kind of managerial training that is lacking today for so many ghetto area citizens. It would extend the title of this act, Economic Opportunity, into a more meaningful phase than it ever has been before. It would create a program of economic development where now there is none. It in no way jeopardizes the Small Business Administration, but what it does provide is a totally new program which would be assigned to the Department of Commerce for the purpose of giving meaningful management and technical assistance and advice to those in urban areas who can, with that kind of training and advice, undertake to become a part of the economic life, the indigenous economic life, of the ghetto area.

All too often the frustrations and the riots that we have seen break out in the past two summers have been vented against the very small businessman we were supposed to be helping.

The reason that has happened is because the small businessman has not been indigenous to the urban area served by

his place of business. Title IV then would begin to reverse that trend.

What we are talking about in title IV is a program aimed at one of the root causes of this Nation's ghetto existence. Without this kind of program to initiate and provide the kind of entrepreneurial skill necessary to improve economic life, our ghettos will remain this Nation's wasteland filled with hopelessness and despair.

In title IV we have a program to ban that hopelessness, to change despair into hope for the future. That hope, quite simply, lies in creating an economic community in our inner cities by providing those who live there with a pride necessary for existence and growth.

Last, I think it would be well for this committee to take note of what a very wise Englishman, Richard Titmus, has said after a lifelong study of the problems of social welfare:

We cannot achieve a better balance between the needs of today and the resources of today by living out the destinies of tradition. Without knowledge of wind and current, without some sense of purpose, men and societies do not keep afloat for long either morally or economically by merely bailing out the water.

S. 2388 in its present form does nothing more than bail out the water. It does not really aim at breaking the cycle of poverty. It does not give true meaning to economic opportunity.

I hope that the program will be redirected to provide less duplication, a greater involvement of State and local government, less redtape, and more meaningful help for the poor.

America today desperately needs an effective program to help the poor in a meaningful way. The Republican proposal—the opportunity crusade—would provide for proper administration of major segments of the existing antipov-erty programs while redirecting the remainder strongly toward overcoming unemployment and dependency. It would use Federal funds in large part as seed money to help enlist the enormous resources of our free enterprise economy and to increase the scope of State participation.

Our opportunity crusade proposal, for example, would authorize a 1968 Federal expenditure of less than \$1.7 billion—the administration called for an expenditure in excess of \$2 billion—but would generate a total investment of public and private funds of nearly \$3.5 billion. The revitalization of the program is impossible to calculate in dollars.

The war on poverty is in very deep trouble. It is in trouble in large measure because of its failure to meet the real needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor and because:

First, in far too many places in this country it has been mired in partisan politics and factionalism.

Second, a large part of the funds appropriated to help the poor have been spent for administrative expenses and high salaries.

Third, its management at the Federal level particularly has been inept.

Fourth, programs such as the Job Corps have produced few results at enor-



mous costs when administered by a Federal agency having no competence in education.

Fifth, it has failed to involve the resources of either private industry or the States in any meaningful way.

I think if we can—as I trust this Committee will—move to redirect it, to involve State and local government and to a greater extent involve private industry. If this is done we can truly say that this House has created an opportunity for some advancement for the disadvantaged. If it does not, it will have failed in its responsibility.

(Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. PERKINS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and in support of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. I would say I rise in support of the bill as reported to the House, but there are areas in which I think it could be improved. I am not an enthusiastic fan of what the present amendments have done to community action. I am not wildly happy about the sudden doubling of the cash contribution by local agencies, and I am quite dubious about those amendments which seem to be designed to prevent the poor from being advised that they, too, are voting members of the community in which they live.

But I am also aware of the temper of this House, and I do not expect that a perfect bill could pass the House this year. Considering the mood of the House, considering the vital needs of the Nation with respect to the poverty problem, I am willing to measure the desirable in terms of the possible, and give my sincere support to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of thousands of words and speeches to the contrary, the war on poverty is not primarily a program "for the poor." It is a program for all America. Poverty is a problem with which the poor must cope daily and intimately. But those among us who think our affluence is eternal have to cope with it as well, whether we know it or not. Poverty at the level it is known in contemporary America is a national problem—it is a handicap all of us suffer from—it is a disgrace to the entire Nation.

There is so much that needs doing in this country, there are so many jobs for for which we lack the trained hands and heads, there are so many competing and equally legitimate demands on our human resources are left virtually untapped.

The growing burden of welfare costs, and the growing impact of the welfare mentality on recipients and dispensers alike, is reaching very serious proportions in this Nation. A program which will help break the cycle of poverty, help find permanent remunerative jobs for those who have always been thought of as being in a kind of surplus labor pool, such a program, Mr. Chairman, would be one of the most valuable things we could perfect, not only for those who would benefit from it at the outset, but for those, as well, who must pay for the consequences of our failure to do so.

America, Mr. Chairman, stands at a moral crossroads. The poverty program is designed to reunite a nation that the evil of poverty has come perilously close to splitting into fragments. The poverty program is intended to bring people into a community from which they have been excluded by walls too high to climb and too thick to push over.

And today, this very day and this very week, Mr. Chairman, this Nation on the floor of this House, will decide whether or not we want to continue with the progress we have been making, or whether we want to continue forward along the other road—the road of fragmentation, of growing alienation and class division. Some Americans may think the choice before it is whether we go forward or go backward—backward to a happier time when:

The poor were poor, and the rich were rich. And you felt so damn secure, just knowing which was which.

These people reminisce about times when the poor were taken care of by private charity, and public affairs were securely in the hands of those whom affluence allowed the time to get involved.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going back there, even if that nostalgic vision were of a land that ever existed—and it did not. We do not have that choice. Our choices are which road ahead are we to take. Are we to try to build bridges and open doors between the two or three or four nations that exist within our boundaries, or are we to deepen the chasms that separate us, and close the doors we have begun to open?

The choice is essentially a moral one. I have heard and heard and heard talk about our "not being able to afford" the poverty program, Mr. Chairman. But on Thursday of this week, we are going to hurl into space, at a cost of \$350 million, a rocketship which several tries later may take three people from the prosperity of Cape Kennedy to the empty wastes of the moon. I do not oppose the space program in essence, but if we can afford to practice moon shots at a cost per practice equal to one-sixth of the entire annual cost of the poverty program, then we can afford the poverty program.

If we can criss-cross America with a network of highways like the world has never seen before, just to accommodate our growing number of automobiles, then we can do something to meet the food and shelter and job needs of people.

If we can spend \$1.2 billion of public funds to develop a supersonic transport, so the jet set can get to Paris in 2 hours instead of 6, then we can afford a program half again as large to slow down the very rapid pace at which a poor American moves from the cradle to the grave.

If we can afford a war in Vietnam which is estimated to cost \$100,000,000 per day, then we can afford to spend the cost of 20 days of that war to fight against poverty—which is as implacable and deadly an enemy to America as communism or Nazism ever were.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply not convinced that this debate, and the votes that come at the end of it will center around cost considerations. Those who shout so loudly about the cost of the war

on poverty are in some cases those who shout equally loudly about "false economy" when cuts are made in some project in their district or some project affecting an industry in which the Member may feel particularly friendly.

In my 14 years in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, I have voted for a great many expenditures of public funds for purposes which seemed to have an immediate impact in one section or among one part of the population. I have voted for great dams in the West, for flood control along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, for agriculture support and research, for highways, for space, and for defense. I have supported these expenditures, even though only a part of the population might profit from them, because I have felt in my heart that what strengthened America strengthened us all. I have always felt that Grand Coulee Dam and the Interstate Highway System and price stability for farmers and insurance and loans for small businessmen and contracts for the aerospace industry were of benefit to us all—that they were investments in a nation which had learned, better than any other nation in the world how to share its wealth among its people, and how to use money imaginatively and profitably, to make us all strong and free.

Never in those 14 years, Mr. Chairman, have I seen a better prospect for an investment in America than I see in the poverty program. Because this program, to a greater extent than any other program I have supported, is an investment in the one natural resource that always pays off—human hands and hearts and brains. I hope those in this House whose districts have benefited directly from the other programs I have mentioned, and who have spoken at such great length about how such programs are good for the entire country—I hope these distinguished and able gentlemen will see that an investment in the war on poverty, too, is an investment in the future of the whole Nation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill. I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on his tenacious and persistent effort to bring a bill to the floor of this House that will enable the war on poverty to move ahead effectively and successfully.

I here cite but one example. Only this afternoon a distinguished group of religious leaders from here in the Nation's Capital issued a statement in support of continuation of an effective war on poverty.

Chairman of this group, the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations, is the bishop of the Methodist Church for the District of Columbia area, Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Bishop Lord's letter to Members of Congress, dated November 7,



1967, and to insert following the letter the list of distinguished clergymen who constitute this committee:

INTERRELIGIOUS CONCERN FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967

(Statement by Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D., chairman, on behalf of the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations)

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Interreligious Committee on Race Relations is composed of 60 clergy and lay religious leaders in the greater Washington area. Their names appear on this letterhead. The Interreligious Committee was organized in April, 1963, with His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington as its Chairman for the first two years. He was followed by the Right Rev. William F. Creighton, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, as the Committee's Chairman for the next two years. As present Chairman of this Interreligious Committee which represents all the major institutions of faith in the Washington Metropolitan area, I am writing to you to seek your support for a continued strong and vigorous War on Poverty.

Three years ago, our nation embarked on the War on Poverty, a bold new effort to give fresh opportunity and a rebirth of hope to the poor. The major religious communities in America strongly supported the legislation which launched the Poverty War as a visible expression of our nation's moral commitment to the liberation of those citizens imprisoned by poverty. This week will decide whether our nation's commitment to that venture will be continued and renewed, or whether the door it opened will now be closed and the hopes it raised cruelly smashed. On the field of this domestic battle the reliability of our national commitments is surely tested at least as severely as on any foreign one.

The decision rests with you, the members of the House of Representatives who are now debating the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. The bill reported out by the committee and now under consideration on the floor already compromises some important parts of the program, and further crippling amendments would spell death to its effectiveness. We call upon the House to pass a strong anti-poverty bill which:

- (a) retains the Office of Economic Opportunity as the Coordinating agency for the whole of the War on Poverty;
- (b) authorizes funding of the program at a minimum of \$2.06 billion annually;
- (c) provides maximum feasible participation of the poor themselves in community decision making without political domination of their programs;
- (d) eliminates the 10% cash local matching fund requirement for community action programs.

In the midst of unprecedented national prosperity, none of us can afford the shame of continued crippling poverty. This is no time for "business as usual" for maneuvering for partisan or personal political advantage. We hope and trust that you in Congress will renew and strengthen the nation's efforts to relieve the misery of its poor. We are acutely aware that many poverty programs here in the Nation's Capital will be severely curtailed or eliminated without positive action in the House of Representatives. If Congress provides the nation with a renewed War on Poverty, our democratic institutions will be given a new chance to prove their worth. If Congress fails to provide effective legislation for the struggle against poverty, we will all pay the price, in bitterness, despair, disillusion and strife, and worst of all in the betrayal of our own aspirations and moral commitments.

We of the Interreligious Community can do no less than to pledge to your our continuing support in common cause to fulfill the promises of America for all Americans.

INTERRELIGIOUS COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Chairman: Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D.  
 Past-Chairmen: Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle; the Right Rev. William F. Creighton, D.D.  
 Co-Chairmen: Bishop Henry C. Bunton, D.D.; the Rev. David G. Colwell; Rabbi Martin S. Halpern; the Most Rev. John S. Spence, D.D.; Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, D.D.

Secretary: Dr. Isaac Franck.

Treasurer: Philip J. Olin.

Members: Floyd H. Agostinelli, Hon. Harry T. Alexander, the Rev. Arthur A. Azlein, Dr. William A. Banner, the Rev. Geno Baroni, the Rev. Theodore Bowen, George O. Butler, William Calomiris, the Very Rev. Msgr. Leo J. Coady, the Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Insp. Vernon E. Culpepper, the Rev. Burke E. Dorworth, Julian Dugas, the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, the Rev. Samuel Frazier.

Also the Rt. Rev. Msgr. George L. Gingras, Louis C. Grossberg, the Rev. Earl L. Harrison, D.D., George Hartford, the Rev. Everett A. Hewlett, Dr. Duncan Howlett, Maj. Reginald K. Ingram, the Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, D.D., Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, the Rev. John W. Laney the Rev. Theodore E. Ledbetter, Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, Edward B. Lyman, Richard K. Lyon, the very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons.

Also the Rev. Graydon E. McClellan, R. Grayson McGuire, Hon. John P. Moore, the Rev. Philip Newell, H. Carl Moultrie, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, the Rev. Daniel Pierotti, Mrs. John Posey, Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, Hon. Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., the Rev. Jefferson P. Rogers, Harry N. Rosenfield, the Rev. John H. Satterwhite, Th. D., David H. Scull, Rabbi Samuel Scolnic.

Also Rabbi Theodore Steinberg, the Rev. Russell C. Stroup, D.D., Dr. Donald F. Sullivan, the Rev. Henri Stines, Sterling Tucker, Rabbi Lewis A. Weintraub, the Rev. Richard Williams, S. D. Wolf.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I also want to pay tribute to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a man of great integrity, ability, and dedication, who has given outstanding leadership to the effort to carry out our national commitment to combat poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I think it appropriate here to raise the following question:

Why, in spite of the very strong support which the antipoverty program has won in communities across the Nation, do we find such determined opposition to continuation of the program on the part of so many of our Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives?

In this respect, I was struck by an editorial, to which reference was made earlier in the debate by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CAREY], an editorial in the New York Times of this morning entitled "Whose Opportunity Crusade?"

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that under the rules of the House it is not proper—and I shall not do so—to make specific reference to any Member of this body who was mentioned in that particular editorial, but I do want to call attention to the fact that the New York Times editorial made a comment relative to the point I am raising; namely, why is there such a determined effort here on the part of some of our Republican colleagues in this body to try to kill or cripple this program?

As the New York Times pointed out in referring to some of the principal Re-

publican spokesmen on the antipoverty program:

The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is grave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, I think this editorial which appeared in the New York Times today is right on target because one of the points that have struck me in this debate is this: From some of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have come suggestions of a so-called opportunity crusade to help the poor. Yet we all know that the strongest support for drastic slashes in funds for carrying out the war on poverty have come from the same side of the aisle. I think, therefore, that, it might be much more apt if we were to talk about an "opportunistic crusade" rather than an opportunity crusade, for it seems to me quite opportunistic to make a lot of speeches about wanting to help the poor in 1 week when not many days before many of those same speechmakers were voting for drastic reductions in the money for this important program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make just one other point and that is to call attention to the widespread support which our national moral commitment to resolve the scandal of poverty in a land of great wealth has won from the churches and religious organizations of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, since I became a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have had the opportunity to study the Office of Economic Opportunity and the programs administered by that agency in the so-called war on poverty.

I wish that I could support S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, and do so with the conviction that I would be helping to improve the lot of the many Americans that do need help to break through the barrier of poverty. Unfortunately, this is not possible.

I realize, as presumably does each Member who will cast a similar ballot, that a vote against this bill will in some quarters be interpreted as a vote for poverty. That is precisely the conclusion many supporters of the measure hope Americans will draw. Nothing would please them more than to have us branded with the stigma that we are unsympathetic with the plight of the economically disadvantaged, or that we are indifferent to the Nation's needs. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have supported and will continue to support every realistic antipoverty measure, whether in the field of education, health, or welfare. This bill is primarily unrealis-



tic because it is based on a false assumption; namely, that our problems are wholly economic. Dollars alone will not eliminate poverty. The principal tool to upgrade those who are now underemployed or unemployed is education. When I speak of education I do not mean merely formal education but also rehabilitation and vocational retraining.

Even if the Government had the money to fight costly wars on two fronts, even if public spending were superior to private investments in solving these problems, and even if you assume all these things—what reason is there for believing that “we can buy our way out of poverty.” Certainly the present OEO program does not warrant such confidence. At best, it has achieved only mediocre success and even that has been expensively purchased.

The founding father of OEO, Sargent Shriver, predicted that his agency would eliminate poverty by 1976. Of course, such a statement is wholly inaccurate and adds fuel to the flames of disillusionment which swept across America in the urban riots this summer. Time after time, I have been told by both friend and foe of the OEO that the agency promises more than it can deliver. A key element, which OEO has not considered, is time. Attempts to substitute time with expenditures of money result in wasteful and extravagant spending as well as ill-advised and poorly planned programs. Specifically, what I object to in the poverty program are its high administrative costs. At least 75 percent of the community action expenditures are administrative in nature; nearly one-half of those employed by the OEO in semiresponsible positions are paid \$10,000 a year.

What we object to in the OEO program is not its aims, which we also share, but its excesses, its failures, its unfulfilled dreams and the frustrations which they, in turn, produced. At this point, I wish to cite some of the many blunders for which this program is accountable. They symbolize what the war on poverty is to many Americans.

The war on poverty has benefited some, to be sure. But in all too many cases, we become aware of situations like these:

Take for example, the case of Mr. and Mrs. William S. Clark. Both were on two poverty war payrolls at the same time. The Clarks drew a total of \$5,178 in pay and expenses during 12 weeks in June, July, and August of 1965. Clark was director of the Headstart program and supervisor of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project at the same time. Mrs. Clark was overall supervisor of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and on the Headstart program as an instructor.

In the Bronx, a minister serving three churches with a fourth post as a city civil defense inspector was charged with still another activity—stealing more than \$9,000 from a Federal antipoverty project he handled.

This gent really knew how to aid the poor. On his antipoverty payroll he had his father at \$150 a week, his mother at \$100 a week, his sister at \$175 a week, and himself at \$200 a week—and they all lived at the same address.

However, this income was apparently inadequate. The 145-count indictment returned against this man, charged that he took kickbacks from the employees of the program.

A CAP director found moonlighting so profitable that he recently gave up the war on poverty to pursue it full time. This gentleman was collecting fees from schools for compiling their applications for Federal aid to education.

The San Jose News indicates that under-the-table payments are being made to expedite antipoverty job training grants—fees are being paid to cover re-writing of applications for grants in a manner that would facilitate their approval.

My colleagues, I cannot ask the tax-paying Americans in my congressional district to continue paying for this type of conduct.

The war on poverty was conceived of politics and under the circumstances it appears that unless the entire house is cleaned, politics will continue to be the name of the game.

In city after city, all across the country, we find antipoverty officials and employees engaging in political activity.

VISTA volunteers registered voters on the Near North Side of Omaha, Nebr., during the 1966 congressional campaign. My protest to OEO brought new guidelines, which in effect said—you can register voters but you must be nonpartisan about it. This is precisely the point. As long as a area contains known partisan groupings, the act of deliberately selecting an area of this type to conduct registration activities is a political or partisan act. While the Hatch Act covers these employees, it is being interpreted so as to permit this activity.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been subsidizing a voter registration drive in Reading and Berks County, Pa., and in Gary, Ind. One has only to read the newspaper accounts of what is going on in Gary these days to see how improper Federal intervention exists.

In Atlanta, Ga., the OEO has 60 employees working on a voter registration drive that is organizing the recipients of poverty program aid on a block-by-block, precinct-by-precinct basis.

Our colleague, JIM GARDNER, has brought to our attention, through minority views filed in connection with the bill we are considering today, that antipoverty funds have been used to establish a massive political machine in Durham, N.C. Antipoverty money in Durham was even used to print sample ballots and to provide transportation to the polls.

In Des Moines, Iowa, antipoverty officials, with approval of Federal officials, are backing candidates in the local elections. The Polk County Community Action Council personally interviewed candidates for mayor and city council, intending to compile the answers for distribution in low-income areas “to give residents information—and to help them make a decision.”

In a desperate effort to thwart responsible efforts to reshape the war on poverty into a workable and worthwhile program. The Office of Economic Opportunity has encouraged Republican

mayors to send telegrams to members of the House and Senate. The message is clear—leave the program alone. I can imagine the message was very clear to these mayors, too. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has pointed out that this activity may violate the Federal antilobbying law.

Bulletin boards in Job Corps centers have been used to develop a partisan political bias in enrollees. I have seen it myself.

I repeat: I cannot ask my people to continue contributing their hard earned money to finance such activities. To aid the poor—yes, but to establish a federally financed political machine—no.

After the OEO sets money aside to pay salaries and other administrative expenses, there is some left to finance programs for the poor. But the American people have just cause to seriously question many of these expenditures. I will mention only a few:

In Nashville, Tenn., funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity went to help finance a liberation school, which was used to teach Negro children to hate whites. This situation was revealed before the Senate Judiciary Committee by Nashville Police Capt. John Sorace, and attempts to discredit him failed when the head of the Nashville Metropolitan Action Commission had to “reverse his field” and admit that the funds had been so used.

An OEO audit has revealed that a Mississippi antipoverty outfit called Child Development Group, “has more than a half million dollars in expenditures which cannot be accounted for.”

This same group was also listed as one of the groups with credentials to the recent meeting of the National Conference for New Politics in Chicago.

An investigation by the General Accounting Office has revealed that a Job Corps center in Pleasanton, Calif., operated by Litton Systems, Inc., purchased \$347,000 worth of so-called instructional materials from Litton Instructional Materials upon the recommendation of another Litton division, the learning resources department.

I have nothing against “keeping the money in the family,” but this money went to purchase materials on the atomic theory, the laws of relativity, trigonometry, and “facts about sex.” These are dropouts they are teaching.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has financed a \$376,000 program through the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to establish a domestic student exchange program. The main problem—instead of the expected 150 participants, only 15 were placed. That works out to about \$25,066 per enrollee for a one-semester project.

The United Community Corp. of New-ark held a weekend retreat at the Goldman Hotel in West Orange that will cost the taxpayers about \$2,500. Included in the package was a floor show.

It was reported in the September 15, 1966, issue of the Detroit News that that city's antipoverty program had been paying \$500 a month since March for a youth center which has not even been opened.



In New York City, a local antipoverty group is providing the funds to defend 10 peaceniks who interrupted church services and staged a protest in St. Patrick's Cathedral against the war in Vietnam.

The Rangers and the Disciples, two of Chicago's big teenage gangs, have been given nearly \$1 million in Federal antipoverty money, supposedly to set up a job training program.

My colleagues, is this the kind of misguided monster the Government of the United States intended to create with the establishment of the war on poverty? I think not, but I am not impressed with claims that the bill we have before us will yield a significantly improved product.

The files in my office, and I am sure yours, too, are filled with letters from people around the country who wonder if OEO has lost direction. OEO seems to have a great deal of difficulty keeping its mind on the task it was established to tackle. For example:

In Omaha, Nebr., 560 children from poor families have had no Headstart program for the past 2 months. Why? Because the Kansas City regional OEO officials have refused to release funds, claiming that residence patterns in Omaha result in de facto segregation.

Has OEO forgotten that the purpose of this program is to aid the poor, not compulsory integration?

The Pledge of Allegiance has been removed from the curriculum of Project Headstart because, in the opinion of the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is "meaningless" to preschool children.

When the OEO was having trouble finding a place for its Headstart program in Kirksville, Mo., the Christian church offered the use of its rooms, rent free. After using the church for 2 years at no cost to the program, the Kansas City office of the OEO ordered the church to remove religious paintings and other symbols from the rooms being used. The church refused.

Community Opportunities, Inc., an antipoverty program in my own district asked newspapers and radio stations to sign pledges to use publicity releases from the agency in return for local in-kind credits of \$1.50 a column inch or \$4 a minute for air time.

As was pointed out by Congressmen KYL, MAYNE, and myself, and by the Des Moines Register, this is nothing short of bribery.

We have often heard that without retention of the Office of Economic Opportunity as the coordinating head of the Government's antipoverty efforts, the program will lose its direction, and the poor will lose their spokesman. My colleagues, I submit that the direction has been lost and the spokesman is ineffective. The American people do not trust the Office of Economic Opportunity, and cannot be expected to continue feeding it the money it needs to keep it alive.

We can all appreciate the difficulty of accurately measuring the success of any program such as we are considering here today. But there is one program which should be capable of evaluation on this type of basis. I refer to the Job Corps.

The concept of the Job Corps is, or should be, to give an unemployed young person, in a relatively short period of time, a needed job skill, a healthy work attitude, and an opportunity to begin working with that newly acquired job skill.

But the Job Corps has failed in each respect.

According to a study made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, only 28 percent of the Job Corps graduates who obtain jobs are working in a job for which they were trained. In this same study, the chamber indicated that in its view, most of the employed graduates found work because of current economic conditions rather than their Job Corps training.

The program continues to cost a phenomenal amount of money. Job Corps officials have recently revealed that the per enrollee cost for fiscal 1967 exceeded a whopping \$8,500.

As was pointed out recently by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], according to the Internal Revenue Service, over 51 million wage earners—two out of three wage earners—make less money than it costs to put one boy or girl through 1 year of Job Corps training. Census figures show that over 70 percent of American workers earn less than this sum.

With the money it takes for a single Job Corps enrollee, most parents could put a child through college. They cannot understand such an expenditure by the Government, and neither can I.

On September 4, 1967, the Omaha World-Herald reported that of the 1,506 trainees who have entered and left the Lincoln, Nebr., Job Corps center this year, the whereabouts of more than one-half are unknown. What's more, only 338 were reported to be employed.

The Lincoln statistics also show that of each 10 entering corpsmen, only two will graduate. The other eight will transfer, drop out or be dismissed. As they say—nothing succeeds like success.

No one seems to be able to explain the reason for the outrageous cost of the Job Corps program, but a couple of examples from a Job Corps center across the river from my congressional district should provide a good clue:

The Omaha girls Job Corps center has less than 800 enrollees. Yet it costs nearly \$93,000 a year to keep unauthorized visitors from entering the centers, and to keep the girls from leaving without permission.

The center also spends \$132,000 a year to provide recreation for the enrollees on Saturday and Sunday. There must be a more efficient way to provide these needed opportunities.

Not only has the Job Corps product been poor, and the cost excessive, but certain administrative practices have brought the program into further disrepute. The Washington office of the OEO, in what appears to have been a plan to inflate Job Corps enrollment statistics, and reduce the per capita cost figures, asked Job Corps officials to withhold information on June dropouts until after the close of fiscal 1967. The initial charges, having reference to the Guthrie, Oklahoma center, were denied by OEO

loud and long. But the director of the Omaha Job Corps center subsequently acknowledged that a similar request was made of him.

I believe the American people are fed up with the Job Corps as they know it. If the backers of the war on poverty want to institute an industry-oriented program that will achieve the desired results—fine. But if we are just going to continue on pouring money into this program as it now operates, I think the time has come to eliminate it.

My colleagues, I object to a program which encourages one group of Americans to hate other Americans. I object to its reliance on measures that are "throw backs" to a depression era. I object to the practices of ignoring and bypassing State and local officials, and the almost total exclusion of the resources that private industry could bring to bear on this problem.

There is no logical reason why many of the poverty programs cannot be funded through and administered by existing Federal agencies. The Federal Government administers more than 79 separate training and education programs under the auspices of 15 different bureaus and agencies. Job recruitment funds can be obtained from nine manpower sources; funds for adult basic education from 10; funds for prevocational training and skill training from 10; and funds for work experience from five. On-the-job training can be subsidized by five programs and support service can be funded from nine programs.

Already, a proliferation of Government agencies are involved in the major segments of the war on poverty. For example, the Department of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense, and the U.S. Employment Service are already involved in the operation of the Job Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is farmed out to the Departments of Labor, and Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Civil Service Commission. In both of these cases, the principal function of the Office of Economic Opportunity appears to be that of a "gadfly."

The list goes on. The Department of Agriculture works with the rural loans program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Labor Department have been delegated responsibility for the work experience program; the Small Business Administration makes economic opportunity loans; the adult basic education program has been transferred from OEO to the Office of Education. These illustrations, it seems to me, serve to emphasize that the Office of Economic Opportunity, as such, is just so much excess baggage. The expertise in dealing with the poor is concentrated in the established agencies of Government.

Why must we forever establish new bureaus, new sections, to deal with problems and programs that clearly are within the province of a functioning agency? That practice produces enormous duplication and waste.

Another concern, maybe even a primary one, is whether the American tax-



payer can afford such an expensive program with our country at war fighting international communism in Vietnam. Also State and local taxes have been increased throughout the Nation; social security taxes soon will be raised, the Johnson administration which, this year alone will produce a \$29 billion deficit seems certain to soon push through at least a 10 percent surtax. Inflation now runs rampant throughout the country—where will it end? How much of a burden must the average taxpayer be asked to shoulder? The only thing we can accomplish by continuing to support legislation like this is not to raise the poor out of the depths of poverty, but rather to tax countless more American, those who work and pay the cost of this Government, into a position of near poverty. We must find the moral courage to admit that we cannot afford to do everything at once, no matter how much some might think it needs doing. Instant affluence cannot be purchased on a credit card. It must evolve from the maintenance of this country's fiscal health.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, who with great diligence and devotion to this program has labored with it and given it his utmost efforts in an attempt to bring forth a bill which would truly serve the needs of the poor of this great country.

In passing, let me state as to the remarks delivered by my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] so recently in the well, I can appreciate his not yielding during the course of the entreaties that we directed to him to yield, because I have never heard more unyielding arguments. They did not yield very much new. They were old criticisms. They were heaped on the back of the OEO from newspaper accounts, many of which have been explained and contradicted.

I do not think that that is a constructive way in which to approach this program. I think the first thing we should do when we come into the well to talk about the poverty program is to produce our own credentials and ask what each one of us has done on his own to try to make this a better program. I know we can look around the table on both sides of the aisle and see those who have gone out into the country and have seen these programs firsthand. They have met the kids in the Job Corps and the young people in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and have seen the infants in the beginning Headstart programs. They know firsthand what is good and bad about these programs.

Perhaps after the gentleman from Iowa has been here a little more than 9 months, he will have time to do that and see these programs firsthand. When he does that, possibly he will know a little bit more of his own knowledge, and he will not have to depend on newspaper articles, which make good reading for

those who want to read horrible things about the program that deals with the most abject cases in society.

So when he finds a benighted man, a minister of God, who strays from the path of righteousness and then is indicted by the U.S. attorney and, with his family, attempts to make restitution, finally receives a sentence in a court of this land for taking money from this program, that does not mean the program is bad. It means human nature is still there to deal with.

Unfortunately, this program has to deal with human nature in its most tragic aspects. I think what the committee is trying to do is to look at the errors and the objections that have been raised validly to the program, and has come forth with a bill that will move this program forth with more efficiency and better direction. There is nothing that was ever legislated in this House that could not be improved.

I say we should speak with our credentials known. I come into the well of this House, as have those others from our side, able to say that in every case I and the others to whom I have referred have voted for this program. We have opposed motions to recommit. We have opposed crippling amendments. We have sat in the committee hour after hour and day after day to hear the recommendations of those from both sides of the aisle who want to help us build a better program.

We come to the well today I think with good conscience, and in all good conscience I promise the people of my district and the people of my country that when I find something wrong in this program, I will not hesitate to speak out and try to correct it. That is why I have supported very strongly, and with great conviction, the remedial amendments that have been placed in the bill this year.

Of course, that which has received the greatest attention has been the restructuring of title II, according to the amendment introduced by the gentlewoman from Oregon, which will have, I hope, a remedial and reforming effect upon community action.

Has it need of this? It most definitely has need of this, for the reason that at the lower level, because this is a local option program, there is no means, no instrumentation, no apparatus, no mechanization at the hands of the Director of OEO, Sargent Shriver, to control the setup of these programs. He can lay down guidelines but he cannot tell local mayors or country officials whom to hire and how to expend funds.

This program was designed that way. As a result of this, we have decided we now need to lay down some very direct statutory authority on what will be done and how it will be done at the local and State levels, because there has crept into this program not politics, not some misuse that is laid to the current structure of our Government in this country, but what has crept in really has been an inordinate use of moneys expended by the Federal Government, devoted by the Federal Government for the benefit of the poor, an inordinate use of these funds to build up administrative struc-

tures at the local level that are not needed to help the poor. That is what we are trying to get at here.

I would be the last to say we have a political boss in New York City, the greatest city in the country, which annually has received \$75 million in poverty funds. We do not have a political boss. I have not heard him called that. He operates this program in New York City. I am not satisfied with this New York City program where, in each eligible community, 75 to 80 percent of the funds are used for high-priced administration, for professional staff, for clerk hire, for rentals, phones, travel, and fixtures, and only 30 percent or less is available for antidependency and action-type activities for the benefit of the poor.

What do I mean by that? I mean we need to write the kind of bill here today that will state if they want maximum feasible participation of the poor in the benefits of the program, there is only one way to get that, and that is to confine and restrict the money that can be used to build up little "pentagons of power" to run the poor and make more programs available to the poor.

In this last minute I will say, Mr. Chairman, I will place in the RECORD, when I have the opportunity to do so, when we go back into the House, chapter and verse, item by item, of the way the poverty program has been structured in New York City by the mayor now incumbent. This is where we need reform, and I hope the Republicans will support this in the interest of the poverty program reform, even if it hurts one of their own.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support for the new Job Corps.

This Nation now has an effective and successful Job Corps which in the past year served 100,000 youngsters, 24,000 of whom were impoverished young women. This is a Job Corp that has significantly reduced its operating costs from over \$9,000 per man-year in 1966 to \$6,950 in fiscal year 1967.

This is a Job Corps that has documented a 70-percent placement record with youths who were the 100-percent failures of the existing educational system. This is a Job Corps that now has an arrest rate that is less than half of the national arrest rate published by the FBI for youths between the ages of 16 and 21; a Job Corps that has reduced the distance that a youth must travel from his home to a center by an average of 400 miles and reduced transportation costs by 50 percent; a Job Corps that has stirred the corporate social conscience of private enterprise and involved business in the work of educating youths as it has never done before; a Job Corps that has revised earlier negative attitudes in innumerable communities throughout this Nation; a Job Corps that represents the first and only organization that seeks out and rehabilitates the poorest of poor young men and women in this country.

And the Job Corps of today estimates that it will further decrease the operating cost of its centers in the coming year; that it will lengthen the average stay of corpsmen to 9 months in the coming



year—since success is so closely related to the time spent in a center—that by next year it will be placing 80 percent of the corpsmen leaving its centers in jobs, school or the military; that it will further increase the number of poor female youths served; that it will seek more effective participation of States in the Job Corps program.

In the spring of 1965, this Nation had neither the capability nor the facilities to reach and help hard-core impoverished youth. But in the short span of just 2½ years the Job Corps has opened and is successfully operating 123 Job Corps centers. Eighty-three are conservation centers operated by the Forest Service and the National Park Service. Seven are conservation centers run by States. Ten are men's urban centers: 18 women's urban centers.

These centers have been erected with a capability of handling over 43,000 youths at any one time, and during fiscal year 1967 the Job Corps reached 100,000 youths. At present, various statutory limitations restricting the female enrollment to a specific percent of total enrollment prevents the Job Corps from utilizing its full capacity.

Nonetheless, during fiscal year 1968, the Job Corps plans to operate with an average on-board enrollment of 41,000 and expects to reach another 100,000 poor young men and women.

In the beginning of Job Corps, emphasis was primarily placed on reaching young men between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of school and out of work. By congressional direction, the female capacity was significantly enlarged.

Within the past 9 months the Job Corps has more than doubled its capability to train young women. As late as this past January there were only a few thousand women in the Job Corps. By May of 1967, 17 percent of the total enrollment in Job Corps were women. By June of 1967, 23 percent of the total enrollment of Job Corps, or over 9,500 enrollees were women.

In 1968, the Job Corps has proposed to further increase the size of its women's program. The present plans are that at least 25 percent of all enrollees will be women. This means that over 10,250 women at any one time will be receiving the services of Job Corps.

From the time Job Corps opened its first center, critics have claimed that the operating costs of Job Corps were too high. These critics persisted, despite their knowledge that all new organizations must initially encounter high start-up costs, which can be allocated to only a very small number of enrollees.

Over the past 2½ years, the cost of operating the Job Corps has continually dropped. Last year at a time when the costs per enrollee in the Job Corps were averaging about \$9,000, the Congress imposed a statutory limitation that the average cost per enrollee in the Job Corps could not exceed \$7,500.

But the Job Corps brought the cost down below \$7,000 and there is every indication that it will continue to reduce its unit cost further to \$6,500 per enrollee in this fiscal year, as required in the bill before us.

The high cost of capital investment has also been a point of criticism about the Job Corps. The total investment for 123 centers now stands at \$144 million or about a little over \$1 million per center. The capital investment was minimized by making maximum use of idle military facilities.

The \$144 million of investments resulted in spaces for 43,000 corpsmen at a cost of about \$3,000 per space. However, the Job Corps has served over 140,000 youths, including those now on board.

The allocation of these capital costs over just the number of youths served to date reduces the capital investment per youth to \$1,000. And this is not the end: these capital costs per youth will continue to decrease as each graduating corpsman is replaced by another youngster.

The record also contains many observations detailing the success of the Job Corps in touching the social conscience of private industry. From Job Corps earliest days, over one-half of all corpsmen were trained in centers operated by private enterprise. A listing of its contractors and corporations desiring to operate additional Job Corps centers reads like a who's who listing of the business world.

It is significant to note that this country has never before been able to attain this level of involvement with private enterprise as an integral part of its educational process. It is also significant to note that no industrial organization has ever quit on the Job Corps. The management of these organizations are fully behind the Job Corps and fully support the objectives that Job Corps has striven to attain.

From time to time comments are heard about companies who make a profit out of poverty: These comments are not fair. The size of the profit realized on any Job Corps training center contract is well below the return being realized by these corporations on other endeavors. The maximum fixed-fee, or profit, has been set at 4.7 percent, significantly below the fixed fee of 6 percent and higher which these contractors receive on Space and Defense contracts and far below the rate of return realized on commercial sales.

Over the past several months we have also heard testimony from several individuals describing training organizations that are "the same as Job Corps." These educational organizations were vocational programs dealing with youths that had dropped out of school.

An objective inquiry and analysis into the programs of these vocational schools and the characteristics of their student body will show that not one of these programs is "the same as Job Corps." These vocational programs:

Do not deal with the truly impoverished youths that the Job Corps seeks to help;

Do not treat the total youth—his educational need, his vocational need, his social need, his cultural need;

Do not operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year; and

Do not operate the same program cheaper than the Job Corps since these institutions receive substantial local support and provide a more limited program,

neither of which is considered when cost per student is cited.

Many vocational schools do an excellent vocational training job. But, the Job Corps remains unique in its approach of treating the total human being. The youths served by the vocational schools whose programs were explained to the Education and Labor Committee are not dealing with the truly impoverished youth.

Job Corps has a success rate as good or better than the public schools and many vocational schools even though the Job Corps youth are much poorer and much harder to deal with.

There is no organization in this country that has the capability of the Job Corps to deal with the hard core and impoverished men and women who represent the failings of the existing educational system.

The Job Corps is unique. From its inception, it embarked on a program of total human renewal. The Job Corps did not see a young man's or woman's lack of educational or vocational training, or lack of social skills, as separate problems to be dealt with by separate organizations.

The Job Corps has never attempted to take the "cream" of the youth. It has taken 103,000 youths who can be truly classified as 100 percent dropouts or failures and has placed 70 percent of them in jobs, school, or the Armed Forces. These are youths who, had it not been for Job Corps, in all probability, would be a dredge to society for the rest of their lives.

To spin off the Job Corps into another agency at this stage of development will do nothing but impede, if not destroy, all that Congress has sought to achieve. Neither the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor have both indicated that OEO should operate the Job Corps.

The public image of the Job Corps has changed for the better in almost every community in the vicinity of a center.

The testimony of House hearings contains letters from the mayors, law enforcement officials, leading editors, and heads of chambers of commerce of 100 towns and cities in the vicinity of Job Corps centers. In all of the letters there are only five that can be considered generally negative.

It is evident from this overwhelming testimony by local community leaders, some of whom were violently opposed to Job Corps just 2 years ago, that Job Corps is a good neighbor. Practically every community is now a strong supporter of the program for many reasons—

Appreciation is expressed by these towns and cities because of the way corpsmen have so willingly assisted with voluntary projects;

City officials compliment the Job Corps on the attitude of corpsmen and staff members on centers and in communities; and

These cities and towns are aware and grateful for the favorable impact on the economy of the community in which the center is located.

This is the record of the new Job Corps—a changed Job Corps that must



be permitted to continue. I repeat that I personally believe one of the greatest tragedies of this session would be the authorization of legislation that would require Job Corps to deviate from the plan that it has outlined to this Congress.

The present Job Corps is an improved Job Corps and one that gives every indication of further improvement in the months ahead. I believe that Job Corps must be maintained as an organizational entity to preserve its imaginative, innovative, and successful program. It must be preserved because, today, this Nation does not have a feasible alternative to the Job Corps.

For the first time in this Nation's history, we have an organization that has demonstrated the capability of dealing with the very poor. We must not destroy this organization.

I strongly support the request of the Job Corps managers that Congress permit them to operate during the remainder of this year at its present capacity. A year in which no drastic changes are required will provide the opportunity to prove what Job Corps can really do. I am convinced that such a year would stabilize the program and result in an even more improved Job Corps than the successful one we have today.

#### THE PATRIOTISM OF JOB CORPS BOYS

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Members of this House of the sacrifices that are being made by young people who have been lifted from poverty by the program whose future we are debating today.

Two weeks ago, 44 young men from Parks Job Corps Center, in California, enlisted simultaneously in the Army airborne forces. Their induction test scores were higher than the national average, by the way.

As we sit here in this comfortable Chamber discussing whether or not to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity, some 350 young men trained by the Job Corps are fighting for their country in Vietnam. This may be a controversial war, but there is no controversy at all about the extent of the danger that stalks the young men we send into battle.

Eight former Job Corps men have been killed in action.

One of these fine young Americans who have given their lives in Vietnam was George W. Jones. A private first class in the 1st Cavalry, he was drafted in June 1966 from Kilmer Job Corps Center and killed in action 6 months later.

This is what George's friends at Kilmer Job Corps Center said about him:

He was here for the same reason we are—to get a trade. Even though George never finished his training, we can finish ours as a memorial to George.

My fellow Members, are we going to make it possible for George's friends to carry out their pledge?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard over and over again the statement that "Job Corps does not provide any placement or follow-up services for its trainees." It is surprising that this myth continues to be related despite vast amount of

testimony during the extensive hearings on Job Corps.

Job Corps placement and follow-up system is effective and is working. Although the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended does not specifically call on Job Corps for placement, Job Corps has been moving ahead in this area.

Job Corps now receives verified placement records for 86.4 percent of trainees within 90 days of termination. 78 percent of the youths who complete training enter jobs, school and the military at an average wage of \$1.70 per hour within an average time of 36 days.

Now it is true that a year ago they did not have all of this information. This is a part of tightening-up and improvement in administration that we have seen during the past year.

In addition to this, Job Corps is interested in long-term results as well. Job Corps has established two methods of obtaining these results:

First. Surveys through Louis Harris and associate, and

Second. Concentrated support service programs.

Follow-up statistics based on surveys show that 6 months after Job Corps:

First. Seventy percent of all youths are in either jobs, school, or military.

Second. Eighty percent of completers are placed with: First, 89 percent working full time; and second, 75 percent having had no more than two jobs.

These figures also show that youths under 18 have less success than those over 18, although completers under 18 do just about as well as noncompleters over 18.

Working hand in hand with placement are Job Corps two networks of support service volunteers—JACS and WICS.

For the men, JACS now has 370 volunteer coordinators and 1,644 community volunteers who have helped 3,000 corpsmen on their return to the community since June.

For women, WICS with its 12,000 volunteers in 300 local units has helped 25,000 women since 1965.

Still not satisfied, Job Corps is testing a model placement and support project operated by the City of Baltimore Health and Welfare Council.

During the last 6 months, they have worked with 347 trainees, placing 80 percent of them. The record for completers is:

First. Eighty-six percent placed;

Second. Ninety-four percent placed in training-related jobs; and

Third. Eighty percent employed in the same job after 6 months at \$1.91 average hourly wage.

This has been done at a cost per youth served of \$51—less than the cost of 3 weeks of welfare benefits or 2 weeks of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this is the new Job Corps—as Lou Harris said in his 2 hours of testimony explaining the results of his surveys before the House Education and Labor Committee:

In fact, what happened to these young people as human beings may in the long run go much further toward determining the real long-term effectiveness of the Job Corps than whether immediately

their hourly wages are going up 20, 40, or 80 cents an hour, or whether they are among the upper third or second third as engine mechanics today.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, 3 years have passed since Congress enacted landmark legislation creating the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We gave a mandate to the OEO to undertake a comprehensive assault on the poverty.

As a result, resources were mobilized. Ideas were generated. Programs were developed and put into operation. Today we can see in human and organization terms the first results of this effort: 1,000,000 Americans volunteering their services in a variety of antipoverty efforts; 1,050 communities with new organizations seeking to meet the needs of the poor; 2,000,000 children helped by the excellent Headstart program for preschoolers; 321,000 young people receiving basic education, job training, work experience, and needed income through the Neighborhood Youth Corps; 102,000 men and women given work training, counseling, and education providing them with a second chance, through the Job Corps; and 41 neighborhood health centers funded and beginning to make a dent in the long-neglected health problems of the poor.

These programs, during their brief existence, have begun to make significant inroads on conditions which have prevented millions of Americans from full participation in the prosperity and economic program of this Nation.

Gov. Warren P. Knowles, of Wisconsin, recently wrote to Director Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity, urging authorization and appropriation of \$2 billion for community action programs.

In his letter of October 5, Governor Knowles spelled out the reasons for supporting increased funds for community action programs. The text of his letter follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,  
Madison, Wis., October 5, 1967.

MR. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: In response to our recent correspondence, I would like to thank you and Mr. Beals of the Chicago Regional Office for restoring most of the cut in allocations to the Milwaukee Social Development Commission. I have been assured that the Social Development Commission now will be able to operate its present programs satisfactorily.

In responding to the P.S. in your letter of September 19, I am most willing to communicate my convictions concerning the Economic Opportunity Act amendments to the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation.

I feel the three major pieces of legislation to be inadequate to the needs of the poor especially as defined by the community action sections in all three. I am therefore enclosing a copy of this letter to the Delegation indicating my request for a larger community action authorization and appropriation over and above 1.062 billion dollars.

Quite frankly, I find various features of program content attractive in each of the three major bills. For the Quie Bill, I believe the strong emphasis on state planning and financial participation to be important. In this direction, I have recommended the State Board of Governmental Operations be au-



thorized \$1 million by the Wisconsin Legislature to be used in assisting inner-city, urban poor.

I have also called for the appropriation of \$100,000 in state monies for the Milwaukee OIC program.

I find the Administration Bill, as proposed, a continuation of programs which are excellent, but which are not coordinated by the federal agencies as well as they should be. Certainly the allocations for community action are heavily mortgaged for Fiscal 1968.

Likewise, I do not consider the community action allocation under the Senate Labor and Welfare Bill adequate to meet the needs of the nation either. The Senate measure appeals to me in its approach and funding level although community action again is given light treatment.

I feel that a \$2 billion investment for community action alone is none too much. Best wishes.

Very truly yours,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,  
Governor.

I certainly regret that some of my colleagues from Wisconsin on the other side of the aisle do not support the Governor in his request for OEO funds. Instead of seconding his call for increased funds, they launched a series of attacks on him.

Governors, mayors, educators, civic groups, and businessmen generally recognize the need for the OEO and the programs it furnishes because they come face to face with the poor and their problems.

Yet, in spite of this, some Members have suggested that the attacks on poverty could be better waged if OEO were eliminated and the responsibility for administering its programs scattered around Washington.

The other body and the Committee on Education and Labor gave careful consideration to this issue. They held more than 6 weeks of public hearings, listened to more than 100 witnesses—mostly from outside Government—and recorded more than 4,000 pages of testimony. An attempt was made to let every knowledgeable and important voice on this subject in the country be heard.

Of the 64 public witnesses who addressed themselves to the issue of retaining OEO, only one called for the elimination of that agency. Outstanding spokesmen representing diverse segments of American life, such as business, labor, church groups, education, and all levels of government firmly and clearly supported the retention of OEO as the central guiding mechanism for the war on poverty.

Public administrators, asked to comment on the question, were unanimous in recommending that OEO be continued. One of these officials succinctly stated the general position of those responding when he said:

To break up the Office of Economic Opportunity and place its functions in the established departments would be a disaster.

There are four good and decisive reasons for continuing the OEO:

First. The poor need an independent advocate. To break this agency up and parcel out its programs to other agencies would destroy the war on poverty as a concentrated effort. It would mean that programs conceived by OEO would be given over to administrators whose

primary responsibilities have not been and still would not be concerned with programs specifically fashioned to help the poor.

Second. The problems of poverty require new and imaginative solutions. OEO has shown a willingness to experiment, to innovate, and to tackle the tough problems of poverty with freshness and vigor.

Third. The war on poverty requires central direction and guidance. Someone must have primary responsibility for leading the fight, exercising control over the channeling of resources, and standing accountable to the public through success and failure. If this country's anti-poverty effort is not to go off in all directions without overall responsibility, the command post must remain intact.

Fourth. The OEO has gotten results, despite the enormity and intractability of the problem and the modest resources so far engaged.

OEO is not perfect. Of course it has faults and makes mistakes as it plows new ground.

The answer must not be to destroy the OEO. Instead, let us support and strengthen it.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, as some Members of this body careen along on budget-slashing sprees and others play nakedly partisan politics with programs that are crucial in attacking the social and economic ills of the Nation, I wonder if we all have a full realization of what these capricious actions mean locally, in thousands of communities across the country.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that not all of us do know the local consequences. And I further submit that we had better find out before it is too late.

There are wise economies, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress must make. But there are also actions, taken piously in the name of saving money, that in reality will result in a prodigal waste of the Nation's resources and will end by costing us all dearly.

It is emphatically not an economical move, Mr. Chairman, to cripple community attacks on poverty, to stifle the local initiative which the self-styled economizers among us pay such lipservice to, and to turn our backs on the national commitment affirmed 3 years ago when Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act.

Yet this is just what the self-styled economizers are doing when they talk of cutting the already minimal war on poverty budget to pieces and in the meantime of putting the economic opportunity programs on a continuing resolution that would force community cutbacks of up to 50 percent.

No elected officials are better qualified to predict the consequences of this false economizing than the mayors of our cities, who must deal day by day with the almost overwhelming problems of poverty and social unrest. My good friend, the perceptive, able, and dedicated Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, has made a telling comment on what the current "economizing" wave may mean for his city. These consequences will not be unique, Mr. Chairman, and accordingly I

insert in the RECORD at this point for the very careful consideration of my colleagues an article from last Friday's Providence Journal summarizing the views expressed by Mayor Doorley at a press conference:

DOORLEY FEARS DEVASTATING POVERTY CUTS  
(By Hamilton E. Davis)

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. of Providence said yesterday that the federal antipoverty director had warned him local programs across the country will be cut by nearly half if the House gets its way on temporary financing for the agency.

The mayor said in an afternoon press conference that the effect of such a cut in community action funds would be "devastating," and that the effect on Providence would be especially serious because the city gets more antipoverty money than many communities its size.

Mr. Doorley said he had been warned of the danger to the program by Sargent Shriver, director of the federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), in a meeting Tuesday in Washington.

If the House gets its way on the temporary spending level and if the appropriation bill is put over to the next session of Congress, the effect on Providence would be to cut its roughly three-million-dollar budget by as much as two-thirds.

To head this off, the mayor said he was calling chief executives from other cities to urge them to bring pressure on the House to moderate its hostility to locally designed and run "community action" programs.

Mr. Doorley said he was not yet sure what form this pressure might take, but that he was hopeful there might be a meeting of big-city mayors in Washington to demonstrate the degree of support for the program among the men who have to live with the problems of poverty.

The threat to the antipoverty effort lies in the House decision to force OEO to operate its community action programs at a level 40 percent below that of last year until the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year is passed.

The Senate wants to operate the program temporarily at last year's level, and the conflict will have to be resolved by a Senate-House conference committee. This decision is expected daily, because OEO's authority to spend anything technically expired at midnight Monday.

Under normal circumstances, the appropriation bill for the agency would be passed about now—the Senate has passed it and House debate is scheduled Nov. 7—but there has been so much controversy over it there is speculation that Congress may put off action until the January session.

In a telephone interview from Washington after the Doorley press conference, an OEO spokesman said that if Congress does put off action on the bill, the agency will have to operate at the temporary level fixed by Congress.

The spokesman said the consequences described by Mr. Doorley amounted to the worst that could happen; that is, the House could make its 40 per cent reduction under last year's stick. Actually, however, the House-Senate compromise is likely to be a smaller reduction.

In his statement yesterday afternoon, Mayor Doorley said that he had been told that the roughly three-million-dollar community action budget for the Providence antipoverty agency could be cut to as little as one million dollars.

He said that he had not discussed the problem yet with officials of Progress for Providence, Inc., but that a major cut could wipe out not only operating programs but those that are in the planning stage.



Cleo E. Lachapelle, director of Progress for Providence, said, when asked for comment last night, that a cut to one million dollars here would emasculate the program.

"It would be a terrific blow, not only here, but throughout the country," he said. "I don't think we could recover from it."

The local programs that are paid for with community action funds include the pre-school Head Start effort, the community schools, the neighborhood resource units, drop-in centers and legal services.

In answer to a question, whether he would consider using city money to help make up any cuts in the program by Congress, Mr. Doorley said that no city, by itself, could hope to attack the poverty problem.

Providence contributes no cash to the program: its share is made up in "in kind" services such as the use of city school buildings.

Mr. Doorley said that he hopes pressure by the chief executives can counterbalance the effects of a coalition of House members who oppose the bill. This coalition does not include Rhode Island's representatives—Fernand J. St Germain and Robert O. Tiernan—he emphasized.

The Doorley move to draw attention to the implications of the House effort and his action in trying to mobilize the nation's mayors appears to be the first major step in an OEO campaign to bypass the hostile House coalition.

The mayor said that the information about the effects of the cuts asked by the House and the specific reductions this would cause in 50 cities around the country were contained in a memorandum given him by Mr. Shriver.

He said he had asked Mr. Shriver what he should do with the memorandum and that the director told him: "Do what you want with it."

In Washington, the OEO spokesman said that Mr. Shriver couldn't very well announce the consequences of the House move because it would look as if he was trying to scare people into support for OEO.

But it was perfectly proper for the staff of OEO to chart the worst possible consequences of the cuts, the spokesman said. It was those consequences that were contained in the memorandum given to Mr. Doorley. The mayor did not release the memorandum. Until recently, OEO was operating at the same level as last year, in which it received an appropriation of 1.6 billion dollars. This figure was agreed on by both the House and Senate.

According to the OEO spokesman, the House voted on Oct. 19 to cut this to 1.2 billion, and on Oct. 23 the previous joint agreement expired. The 1.6 billion figure contains \$1,022,000,000 for community action programs; the remainder is for other programs that are federally designed, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The 1.2 billion sum contains only \$600,000,000 for community action. These levels are set in what are known as "continuing resolutions." The compromise between House and Senate between the 1.2 and 1.6 billion dollar figures is expected momentarily.

The actual appropriation bill requested by the administration calls for a total annual spending of 2.06 billion dollars. The Senate has passed a bill authorizing expenditure of 2.258 billion dollars.

On Nov. 7, the House is scheduled to debate a bill calling for 2.06 billion dollars, but with a series of amendments attached that are aimed at satisfying critics of the community action effort.

This bill was reported out by the House education and labor committee, but only after the most heated debate in the life of the anti-poverty program. It is this factor, and the hostile mood in the House that has led to the speculation that Congress might just let OEO run for an indefinite period on the continuing resolution.

Mr. BOLAND: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished Member from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] in his personal judgment of R. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Few men have had more difficult assignments in the Federal Government than Mr. Shriver and few men have so risen to the challenge and responded so magnificently. The genesis and progress of the Peace Corps has had no greater personal stamp than that of R. Sargent Shriver. The success of this great program is, in my opinion, directly attributable to his leadership, his dedication, and the inspiration he gave to the staff and the members of the Peace Corps.

In this complex, highly controversial, and difficult task as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Shriver has again demonstrated his ability to bring life to a new and untried program. No one knows better than he, that all has not been a bed of roses, and everything about the program has not been perfect. He would be the first to agree to this. But his vision and his deep concern for the problems of the poor gave him the drive to get the program off the ground. He deserves the applause of all who are concerned with giving hope and help to the disadvantaged and poor of this Nation. I congratulate him for what he has done in this important area.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, today we must face the question of continuing or abandoning our national decision a few years ago to attack poverty and to seek to better the lives of millions of Americans whose lives are carried by urban and rural ghettos and the culture of poverty. New techniques and ideas were put to the root of the problem, emphasizing most particularly jobs and education.

A smaller part of the war on poverty was to be directed at assisting low-income persons expand their business opportunities and gain a stake in the economic life of the community—title IV authorized loans to be approved finally by the Small Business Administration and envisioned the establishment of small business development centers to locate and screen applicants and to organize training and management counseling necessary for borrowers, most of whom had little formal education and lacked basic business skills. Without much priority, though, and with administrative conflict of the guiding principles of the program, the entire operation was shifted in 1966 to the SBA and soon the SBCE's were being informed that they would not longer be funded.

I feel very strongly that this program must be revitalized according to its original concept and so I rise to urge the support of the House for the amendment of our colleague, Congressman STREIGER, to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—to focus the loan program upon small business concerns either located in poverty areas or owned by low-income persons and, second, to require management development programs for the participants. The responsibility for this crucial technical assistance is to be with the Secretary of Commerce, and thereby, the Economic Development Administration.

By reactivating the SBCE's, we shall not be undermining the role of the SBA, but merely halting the further slipping away of the economic opportunity loan program with its unique and difficult goal of testing whether or not low-income, unemployed, little-educated persons, given the proper training and assistance, can establish a self-supporting small business enterprise.

I include a letter I received recently from Mr. John K. Lopez, treasurer of the American Association for Business and Economic Development, urging the support of the Congress for title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. Mr. Lopez cogently and forcefully states the case for this program, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR  
BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,  
San Jose, Calif., October 24, 1967.

HON. W. DONLON EDWARDS,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: It has become apparent in the past few months of the Congress sessions that the concept of *local participation in the development of the nation's business economy is being discouraged.*

Federal bureaucrats in a display of self-serving interest have co-ordinated their activities with private pressure groups in an attempt to destroy the funding provisions of *Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act—Employment and Investment Incentives.*

As you well know, Title IV—EOA is the enabling legislation for the Small Business Development programs of many local community and business organizations. These programs assist the minority and disadvantaged to develop entrepreneurial skills.

These beneficiaries are the hard-working small businessmen of the disadvantaged community, the real victims of the civil destruction and disorder that has plagued our nation.

It is incredible that any of our Congress would allow a single bureaucracy to control all available assistance to the entire small business community (95% of all U. S. businesses).

However, it is evident that numerous informed members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, from both political parties, have maintained Title IV of the EOA and have additionally called for more resources to develop this program of free enterprise and job opportunities.

Our nation is truly indebted to those of the Congress that support Title IV—EOA.

Locally sponsored and administered small business assistance programs, co-ordinated by the Department of Commerce, are a splendid opportunity for our nation's resources to encourage participation and contribution by responsible minority and disadvantaged individuals in our free enterprise democracy.

Your support is needed.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. LOPEZ,  
Treasurer.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, I reported to my distinguished colleagues of the very great degree of support for the war on poverty which exists in my congressional district and in the State of Minnesota, and to express my alarm over the threatened demise of tremendously worthwhile and essential anti-poverty projects in Minneapolis.

Today, I would like to further substantiate what I have said on previous occasions about the crucial importance of the war on poverty in Minneapolis by calling the attention of my colleagues to an editorial, entitled "Penny Pinching on Pov-



erty," which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on November 3, and a very fine article by Bernie Shellum, entitled "Mayor Urges Fight To Get Pilot City Fund," which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on November 2.

Mr. Chairman, the Minneapolis pilot city project, which was to be supported with OEO funds, is of great importance to my city, just as thousands of other locally developed antipoverty projects are essential to the health and stability of cities from coast to coast. As Governor LeVander of Minnesota said in a recent statement:

With the tremendous amount of citizen interest and neighborhood involvement in the pilot city project, the sudden halt of funds would be a breach of faith.

Mr. Chairman, the time for partisan politics and petty bickering is past. We are dealing with America's future. Let us pass a strong antipoverty bill without further delay.

With permission, I insert the Star editorial and the Tribune article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star,  
Nov. 3, 1967]

#### PENNY PINCHING ON POVERTY

Northsiders, and others in Minneapolis who worked long and hard to organize the successful election of directors for the Pilot City demonstration project, can hardly be blamed for their outrage as they see the program about to collapse.

The fault lies with Congress. Looking about for spending programs they could cut, members of the House have passed up such obvious targets as pork barrel works projects and the supersonic transport, and instead have zeroed in on the war on poverty. By slashing the spending authorizations for the Office of Economic Opportunity, the congressmen have brought the Pilot City project and other antipoverty programs here to the edge of bankruptcy.

The lessons of last summer's riots and disturbances have apparently been forgotten. One of those lessons was that the dwellers of the nation's ghettos cannot for much longer be taken up the mountain of expectations and then, before realizing the hope of a better life, be dropped again into the abyss of despair.

The North Side Pilot City project offered such a hope. Scheduled to start operations this week, with the elected board of area residents planning a wide variety of social services, the program may never get off the ground. A letter-writing campaign by Northsiders, and a city-wide protest meeting Monday night, will convey to congressmen the disappointment at this turn of events. We hope they will be listening.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune,  
Nov. 2, 1967]

#### MAYOR URGES FIGHT TO GET PILOT CITY FUND (By Bernie Shellum)

The Pilot City project in North Minneapolis was nearly bankrupt Wednesday, two days after 1,317 residents elected new directors.

The estimate that the demonstration project would run out of money in about 1 day provoked a protest against congressional cuts in the antipoverty program.

"We must have lost our sanity," said Mayor Arthur Naftalin at a news conference in which he chastised Congress for a "punitive" attitude toward the poor.

The news conference is to be followed by a letter-writing campaign urging restoration of antipoverty funds and by a citywide protest meeting Monday night.

The letter-writing campaign and the Monday meeting at Lincoln Junior High School will be sponsored by the North Side Federation, the 60-plus organizations which have formed the base for Pilot City board elections.

"We are not rats. They won't exterminate us," said Mrs. Charlotte Carmouche, one of the 12 resident members of the Pilot City planning committee. She was reelected Monday and, with two other North Side women attended the news conference in Naftalin's office.

The Pilot City staff of 12 full- and part-time workers is operating on what remains of a four-month, \$50,000 planning grant.

As a new project it is not eligible for federal funds being doled out to other Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) agencies under a continuing resolution which has served in place of a 1968 appropriation.

President Johnson has requested \$2.1 billion in antipoverty funds for fiscal 1968, which began in July. The Senate is willing to provide it, but the House is not.

The House, until recently, did allow OEO to continue spending at the 1967 rate of \$1.68 billion. But on Oct. 23, the House amended the continuing resolution and cut OEO spending to a level of \$1.2 billion, 40 per cent less.

Nationally, some 35 local agencies serving 500,000 poor people will have to shut down in three weeks unless they are financed. Some 38,600 Job Corps boys and girls will start living off the shelf and 2,800 workers at OEO headquarters in Washington face a payless payday Nov. 14.

Yesterday Naftalin said Congress understands neither the importance of the antipoverty effort nor "the nature of the trouble this nation faces."

One reason for the plight of OEO, Naftalin said, is that Southern congressmen object to the large number of Negroes employed in the program.

He said he has written to all Minnesota congressmen urging their support for OEO and invited Rep. Albert Quie, R-Minn., to "come into Hennepin County" and "go project to project." Quie has led Republican critics who want to transfer many OEO functions to other governmental agencies.

Naftalin called antipoverty money "the price of decent relationships next summer."

Pilot City was promised \$100,000 for 1968 to administer a complex of social services that would be available under a single roof to 52,000 North Siders.

The planning committee compiled an application for programs costing up to \$4 million before giving way yesterday to the Technical Advisory Committee to Implement Community Services (TACTICS), elected Monday. The fate of that application, the first of 14 such projects in the country, is still not known.

The appropriation for the Hennepin County antipoverty board, Mobilization of Economic Resources (MOER), expires Nov. 30, meaning a 40 percent cut in those projects unless the mood in Congress changes.

Edgar Pillow, MOER director, said Head Start, which involves 1,000 children—and 109 parents as paid workers—will be among the programs to be reduced. The youth employment program, which gave jobs to 1,000 last summer, also would be cut.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, never, since I entered the House of Representatives a little less than 3 years ago, have I been as deeply concerned as I am today.

The lead editorial in today's New York Times and a column by Tom Wicker eloquently state the reasons for my concern.

I will include in the RECORD excerpts from both items at the conclusion of my remarks.

I would like to add a personal plea to all of the Members of this House—Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative.

When this House first passed the Economic Opportunity Act, we were, for the first time, facing up boldly and courageously to a grave national problem we had ignored for generations.

We dared then to give the poor and downtrodden a voice, a chance to live a decent life, to educate their children, to participate in the design of their own futures. We dared to conceive the idea that we in the United States of America could, for the first time on this planet, banish abject, inherited, endemic poverty.

We have now created a tidal wave of rising expectations, hopes, aspirations, commitment. We must not, we cannot, turn back the clock.

During the past month, this House has demonstrated its hostility to this program in mean, petty, and vindictive ways, utterly beneath its dignity, let alone its generosity. Government employees, including secretaries, office boys, and so forth, face payless pay days because the House has refused interim funding. And Federal poverty employees at all levels were gratuitously and spitefully-executed from the general executive branches pay raise.

Across the country, antipoverty programs are in chaos, some without funding, others uncertain as to their future.

Now we have an opportunity to erase the bankruptcy of the immediate past. Let us unite to produce legislation that will not dash, but rather will fortify and validate the hopes of millions of the poor who wish meaningful work, not welfare; independence, pride, and self-respect, rather than charity, dependency, and despair.

This program is important to many of our towns and rural areas; it is desperately crucial to our cities.

Our cities are paying for half a century of neglect by Federal and State governments. Polluted air and water, filthy traffic-jammed streets, crumbling rat-infested slums, and grossly antiquated educational plants and systems are too often the tragic hallmark of our central cities.

In these explosive surroundings live a substantial number of the beneficiaries of this antipoverty legislation. The failure of this legislation may well be the proverbial straw for many of our urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, let us not play Russian roulette with the fate of our cities.

The excerpts referred to follow:

#### WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds



slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for pre-school youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now underway in the House.

#### POVERTY IN THE HOUSE—THE POLITICAL GRAB BAG

(By Tom Wicker)

In most of this, of course, there is little concern for the poor; and although opponents of the program love to charge that it has been nothing but a political grab bag, the political grabbing in the House of Representatives obviously is a lot worse than anything yet proved to have happened in the poverty program.

But whatever happens to the program itself, the poverty question is not going to disappear. That is the real achievement of O.E.O.; it has aroused some of the poor themselves, and called the attention of a nation to their plight. Poverty is going to haunt American politicians for years to come, and if the men who vote in the House this week don't know that yet, they will find it out the hard way.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, as the House begins debate today on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I hope that my colleagues will focus their attention on the great accomplishments of the antipoverty program during the last 3 years rather than constantly eyeing and criticizing the few faults of the program.

There have been problems with the antipoverty program, as there are with any new program in Government during the shakedown period. But this does not mean that we should emasculate and dilute the program, as title II would, because there have been problems. We are living in a most critical period and the need for a more meaningful and effective antipoverty program is urgent, both now and for the future.

The New York Times respected and perceptive columnist, Tom Wicker, writing on the antipoverty bill today, said, and I quote:

President Johnson declared "war on poverty" three years ago. The resulting program may be reduced to a helpless invalid, without money or power, when this week's shouting, table-thumping, posing and meat-

axing have been completed in the House of Representatives.

Already the Office of Economic Opportunity's funds are exhausted and many of its projects around the nation are shutting down; already its employees are having to work as volunteers—despite the insulting fact that this House has specifically excluded them from a Federal pay raise.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wicker justifiably says in concluding his column:

But whatever happens to the program itself, the poverty question is not going to disappear. This is the real achievement of O.E.O.: it has aroused some of the poor themselves, and called the attention of a nation to their plight. Poverty is going to haunt American politicians for years to come, and if the men who vote in the House this week don't know that yet, they will find it out the hard way.

Mr. Chairman, there are still some 30 million Americans living in poverty today. The productive future of some 2½ million of them, if we exclude youths still in school, is in large part dependent on intensive training and job placement programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity will have reached no more than 1 million of these at the end of this fiscal year. The Nation is just beginning to realize the dimensions of the problem facing it, in terms of the numbers of poor and of the kinds of needs that must be met.

Promises have been made to these people and they should not be broken. This is not the time to cut back or to change the antipoverty program. There have been successes, innovation and creativity in these programs. Let me list some of them:

Headstart has changed the future for more than 2 million youngsters.

The legal services program has assured the poor the right to equal justice which more fortunate Americans have so long enjoyed.

Neighborhood health centers have helped to break the vicious cycle of poor health and poverty for residents of 35 low-income areas.

Upward Bound has opened the doors of a higher education to some 27,000 young men and women whose potential might not otherwise have been recognized and encouraged.

The 700 neighborhood centers established by community action agencies as multiservice units have brought a large reservoir of heretofore untapped manpower and services to bear on the total needs of individuals and families.

The followthrough program, which seeks to provide services of the type offered in Headstart programs to youngsters who have moved on to kindergarten and first grade, is now underway on an experimental basis for some 190,000 children, and holds promise as a meaningful addition to the regular curriculum of educationally deprived children in public schools.

Mr. Chairman, these programs, and other OEO components such as the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, are concerned not only with learning to read but also with learning what books are and what they have to offer, not only with learning a skill but also with learning what it means to hold a responsible job.

Participants in these programs differ from middle-income Americans not simply in terms of their paychecks but in the more tragic, the more human terms of functioning as thoughtful, responsible, and self-sufficient citizens. To learn these things—to learn to learn—is one of the most basic goals of the antipoverty program, and is a prerequisite to increasing a youngster's reading level by three grades or learning to be a television repairman.

In this endeavor, the Office of Economic Opportunity has the potential to provide the impetus and coordination that make such programs meaningful. The overall direction and coordination must be left with OEO. It would be a mistake to sacrifice the innovation and spirit that OEO has brought to this challenge to the more traditional approaches of many other governmental units.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to turning over control of community action programs to city hall. This would dilute the independence of existing local boards and still the voices of the poor and the disadvantaged who now have the opportunity to serve on these boards. These provisions in title II should be taken out of the bill.

I have received many telegrams from my district and from throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in opposition to this proposal. I also received a petition with hundreds of signatures of people benefiting from the antipoverty programs in Springfield—my home city of Springfield—expressing opposition to this provision in title II. The petition preamble reads:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: The bill, if passed as drafted, will take the Poverty Program away from the poor people.

It will place the Poverty Program in the hands of state and local governments. If approved by the House and voted into law, it would give governors, mayors and local officials a good deal of authority in running the Poverty Program. Please vote to kill this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to further cuts in the antipoverty program. America has made a commitment to the poor and the disadvantaged. We should live up to that commitment by expanding these programs, rather than slashing and weakening them. Not because we want to show our magnanimity in order to prevent riots in the city, but because it is right and long overdue. In conclusion, let me quote from the lead editorial in today's New York Times concerning the bill before us now:

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for pre-



school youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388), to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 2388 and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### FIRMNESS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at long last there are indications that a new firmness is taking hold within U.S. college administration in dealing with unlawful college demonstrations. The distinction between the constitutional right to demonstrate and illegal civil disobedience is being drawn in terms of suspension or expulsion from school or college, which is, of course, something that should have been done long ago. In fact, it is almost safe to say that had it been done in the beginning, much trouble would have been avoided.

This same firmness is urgently needed on the part of our law-enforcement agencies in dealing with non-school illegal civil disobedience. Those who deliberately violate or conspire to violate the laws of the land in the process of demonstrating should be warned that if they break the law, there will be prompt arrest and prosecution without exception, no matter who they are as individuals. If a professor at a particular university deliberately breaks the law, no matter what his motivation, he should be prosecuted. If he wishes to have a record of conviction of lawbreaking, his wish should be granted. The same should apply to individual students.

There is now new talk about more illegal civil disobedience either this winter or in the spring, some relating to the war in Vietnam and some to civil rights causes. Insofar as these planned demon-

strations project a deliberate violation of Federal law, their organizers should be dealt with as conspirators and prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney General in accordance with the law.

Title 18 of the United States Code makes it a Federal offense punishable by 5 years in the penitentiary to conspire with another person to commit an offense against the United States or any agency thereof and to do an act to effect such an objective. Organized demonstrators should be warned that if they plan an unlawful demonstration against a Federal agency such as the Pentagon and then commit an act carrying out the demonstration, they violate this Federal statute.

In the same sense, title 18 of the United States Code, section 2387, with reference to the armed services provides a penalty of 5 years in the Federal penitentiary for anyone who, intending to interfere with loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military advises insubordination or mutiny or refusal of duty by any member of the Armed Forces. It is well known that numbers of adults throughout the country have intentionally urged refusal to serve by draftees as well as distributing materials encouraging demoralization of morale amongst members of the armed services serving in Vietnam. The persons distributing this material should be arrested and promptly prosecuted under this statute, no matter who they are, including the ministry.

Why does the Attorney General fail to act here?

Recently the president of the United States Anti-Communist Congress, Mr. Wilson C. Lukom, inquired of the Attorney General with regard to these specific statutes in relation to the proposed demonstration on October 21, 1967, in Washington, D.C. A copy of his letter has come to me from the staff of one of the standing committees to which it was sent, and I include it following these remarks. So far as I know, the Attorney General has not even acknowledged receipt of this letter. I am sure that Members of Congress will be most interested in the answers to these questions.

The other day I wrote the Attorney General asking him to act to keep a certain article in Playboy magazine out of the U.S. mails on the ground that it was obscene within the meaning of Federal law. The Department replied to me in substance that they were unable to say it was obscene under decisions of the Supreme Court relating to pornography. This correspondence and my reply is also appended.

In protecting our people from what the chief law enforcement officer of the country believes to be pornographic principles announced in a Supreme Court decision dealing with different material are not a complete bar. Each case stands on its own in this field, and if the Attorney General would only act to protect the people from the floods of this type of filth we would be better off. He can do so under existing statutes awaiting court ruling on the new material. This sometimes takes years, but in the meantime, the offending material will not be on the shelves.

It is little short of scandalous that the

Supreme Court of the United States declares itself unable to define or describe obscene material in such a way as to enable those who are responsible for protecting the young people of the Nation against outright pornography to even know what is illegal material. The Court's opinions have been so unnecessarily libertarian as to open the floodgates of the mails and invite the printing presses of the unscrupulous to sell the most aggravated types of pornography and obscenity. The article to which I have referred at page 154 in the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine is one example. Beyond nationally known publications everyone knows that smut and filth available in relatively unknown magazines and tabloids can be found in quantity at virtually any corner store across the land.

The dismal thing about all this, of course is that there has been no need for such loose decisions. They could have been worded in such a way as to give the country some measure of protection.

Even more dismal is the compelled conclusion that those who wrote these decisions knew exactly what effect they would have upon this country and are now fairly chargeable with having intended the foreseeable consequences of their chosen language. The national injury does not derive from a single case. The decisions have been repeated, again and again.

Mr. Speaker, this is a damning indictment, but it is nevertheless demonstrably true. In the meantime, let the U.S. Attorney General and the Department of Justice pick up the pieces and do the best they can with the help of this Congress in moving against the conspirators, the peddlers of pornography, the distributors of narcotics and the inciters of riots. Let us have some firm action to protect and preserve the America we love. The hour is late.

The material referred to follows:

UNITED STATES ANTI-COMMUNIST  
CONGRESS, INC.,

Washington, D.C., October 14, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,  
Attorney General,  
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Congress is being criticized for not passing new laws to protect our government departments and the armed forces from obstruction of their lawful functions by demonstrators. A specific reference is made to the "Peace" Demonstration of October 21, 1967.

In addition to obstructing the lawful functions of the Defense Department, you can be assured that the TV and news coverage will be used throughout the world to mold world opinion to the effect that President Johnson's Vietnam Policy is wrong and that the American people do not approve of the President's policy—once again damaging his world image.

The Washington Daily News, October 14, 1967, carried an article by Ted Knap, Scripps Howard Staff Writer, stating, "Mobilization chairman David Dellinger said more than 100 organizations will be represented. These include the Communist Party, W.E.B. DuBois clubs and several communist splinter groups".

Realizing how busy you are with other important matters, I call your attention to the following two sections of the United States Code which are present, enforceable laws:



whether or not we have enough citizens or enough socialists. Let us get these jobs done instead of indulging our prejudices or our generalised assessments of people by skin colour or country of origin.

There is another aspect of our self-reliance policy which has also been misunderstood by some people. For the Arusha Declaration does not say that Tanzania refuses outside aid, or that there is something wrong in receiving it.

The Declaration says, and I quote: "We are not saying that we will not accept, or even that we shall not look for, money from other countries for our development. This is not what we are saying."

What the Arusha Declaration says is that the only group of people we will rely upon is ourselves; we will not organize our country and our life in such a way that there will be no development unless we get foreign money. And most of all, we have said very firmly that we shall not bend our political, economic or social policies in the hope of getting overseas aid as a result.

But if we get outside assistance to carry out purposes decided by us, then we shall welcome that assistance. Thus we welcome the Chinese decision to help with the Tanzam Railway. Thus we shall welcome an American decision to help build our road from Dar es Salaam to Tunduma.

In fact, self-reliance is not really against anything or anyone, unless there are people who want to recolonize us. Self-reliance is a positive affirmation that we shall depend upon ourselves for the development of Tanzania, and that we shall use the resources we have for that purpose, not just sit back and complain because there are other things we do not have.

We are saying to ourselves that we are going to build a self-reliant socialist society. We are saying: "Here is land, here we are: this is the amount of knowledge, skill and experience we have; and this is the amount of money we have to spend on supplementing our skill and knowledge or on buying more advanced machines. Now let us get on with it". And we are saying to other people: "This is what we are doing: if you want to help us, do this and this and this, for that is what we need most at this stage".

The really important thing for us to be clear about is that we are not saying to other people (and now, after the Arusha Declaration, we cannot say): "Please come and develop our country for us, and if you insist we will stop being socialist, or believing in equality, or being anti-colonial". These things we will never say.

We do not believe that anyone else can develop our country for us and, even if they could, we would not be willing to give up the determination of our own policy. It is we ourselves who will develop our country. We may decide to spend some of the resources we have, or the products of those resources, on buying imports of skills or machines from abroad. But our real emphasis will be on using the skills that we already have, and on developing the natural resources that we now possess.

In our situation this means that the emphasis of our development will be in the rural sector, and particularly in agriculture. Further, it means that we shall modernise within our resources. But we must modernise. In many parts of the country we are beginning to follow the advice of our agricultural experts. But our major tool, the jembe, is too primitive for our present day needs. We must now abandon it and replace it with the oxen-plough. We cannot make progress by waiting until every peasant is able to possess his own tractor which he can drive and maintain.

Indeed, if we wait for that we shall never leave the hoe behind us, for our present methods are too inefficient ever to produce the wealth which would enable us to buy tractors for all parts of the country, or to

train the people to drive and maintain them. We are not ready for the tractor, either financially or technically; but we are ready for the oxen-plough.

We have the animals, and the ploughs can be bought cheaply or even made here. They are simple tools which our peasants can quickly learn to use, and they are appropriate for the kind of small unit farming which is involved in the ujamaa villages to which we aspire, or even to the amount of land an energetic individual peasant family can cultivate.

We have to modernise our farming if we are to improve our standard of living. But we cannot modernise by buying tractors for everyone, because we do not have either the necessary money or the necessary technical skill, or the social organization which would make such implements economic. We have to modernise by utilizing to the full the tools which are within our capacity to buy and to make: which are sufficiently simple for us to use without trouble and breakdown.

#### LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT PROVIDING VITALLY NEEDED ASSISTANCE TO UNDERPRIVILEGED PEOPLE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the legal services program carried out under the Economic Opportunity Act is providing vitally needed assistance to underprivileged people. Through these locally administered programs, controversies are resolved through the courts rather than through civil disobedience.

On November 5, Florida Accent, a magazine supplement to the Tampa Tribune, featured an interesting and informative report on the operation of the legal services program in my congressional district. The Hillsborough County program is administered by Law, Inc., in cooperation with the Hillsborough County Bar Association. Although their staff is small, they are doing a fine job in helping a large number of people help themselves.

I include the full text of the article, entitled "And Justice for All," at this point in the RECORD:

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL  
(By Jack McClintock)

In four offices in four of the county's poorest neighborhoods, there are four lawyers waiting for clients.

Which, when you know the rest, is pretty unusual.

It is unusual because for a long time most lawyers didn't pay much attention to poor neighborhoods—let alone have offices in them—for the very good reason that lawyers have a living to make. And it is hard to make a living from the troubles of people who are having trouble making a living for themselves.

Which, in turn, is one reason the poor have historically found it difficult to get legal help when they need it, and why Law, Inc. was formed.

The four lawyers are paid by Law, Inc., out of the national treasury.

They work, however, for the poor.

Law, Inc. is an Office of Economic Opportunity program which cranked up in Tampa in August, the fifth such program in Florida. The others are in Miami, Ft. Pierce, Daytona Beach and Jacksonville.

Its purpose is to help that one-sixth of

Americans who, in the words of Mr. Justice Fortas, "live on society's fringes."

"Our basic objective," says Don Castor, Hillsborough's executive director, "are to provide orderly and lawful methods of solving problems and handling grievances. In many ways, ours is a conservative approach—we resolve controversy through the courts rather than through civil disobedience."

The four lawyers are there to represent the poor. When a poor family has a problem, its members will come to the nearest Law, Inc. office. These are purposely situated in neighborhoods where the need is likely to be greatest: West Tampa (staffed by Douglas W. Kielkopf), Sulphur Springs (Malory B. Frier), Ybor City (John G. Tomlinson), and Plant City (James B. Moore).

The lawyer then studies the case and the financial situation of the applicant. Roughly, a single head of household must have income of \$28 a week or less to qualify, with an additional \$12 a week permitted for each dependent. If the applicant qualifies, there is no charge and the attorney will pursue the case through appropriate legal channels.

Law, Inc. has helped people with their legal tribulations in such fields as veteran's benefits, unemployment insurance claims, social security, welfare appeals, (on the state level), evictions, foreclosures, some misdemeanors (but not many), and Castor's area of special interest: consumer problems. The latter include sales and service complaints, warranty difficulties, etc.

Criminal cases are left to the Public Defender's office, and most misdemeanors to the Legal Aid Bureau and other appropriate agencies. It is not only good politics but practical to avoid an overlapping of services.

Law, Inc. interests itself in other matters as well.

"We also want to see that the poor obtain a legitimate share of public services," Castor says. A city councilman, for example, pestered for better street lighting, usually finds it easier to say "So what?" to a poor man than to a rich and influential one.

"Tampa rates pretty well here," Castor says, "but more needs to be done. There are slum areas with potholes in the streets, inadequate bus service . . . Nobody seems to care."

For years, the poor have been victimized in this and similar ways. They had no recourse. Castor can, and will if his visitor has time enough, reel off dozens of cases of old couples being conned into signing exorbitant loan contracts, of juveniles being hauled off to jail without their parents being notified, of illegal evictions, retaliatory rent hikes, and many cases of people simply not knowing what was coming to them and therefore not getting it.

"There are self-righteous people who consider themselves law-abiding in the country club," Castor says, "but seem to think they are above the law when they go to evict a tenant, for example. There is a legal procedure for this—you don't just move a family's belongings out into the street."

Even in such cases as have gone to court, there has often been a tendency to subject poor people to what Frier calls "cafeteria-style justice." "These people go through the mill," he says. "Their cases get handled routinely and, without counsel, sometimes handled unfairly."

It was Frier who was recently able to have a 17-year-old girl's shoplifting sentence (she admitted taking a \$16 pair of false eyelashes) reduced from \$300 or 100 days, to six months probation and a \$100 fine payable in installments. She had been sentenced twice without even her parents being notified that the case was going to trial.

Now that they have a place to go, poor people have flocked to legal service offices all over the country. Word gets around via referrals by social workers, private lawyers, and word-of-mouth.



The OEO Legal Services program, according to "The Reporter" magazine, has been one of the most successful of poverty programs. There are about 190 local programs, including the five in Florida, and some 600 offices in the nation's poorest neighborhoods, including the four in Hillsborough County. They are staffed by 11,000 full-time lawyers who earn an average salary of \$9,500 annually. Two in Hillsborough earn \$11,000; the other two earn \$8,000. (In 1959, lawyers and judges in the U.S. averaged \$10,587 annually.) These men are working for people who could never have afforded their services before and, in some cases, did not even know they were available.

In Hillsborough County, Law, Inc., is administered by a hired executive director (Castor), and policy is made by a 12-man board—eight lawyers designated by the bar, and four laymen to represent the poor (although none of the four is himself poor).

One of Castor's early problems was finding qualified Negroes to serve in staff positions. Since many of the nation's poor are black, it was thought not only fair but practical to have Negro lawyers to work with them—or with whomever happened to need help; there was no thought of segregation in reverse. But Castor says it was not possible to find qualified men who were willing to take on the job. There are Negro legal secretaries, and the chief legal investigator, Warren H. Dawson, is a Negro, but to date the four lawyers are white. The situation does not satisfy Castor completely.

Ideally, the poor obtain from all this not only the legal due process which in many cases eluded them for years, but a new feeling of dignity, of participation and actual membership in society. They need no longer regard themselves as left out, ignored, merely underfoot.

The success of the Legal Services program has not always set well with all the people. When the program was suggested, the American Bar was cool toward it, although it later appointed a committee to help out in designing the program. This, Castor says, was not only an admirable shift in viewpoint, but an exercise of the historically sanctioned principle: "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em and do a little lobbying from inside." The bar was able to influence the shape and direction of the program.

Some of the original opposition related to legal ethics, and this remains a point of contention with many lawyers. Many objected, Castor says, on grounds that such a program could permit—even encourage—lawyers to "stir up litigation."

The potential was indeed there, but many now think that the prohibition is irrelevant, since the lawyer who "solicits business" is not doing so to benefit himself but some other person. The lawyer's salary, after all, remains the same. The other question—of overstepping the boundaries of dignity—has to be resolved by each lawyer in terms of his own definition of "dignity."

There were other objections, some still heard. A judge said recently that Legal Services lawyers (not necessarily those in Hillsborough) seemed bent on dragging every nickel-dime case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In any event, once inaugurated the program faced another obstacle: the poor themselves.

"It really takes some time for the poor to identify with the neighborhood lawyers and to believe that some professional person is interested in what happens to them," Castor says.

This suspicion is one of the legacies of that long-time neglect of the poor by the legal establishment and by the law itself.

"To the poor, the law has often meant only welfare cutoffs, wage attachments, arrogant policemen and marshals with eviction notices," wrote Wade Green in "The Reporter."

Most of the Law, Inc. lawyers want not only to deal piecemeal with individual problems as they arise, but to press for reform of the statutes themselves.

"We are anxious to get into the field concerned with developing some idea of what laws should be passed—or repealed," says Castor. Take the case, for example, of an employer of day-labor who sometimes refuses to pay his men, claiming the work was unsatisfactory.

Perhaps only one in ten of these men, Castor says, will do more than go home mad. That one man may take his case to small claims court, where the employer can cheerfully ante up, then take his profits from the other nine men, and run.

"So how do you get around something like that?" Castor asks rhetorically.

"Simple. All you do is pass a law allowing punitive damages to the employee if it is proved he was wronged. This is the kind of thing we'd like to urge."

To do so, a lawyer might submit proposed laws to the legislature or local governmental bodies, and argue for their passage.

Until now, everybody had a lobby but the people.

Law, Inc., would also like to perform a kind of preventive maintenance: Castor says the lawyers would go over such items as sales and loan contracts for clients—before the purchase—and explain the client's obligations. Such obligations are often nuclear even to the sophisticated reader.

"Most of our cases, from my observation," says Frier, "stem from ignorance—which applies to a lot of middle-class people as well as poor ones."

Law, Inc.'s primary job, in a sense, is to keep the channels of communication open between various strata of society. By facilitating dialogue among the aggrieved, the judges, and the other side, for example, it is often possible to settle matters without going into court.

Those conservatives who like to label the poverty program a wholesale boondoggle might be encouraged by a closer look at the Legal Services program, here and elsewhere. For among its most important functions is this, in the words of Earl Johnson, the director of the program in Washington:

"We have a duty to do everything we can to substitute justice in the courts for violence in the streets."

#### MEDICARE IS FOR PEOPLE

(Mr. HICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this House to an action of the Social Security Administration which I consider the epitome of rampart bureaucracy. It concerns a medicare claim.

A constituent of mine, in Tacoma, Wash., had been hospitalized under the medicare program. After his discharge, early this year, his family naturally preferred to take care of him at home if at all possible and attempted to do so. When it became obvious they could not properly attend him, and his doctor ordered nursing home care, they sought his admission to a home. The attempt took place near the end of the 14-day statutory period for eligibility for posthospital, nursing-home care, but it was still within that period. However, the period ran out over a weekend, and although virtually every facility in the Tacoma area was contacted, each one indicated they adhered to the policy of making no admissions

on a weekend. The patient finally gained admission to a nursing home at the beginning of the following week.

Only then did he learn that, contrary to all usual business procedure in which contractual agreements do not begin or end on a weekend, and regardless of the fact that all nursing homes adhered to the policy of no weekend admissions, his claim for medicare coverage was rejected because the 14 days had expired while the patient, acting in the best of faith, was attempting unsuccessfully to gain admission to a home.

I object most strongly to this callous disregard of the true purpose of the medicare program. It has already caused my correspondent and his family great inconvenience and difficulty, and while I sincerely hope others will not be trapped by this rigid ruling, I have no doubt similar cases will occur. If the Social Security authorities cannot see their way clear to making their rulings fit the purpose of the legislation, then I think it will be up to the Congress to correct it.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF LAST WEEK BEFORE CONSUMER ASSEMBLY, 1967

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a speech last week before Consumer Assembly, 1967, sponsored by consumer organizations, cooperative groups, and labor unions.

He took the occasion to call for public pressure upon the Members of this House as well as the Senate to enact his proposed tax increase.

Two major newspapers in my congressional district carried front-page stories which were headlined in the Orlando Sentinel as follows: "L. B. J. Urges You Fight for Tax Hike," and in the Brevard County Today newspaper, "L. B. J. Asks Public To Back Tax."

As a result of these headlines and accompanying news stories, I started to get mail in my office.

As L. B. J. had hoped, the taxpayers are taking his advice and are writing Congress. However, the reaction is a little bit different than L. B. J. had hoped for.

So far, the letters in my congressional office have been 100 percent against the tax increase.

Some of the letters contained some rather pithy language like "Spending cut—Si; surcharge—No—with exclamation points."

Another correspondent said:

I think he (LBJ) is in for a real shock when he finds out how the American people feel about this. I suggest that we get a copy of the recording, "The Party's Over," and give it to him as a reply to his request for more money to spend.

Another:

As long as the President thinks he can raise taxes, he will continue to spend; no more taxes—less and less spending.

Let's cut down on wasteful government squandering of our hard earned money.

President Johnson has asked us to write urging you to increase our taxes. Instead of doing that now, I hope you will cut some of



number of Defense installations and military personnel there; but because of the 14 states with open housing regulations and laws, California has the lowest percentage of apartment facilities open to all races.

Indeed, we have plans to extend the program in a dozen additional states in the near future.

Everywhere our approach will be the same. We will survey the local situation of each military base. We will meet with the realtors and landlords and explain the problem fully. We will request their cooperation and seek their voluntary compliance. We will do everything possible to see that our military families act as good tenants: that they pay their obligations promptly, and that they respect the property of private owners. We will enlist the help of local and State officials. And only when, and if, all other actions fail, will we apply the appropriate sanctions.

I want to emphasize that I am fully aware that the Defense Department is not a philanthropic foundation or a social-welfare institution. But I want to emphasize just as strongly that I do not propose to let our Negro servicemen and their families continue to suffer the injustices and indignities they have in the past.

It is said that there are no atheists in foxholes. I can assure you that in South Vietnam there is no segregation in foxholes.

There is no segregation of our servicemen in on-base housing.

And the Defense Department cannot tolerate segregation of our servicemen in off-base housing.

Where we must use stiff sanctions, we will.

What we prefer, hope for, and expect is an overwhelming measure of voluntary compliance.

Now let me discuss with you for a moment our second program in the social field. It is called Project 100,000, and I first announced it in a speech in New York in August of last year.

I pointed out, at the time, that though there were roughly 1.8 million young men reaching military service age each year in the United States, some 600,000—a full third—were failing to qualify under our draft standards. Some had medical problems, but I was particularly concerned about those thousands who failed because of educational deficiencies.

In some areas, the failure rate for draftees ran as high as 60 percent; and for Negroes in some states it exceeded 80 percent.

What this clearly meant was that the burden of military service was not being shouldered equally. Inequities were serious: inequities by region; inequities by race; and inequities by educational level.

What was even worse was the obvious implication. If so massive a number of our young men were educationally unqualified for even the least complicated tasks of military service, how could they reasonably be expected to lead productive and rewarding lives in an increasingly technological and highly-skilled society?

Our studies confirmed that a great number of these draft rejectees were the hapless and hopeless victims of poverty: a poverty that is not the mere absence of American middle-class affluence, but something infinitely more complex: a corrosive and decaying mix of social, educational, and environmental deprivation.

What these men badly need is a sense of personal achievement—a sense of succeeding at some task—a sense of their own intrinsic potential.

They have potential, but the slow and silent poison of the poverty virus has paralyzed it in many of them. They have grown up in an atmosphere of drift and discouragement. It is not simply the sometimes squalid ghettos of their external environment that has debilitated them—but an internal and more destructive ghetto of per-

sonal disillusionment and despair: a ghetto of the human spirit.

Poverty in America pockmarks its victims inwardly.

If unchecked and unreversed, that inner ghetto of the poverty-scarred personality of these men can fester into explosive frustrations of bitterness and violence.

Chronic failures in school throughout their childhood, they are destined to a downward spiral of defeat and decay in a skill-oriented nation that requires from its manpower pool an increasing index of competence, discipline, and self-confidence.

Poverty destines thousands of young men today to a dismal future. Destines them, yes. But dooms them, no.

These young men—and they are typified by those who in the past have failed to qualify for military service due to educational deficiencies—can be saved from that futile future. They can be rehabilitated, both inwardly and out. They are men, we concluded, who given the benefits of the Defense Department's experience in educational innovation and on-the-job training, and placed in an atmosphere of high motivation and morale, could be transformed into competent military personnel. Beyond that, after their tour of duty, they could return to civilian life—equipped with new skills and attitudes—and thus break out of the self-perpetrating poverty cycle.

The Defense Department is the world's largest producer of skilled men. We provide enlisted men with highly professional training in 1,500 different skills, in more than 2,000 separate courses. And each year we return about three-quarters of a million men to the nation's manpower pool.

The goal of Project 100,000 was, therefore, to take in 40,000 rejectees the first year, and 100,000 each year thereafter. The program completed its first year on September 30.

I want to report to you on its progress.

Our goal was to take 40,000 men; we took 49,000.

They entered all of the services: Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps.

Now, what sort of backgrounds do these men come from? About 60 percent are whites; about 40 percent Negroes. Their average age is 21. Thirty percent of them are unemployed at the time they come to us, and an additional 26 percent are earning less than \$60 a week.

What this means is that more than half of these men are gripped in poverty. Nor is that surprising. Their average reading score is a bare sixth-grade level; and 14 percent of them read at a third-grade level or less. Many are poorly motivated when they reach us. They lack initiative. They lack pride. They lack ambition.

If nothing were done to give them a strong sense of their own worth and potential, they, their wives and their children would almost inevitably be the unproductive recipients of some form of the dole 10 years from now.

I want to repeat: We have taken these men into the service because we are convinced that, given the proper environment and training, they can contribute just as much to the defense of their country as men from the more advantaged segments of our society.

Has that belief been borne out by the facts?

We now have had a full year's experience with this program, and let me tell you the results.

Ninety-eight percent of our traditional categories of recruits successfully graduated from basic training during the year. And the successful graduation rate of these 49,000 new category men was 96 percent—only two percentage points less than our traditional recruits.

I have insisted that these men should never be singled-out or stigmatized as a special group. Technically—and for our own internal record-keeping—men who would have

formerly been draft rejectees are termed New Standards men. But the men themselves are never informed that they are in this category.

It is absolutely imperative that they believe in themselves and their own potential. They obviously cannot do that if we treat them with anything remotely suggesting condescendence.

The plain fact is that our Project 100,000 is succeeding beyond even our most hopeful expectations. Many of our commanders report that these men are turning out to be even more highly motivated than some servicemen with a much more privileged background.

Now these are the initial results, and we are immensely encouraged. But obviously the real test is going to come later, when these men move back into civilian society. How will they fare then?

Will the vital sense of achievement and self-confidence they have experienced in their military service, as well as the skills they have learned, move them forward in society—or will they return to the depressing downward-spiralling, poverty-in-the-midst-of-plenty phenomenon that plagues our urban ghettos and our rural pockets of economic stagnation?

We cannot say for certain. But we intend to find out.

We are launching a careful follow-up study to test conclusively the ultimate outcome of Project 100,000. At least a decade of careful measurement of the performance of the men both in and out of the service will be required. We won't know until the end of that period what the definitive study will prove. But I am willing to make a prediction. I am convinced that the Project 100,000 men will continue to do a fully creditable job in the service; and that on return to civilian life, their earning capacity—and their overall achievement in society—will be two or three times what it would have been had there been no such program, and had they remained rejectees.

Hundreds of thousands of men can be salvaged from the blight of poverty, and the Defense Department—with no detriment whatever to its primary role—is particularly well equipped to salvage them.

We not only can do it. We are doing it. And the benefit to our society—and to the ultimate roots of our security—will be immense.

Now, let me describe to you briefly our third program in this field. We call it Project Transition.

As I mentioned, we return some 750,000 men from the services annually to civilian life. Some of these men can move readily into civilian jobs without difficulty, but a significant number of them are faced with genuine problems.

We surveyed the situation, and found that some 50 percent of the men about to leave the services need and want some degree of help to make the transition to a productive civilian life.

To provide that help, we have created a voluntary program—Project Transition—for men with 30 to 180 days of service time remaining. The project gives priority to certain groups: to those disabled in battle; to those with no previous civilian occupation; to combat arms servicemen with no civilian-related skill; to those who have such a skill, but who require additional training or upgrading; and finally to those who desire a completely new civilian skill, regardless of their current training status.

The program meets four basic needs of the man leaving the service: counseling, skill enhancement, education, and job placement.

We now have pilot programs—for each of the services—at five bases. I can report to you today that within sixty days Project Transition will be in operation at all eighty of the major installations in this country.



We have enlisted the cooperation of other federal agencies—the Labor Department, HEW, the Postal Service—as well as a number of State and local agencies that can assist with training, and offer employment to these men. A number of police departments around the nation, for example, are participating, not only with professional advice and technical assistance but with solid job offers as well.

Though the program is still in its pilot stage, it clearly has tremendous potential, and industrial leaders throughout the nation have already expressed enthusiasm for the idea. Further, the Ford Foundation has offered to work closely with us in solving the problems connected with placing the right veteran in the right job.

We are going to be able to give the returning Negro veteran—particularly the Negro veteran who without help might be compelled to drift back into the stagnation of the urban ghetto—an opportunity for valuable training and satisfying employment.

Every veteran—regardless of color, creed, or class—who has served his country in the Armed Forces deserves the opportunity to move back usefully and productively into civilian life. Project Transition will help give him the opportunity.

I think the point we must realize is this. There is no question but that the economic, social, and educational legislation of the current period eventually will transform American society immensely for the better.

But the very magnitude of the task will require a decade or two for the full effects to be felt.

This means that the present generation of the under-privileged youth of all races, caught in the self-perpetuating trap of poverty, are in danger of being left out of these eventual benefits.

The President has made clear that the United States cannot be satisfied with that situation. We must find ways to assist people now—even before our present legislation can reach its full potential for economic and social improvement.

This is manifestly a national responsibility—not primarily a Department of Defense responsibility.

Our primary responsibility—to repeat—is the security of this nation. But in the ultimate analysis, the foundation of that security is a stable social structure. I suggest to you that the Defense Department can find ways to contribute to the development of such a structure without compromising the combat readiness of its forces.

The three social programs I have described to you today are the kinds of programs that will bolster the security of this nation. They are the kinds of programs that will reduce the criticism, some of it justified, that we are often bludgeoned with internationally: criticism that grows out of the discrepancy between our traditional preaching of the principles of liberty and equality—and our obvious lapses in the practice or those two bed-rock constitutional guarantees. They are partial answers to the basic question: can our present American society afford to meet simultaneously its responsibilities both at home and abroad?

Can we continue to meet our commitments to contain aggression internationally, and at the same time take the measures necessary to cure our urban and racial ills here at home?

I say definitively that we can.

This nation is immensely powerful—both in material and human resources.

Our current Defense expenditures—as heavy as they are—are only 9 percent of the GNP. That is a lesser percentage of the GNP than defense spending in most of the years of the 1950s. The taxes we pay today are billions of dollars less than the taxes we would be paying under the tax rates of the 1950's. The modest surcharge that the Pres-

ident is recommending—and which makes eminent sense in our highly charged economy—will represent a recision of less than half of the tax cuts this Administration has achieved.

And yet, we appear to believe that we cannot afford to achieve all that genuinely needs achieving.

We appear to believe that we are stretching our resources too thinly.

We appear to believe that we cannot simultaneously wage war against aggression abroad, and a war against poverty, urban decay, and social injustice here at home.

That we cannot afford it is a myth.

That we may choose not to attempt it, is another matter entirely.

But if we make that choice, let us make it deliberately and rationally.

Let us not make that choice because of a mere mythology—the mythology that America is not now strong enough to do all that needs doing.

We are strong enough materially and technologically. We do have the resources in both money and manpower.

What we may lack is the will power.

If we do lack it, so be it. But let that be our conscious choice. Let us face the issues honestly, and admit to ourselves that we simply do not want to make the effort.

Let us not blame the lack of effort on the myth that we cannot do all that needs doing.

For the fact is, we can.

We can curb aggression abroad. And we can meet our pressing social problems here at home. And we can do both at the same time if we will use wisely existing institutions and available resources.

The simple question is this: do we have the requisite faith in ourselves?

Do we have the requisite confidence in our constitutional objectives?

Do we have the requisite resolve to complete the achievements that the United States was founded less than 200 years ago to secure?

I, for one, say we do.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what say you?

Thank you, and good morning.

#### HON. SARGENT SHRIVER—AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN AND INCOMPARABLE PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier in general debate today on the poverty bill a statement was made to the effect that Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has indicated that he would resign from his position if Congress reduced appropriations below what he believes is the absolute minimum which he needs to carry on this program.

One of the Members during general debate expressed the desire that Sargent Shriver should resign from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and further had some rather unkind things to say about the Director of the poverty program.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver needs no apologists. He has written a record which speaks for itself.

He is one of the outstanding citizens of this country and has made a profound contribution to his Government at all levels.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver truly represents the very epitome of a good American and a good citizen.

However, I would not want this record to show that the statements made by an earlier speaker calling for the resignation of Sargent Shriver went unchallenged.

I know Sargent Shriver well.

I remember him as an outstanding citizen of the city of Chicago when he was president of the Chicago School Board and when under his administration Chicago developed one of the finest school systems in the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver was brought to Washington by the late great President John F. Kennedy to head the Peace Corps. He was invited by President Johnson to take on the very difficult task of putting together an effective war on poverty.

I do not know of any man in Government who has a more difficult and thankless job, than Sargent Shriver.

We are the first nation in the world, Mr. Speaker, that has undertaken the herculean task, a difficult task, and a seemingly impossible task, of eliminating poverty from our ranks.

Sargent Shriver has carried out and managed this battle with a dedication seldom found in a public official.

Sargent Shriver is independently wealthy. He has a lovely family that he would like to spend more time with, and yet week in and week out, and day in and day out, and night in and night out, Sargent Shriver is at his desk here in Washington or visiting some community action center, or some community action agency in the country, to make a personal observation of the programs, and to make sure that the great hope and confidence that the American people have placed in the poverty program will be effectively carried out.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am no deep student of the poverty program, but I do want to say that in my judgment Sargent Shriver has diligently sought to do a good job with the program. I realize that many mistakes have been made, and I believe anyone will agree that mistakes would be inevitable in trying to do what amounts almost to the impossible in dealing with this poverty problem.

Mr. Speaker, I further want to say that I have the greatest respect for Sargent Shriver. I believe he is a brilliant and capable man, and I believe he has given unstintingly of his efforts to serve the Nation in an important capacity.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. I would certainly join the gentleman from Texas in saying that this country and all of us, rich and poor, in politics and out of politics, in Government and out of Government, owe Sargent Shriver a monumental debt of gratitude.

It will be a great loss for America if and when the day does indeed come when



for personal reasons and reasons known best to himself, he will remove himself from the poverty program.

He has given this program direction and hope, and if we are winning this war—and we are winning this war against poverty in community after community in America—it is a tribute to the determined, honest, and dedicated leadership that Sargent Shriver has given to the program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during the 4 months in which I have been conducting an investigation of the American Farm Bureau and its affiliates, not one of my charges has been refuted. Instead, the Farm Bureau uses an intriguing end run of personal attack and distortion of my views.

For example, in the October 2 edition of the American Farm Bureau Federation Official Newsletter, I read that—

Representative Joseph Y. Resnick (D) of N.Y. has launched an attack on all farm cooperatives.

This scurrilous and irresponsible account of my investigation ignores the fact that I have repeatedly said I am concerned with the practices of only those giant cooperatives—usually affiliated with the Farm Bureau—which have been victimizing the American farmer by issuing worthless patronage dividends.

Many cooperatives—certainly a large majority—are truly farmer controlled and farmer owned. Since they represent the farmer, they return co-op profits to him within a reasonable period of time. Such a co-op is the New York Dairymen's League.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following statement of the Dairymen's League, which describes their policy of distributing patronage dividends, in the RECORD. It is a model which all cooperatives would do well to follow:

#### DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

1. Dairymen's League Certificates of Indebtedness represent, in effect, a legally binding agreement between the Cooperative and its individual members. Each member under the bylaws of the Association, loans the League 10c a hundredweight on all of his milk marketed through the League. In return, he receives each April a Certificate representing the monies so loaned during the preceding 12-month period. This Certificate has a due-date 10 years from the date of issue. In addition, it pays (presently)  $5\frac{1}{2}\%$  interest each year until called. The money is used exclusively for capital purposes: building plants; buying businesses; plant improvements etc. It is separate and distinct from the 2c a hundredweight members contribute to the day-to-day operations of the League.

2. For more than 40-years League Certificates of Indebtedness have been used by members of the Association as a regular part of the financial operations. They are often used as security when negotiating a loan. In

instances of this type, the bank holds the Certificates until the loan has been paid, but the League member continues to collect the interest.

3. There has always been a ready market for League Certificates. In most cases, the member can sell his Certificates for 100 cents on the dollar to other members or to other private parties looking for a secure investment for surplus cash. There is also an active dealers market for Certificates. At least two or three such dealers regularly advertise in the Dairymen's League News to buy all Certificates offered. As is customary in such cases, the dealers buy at some discount below the face value of the Certificates.

4. The League has never failed to redeem its Certificates—usually a year or two before they are legally due to be called. No interest payment has ever been missed.

5. Beginning in 1967, the League issued an additional type of Certificate called a "Certificate of Investment." This is purely voluntary. It is intended to provide the Association with long-term capital and members with opportunity for long-term investment at a high rate of interest. These Certificates of Investment are for 25 years and carry 6% interest. As one mark of the confidence members have in the Association, some \$700,000 have already been invested in the new Certificates by members. There is no doubt that this success reflects the reputation earned during the past 40 years by the original Certificates of Indebtedness (which, of course, continue to be the mainstay of the Association's capital financing.)

#### A SALUTE TO MARIE CURIE

(Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today let us pause to consider and to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the world's most important and heartwarming scientist—Marie Curie. Every American school child has heard the story of the Curies—Pierre and Marie—who persevered through the harshest circumstances to isolate polonium and radium. Marie Curie is considered a scientist par excellence whose life should be studied by any young person aspiring to scientific endeavor. Madam Marie Curie was born Marie Sklodowska in Warsaw, Poland, on November 7, 1867. She grew up in an atmosphere of scientific pursuit—her father was a professor of physics—and in 1891 traveled to Paris to study physics and chemistry at the Sorbonne.

Mademoiselle Sklodowska married Pierre Curie, a professor of physics, in 1895 and together the Curies began their researches into radioactive substances. In 1903 they were awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics for the discovery of radioactivity. After Pierre was killed in 1906, Marie continued their work. In 1911 she was awarded the Nobel Prize for Chemistry for the discovery of radium and the study of its properties. She became the first person to receive the Nobel Prize in two subjects.

In 1921 and again in 1929 she visited the United States where she was enthusiastically received and aided in her radiology research. Marie Curie encouraged the establishment of a radium institute in Warsaw, the city of her birth, and attended the dedication of the institute in 1932. She died in Paris on July 4,

1934, but will never really die so long as we continue to look to her fortitude in the face of adversity as a source of inspiration and courage.

#### POLLS TAKEN BY KOB-TV

(Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues would appreciate being provided with the results of recently taken polls in Albuquerque, N. Mex., by KOB-TV news station, directed by Mr. William F. Tucker, radio-TV news director, and substantially representative of the thinking of the Southwest—and specifically of New Mexico—in the fall of 1967. The results of the polls are as follows:

Should the Government force a ban on cigarette advertising and also try to halt the sale of cigarettes?

[In percent]

Yes ----- 60.1  
No ----- 39.9

Should Congress pass Federal gun registration and strict gun control laws?

Yes ----- 22.3  
No ----- 77.6

Should teachers be permitted to strike?

Yes ----- 64.9  
No ----- 35.1

Do you feel 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote?

Yes ----- 55.4  
No ----- 44.6

Do you think a stoppage of the bombing in North Vietnam would lead to useful negotiations?

Yes ----- 71.1  
No ----- 24.9

Are you in favor of abolishing capital punishment?

Yes ----- 28.6  
No ----- 71.4

Do you think the Job Corps is doing a good job?

Yes ----- 29.6  
No ----- 70.4

Do you think labor unions have become too powerful?

Yes ----- 70.4  
No ----- 29.6

Do you think members of the clergy should participate in civil rights demonstrations?

Yes ----- 19.7  
No ----- 80.3

Do you think Congress should cut back and completely reexamine the war on poverty?

Yes ----- 69.7  
No ----- 30.1

Do you think draft card burners should be charged with treason?

Yes ----- 78.1  
No ----- 21.9

#### THE 95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the



RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on October 23 to 27, the American Public Health Association held its 95th annual convention in Miami Beach, Fla. It may seem somewhat incongruous to my colleagues that I draw their attention to this meeting rather than to last year's APHA meeting which was held in my home State, but I do so for two reasons. First, this outstanding association, with a membership of over 19,000 persons working in official and voluntary public health agencies, at the Miami Beach session named as its president-elect, Dr. Lester Breslow, director of public health of California's State Department of Public Health. Dr. Breslow has a well deserved reputation as an outstanding leader in public health activities. California is fortunate to have a man of Dr. Breslow's competence directing its public health programs. I compliment him on the honor which has been given him and commend the American Public Health Association for its wise choice.

Additionally, my colleague on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Congressman PAUL ROGERS, presented an unusually perceptive address at the convention's first general session on the Partnership for Health Act. Congressman ROGERS, whose interest in and whose many contributions to this Nation's health programs have long been recognized by members of our committee, skillfully outlined our view of the potentials which this bold new program offers in better coping with the health problems of this country. I believe that Congressman ROGERS' remarks, which I am including, will be of interest to all Members of the House.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS AT THE 95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION IN MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

At the onset, I want to say all Floridians were complimented by your selection of our state for your meeting this year. Your choice reflects the sort of keen judgment all of us in the Congress have come to expect from the American Public Health Association.

I am also delighted that you are interested in such a vital way in the Comprehensive Health Planning Program which we passed last year and are in the process of amending and extending this session.

As little as five years ago the comprehensive health plan was just a dream. We knew something was needed to improve our health services and planning. But at the same time there was little on the horizon that would indicate just when we would have relief. This caused anxiety.

It was rather like the man who felt there was something wrong with him and scheduled a visit with his doctor to get a checkup. The doctor ran the man through three hours of testing and while the patient was dressing somewhat confirmed his patient's fears by asking, "How do you spell incurable?"

Well, I don't think any of us really felt that our health services were in such straits. And I think we are now proceeding to find an effective cure for many of the problems which have plagued our health services.

I think the single most encouraging and enlightening item in making our health legislation is the fact that we have begun to define our goals. I consider this most important.

With your help, we are shaping legislation that in turn will re-shape the structure of public health programs across the nation.

The main tool in this effort, I feel, will be the Comprehensive Health Act, or, the Partnership for Health Act.

I assure you that we in the Congress will be closely watching the planning and execution of this program as to quality, cooperativeness and of course, the ultimate effectiveness of the program. In many ways the legislation is an experiment. The success of the experiment depends largely upon the ability of all the parties concerned to meet their responsibility.

I know that some organized elements of the health enterprise may be hesitant in participating for fear that they will lose their identity. But I submit to you, that to get your state and the nation moving along on the same road to better health services, there must be comprehensive health planning to unify our health effort.

When we reported this year's amendments to the Comprehensive Health Act from the House Committee, we took particular pains to indicate to the House our concern that the planning process was to be inclusive of every health element—not exclusive.

As we envisioned this legislation, the future should bring about plans for each portion of a state where there are health problems. We may see geographic areas which encompass several counties combining to submit a plan which is particular to that area. Of course, the individual county with a large population will most probably submit its own plan.

Evolving finally, however, we hope that each area of each state will participate to the extent that all will fit together like the pieces of a puzzle which, in the end, will represent the state plan.

The Comprehensive Health Planning Act, or the Partnership for Health Act, evolved from a finding by the Congress that (A) the changing character of health problems demanded a comprehensive planning for (1) health services (2) health manpower, and (3) health facilities at every level of government. That (B), desirable administration required strengthening of the leadership and capacities of state health agencies, and (C) that support of health services provided people in their communities should be broadened and made more flexible. Under these headings come more specific items which demand our attention.

(1) Health services require more planning and concern for delivery of health services, using and disbursing the latest techniques. Our heart, cancer, stroke legislation—which in reality is a continuing education program—is a good example of this.

(2) Health manpower requires planning for more effective use of highly trained and skilled personnel and a means to help solve our existing shortages. Use of supporting allied health personnel is a necessity. The Allied Health Professions Training Act should be of great help to train those interested in the supporting health professions. The development and use of electronic devices to free limited manpower should be given greater emphasis.

(3) Health facilities—better planning and coordination in placement of facilities, and in particular, better planning in placement and use of expensive, yet limited-use equipment.

A major priority in all health planning must be a consideration heretofore not emphasized sufficiently—and that is a reduction of the cost of health services to the American people.

Hospital and medical costs have skyrocketed alarmingly. The Brookings Institution published a study which has projected a \$100 a day hospital room cost in the very near

future. Health services have risen 7 to 8 per cent a year in the past two decades and jumped 14 to 16 per cent each year in the last two years. A concentrated effort in planning must be undertaken to solve this problem.

Planning must give greater emphasis to preventive medicine rather than just curative medicine. There must be more extensive use of examinations and check-ups to catch and prevent critical health problems before they develop and require extensive and expensive care and hospitalization.

Your organization can perform a major service to the American people if you will devote your abilities to help meet and solve this challenge and assume a leadership role.

As you know, we are moving into a new concept of Federal-State relationship—a Partnership for Health—with greater responsibility thrust upon state and local governments to develop comprehensive, imaginative and effective plans and programs for health. How the states meet this responsibility will determine the continuance of this program. As to the Act itself, there are four provisions I would like to briefly mention.

(1) Block grants to the states will replace the old categorical grants. The planning done by the state—not by Washington—will be the determining factor in the allocation of these funds. In other words, the states will say where this money will go, determined by the priorities set by the state. The plan must be comprehensive.

(2) Project grants must conform to the state plan. It is my feeling that in the near future the Congress will look at the division of funds between block grants and project grants, which presently are equal, to see if more of the funds should be allocated to the block grants and a subsequent reduction in project grants.

Special programs like Migrant Health, as well as new and innovative programs will continue to need special attention.

(3) Personnel exchange and training in the new legislation is also a most significant step. The law is designed to again carry out the Partnership in Health approach in a realistic manner. Federal health personnel and state health personnel may be interchanged as agreed upon by the Secretary and the State. This will allow a greater knowledge and understanding of health problems and solutions. I hope that extensive use will be made of this provision not only by the states, but also by the Federal agency, so that those in Washington may obtain a better working knowledge of the problems in the field.

(4) Training programs for state public health personnel should be developed and used immediately as authorized by the Act.

The Congress has been responsive in trying to meet the health needs of the nation in formulating legislation. In fact, 37 separate pieces of health legislation have been approved by the Congress and signed by the President in the past six years. When we consider the number of people who have been affected by medicare and medicaid, we can see just how Federal health legislation has gone to the heart of some of our largest problems—health protection and service for the elderly. We did not have this six years ago.

Clearly, health programs are an increasingly important part of our national effort. And their growth is as certain as the growth of our total population.

The momentum caused by this health legislation led the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to establish a Special Subcommittee to investigate the health activities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It was my honor to chair this Subcommittee. I feel certain that we will soon see a continuing and effective reorganization of the Federal Health Agency.



And who: through this dedication to the American tradition of man's dignity, best exemplifies the Sterling Virtues of Thomas Nelson, Jr.

Who: served in the Virginia House of Delegates, was a member of the first General Convention, signed the Declaration of Independence, was Governor of Virginia and led Virginia's forces in the Battle of Yorktown and whose patriotism led him to pledge his own credit in raising funds for the Revolution since it was a surer guarantee than that of the National Government: advocate of sound government and of strong national defense, and devoted Patriot.

THE THOMAS NELSON, JR., CHAPTER,  
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN  
WILLIAM M. TUCK AT "SURRENDER DAY"  
CEREMONIES AT YORKTOWN, VA., OCTOBER 19

You have paid me a great honor today. To be chosen an exemplar of the sterling characteristics of Thomas Nelson, Jr., is a distinction indeed to be cherished. I do not consider myself worthy of such, and I do not find words to express adequately my appreciation for this honor which you bestow upon me.

However, I can assure you of my deep gratitude to the Virginia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution for such recognition. I understand that it is the third award of its kind that the organization has made and that the two previous recipients were my friends, the late Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., and the Honorable Howard W. Smith, gentlemen for whom I have always had the highest admiration.

In accepting this presentation of the tribute expressed in your citation and so fittingly symbolized in the medal you have struck, I recognize the occasion as one for rededication to the great American principles for which Nelson fought and for which the Sons of the American Revolution stand.

Thomas Nelson, who as the third Governor of Virginia succeeded Thomas Jefferson in that office, perhaps gave more of his time, talent and wealth to his state and country than any other man in history. He gave so much of himself that his health was broken; he gave so much of his wealth that he was threatened with poverty. In fact, he gave so much that, as you know, the epitaph on his tomb here at Yorktown reads: "He gave all for liberty."

He was a statesman, a soldier, and a benefactor in the cause of American freedom. History has shown him to be a man of selfless patriotism, a gentleman with the highest order of personal integrity.

He it was who introduced the Virginia Resolutions of 1776 calling upon the Continental Congress to declare the Colonies free and independent. He was one of the immortal signers of the Declaration of Independence. He served in the House of Burgesses and in the Continental Congress. He raised troops for the Continental Army and he served as commander of the Virginia Militia. The fact that he ordered the bombing of his own home in the Battle of Yorktown is a clear demonstration of his patriotism.

In view of this Virginia patriot's completely admirable qualities, no award could be more appropriately named. It serves as a pledge on the part of all of us to preserve and protect free constitutional government.

The Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution have always supported and defended the fundamentals and principles of our form of government, the very essential foundations which have made this country great. Thus I shall ever cherish and appreciate the citation and the high honor which you have bestowed upon me today. I hope and trust that I may always be worthy.

## URBAN CRISIS

(Mr. VIGORITO (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about our "urban crisis." In an attempt to solve the many problems surrounding our cities, the President has asked this and previous Congresses to pass a number of most important bills. These have touched upon the problems of urban sprawl, mass transit, urban renewal, and so forth.

Unfortunately, despite the demonstrated need, passage of these bills has been like "pulling teeth."

As a member of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, I have been vitally interested in this legislation, not only because of the nationwide impact of these various programs, but because of the need for them in various cities in Pennsylvania.

In last year's gubernatorial election, we were honored to have as the Democratic candidate, Milton J. Shapp, of Philadelphia. No one has researched deeper into the problems of our cities and no one speaks with more authority on this subject.

Because of this, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report of a press conference which Mr. Shapp held on October 30 which contains some interesting statements and revealing statistics:

Milton Shapp, Philadelphia executive, today called upon Governor Raymond Shafer to "put muscle behind his pledge to whip his party's Pennsylvania Congressional delegation into line to support manpower training, anti-poverty, urban renewal and other federal welfare programs."

Shapp noted that at a press conference last Wednesday, following a meeting in Harrisburg with Mr. Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Governor said he would call upon the Pennsylvania delegation in the Congress to seek maximum federal money for anti-poverty urban aid and manpower retraining.

Shapp called the attention of the Governor to the record of his party in the U.S. House of Representatives and indicated it would take strong action on his part to correct their voting record.

"When the model cities program came before the House of Representatives in Washington this year, the GOP led a fight that resulted in an authorization of only \$300 million, a figure which has prevailed in the House-Senate conference despite a Democratic effort in the Senate to double this amount. Yet, even the smaller amount was fought by the Pennsylvania Republican House delegation which voted against it by a 10-3 majority.

"When the original rent supplement bill was killed in the House of Representatives last May, all thirteen of Pennsylvania's Republican members voted for its death. The House later agreed to a paltry \$10 million and the Senate Democrats upped the amount to \$40 million. When the measure was returned to the House for concurrence on Tuesday, October 24, all Pennsylvania Republicans voted to reduce the amount to \$10 million.

"On July 20, the U.S. House of Representatives voted down a \$40 million rat control bill by 207 to 176. Only two of the 13-man Pennsylvania GOP delegation voted in favor.

When public uproar caused the House to switch to a two-year \$40 million authorization, seven of Pennsylvania's GOP delegation were still opposed.

"I would suggest," Shapp said, "that the Governor immediately inform his own party's Congressional delegation of his own altered views, and that he publicly call each Congressman to account by name when any of the delegation refuses to support programs that benefit all people in the nation, including the citizens of Pennsylvania."

## THE 3D MARINE DIVISION

(Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, like many another former marine, I took great and solemn pride in reading the Presidential Unit Citation presented to the 3d Marine Division by Vice President HUMPHREY during his visit to Vietnam last week. When the Vice President pinned another streamer on the division colors, he added further to the record of "uncommon valor" achieved during the Pacific campaigns of World War II and the Korean conflict.

The 3d Marine Division was activated in September 1942, and participated in the campaigns of Bougainville, Guam, and Iwo Jima. As a rifleman and Japanese interpreter, it was my honor to have a part in each of these campaigns. Many of my fellow marines gave their lives, and many others were wounded during these assaults against heavily defended Pacific islands; and in each of them the Marine record of superb training and great courage won new laurels for the division.

The Presidential Unit Citation for 2½ years of service in Vietnam speaks for itself, and I am honored to place it in the RECORD at this point:

For extraordinary heroism and outstanding performance of duty in action against the North Vietnamese Army Viet Cong forces in the Republic of Vietnam from 8 March 1965 to 15 September 1967. Throughout this period, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced), operating in the five northernmost provinces of the Republic of Vietnam, successfully executed its three-fold mission of occupying and defending key terrain, seeking out and destroying the enemy, and conducting an intensive pacification program. Operating in an area bordered by over 200 miles of South China Sea coastline, the mountainous Laotian border and the Demilitarized Zone, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) successfully executed eighty major combat operations, carrying the battle to the enemy, destroying many of his forces, and capturing thousands of tons of weapons and material. In addition to these major operations, more than 125,000 offensive counter guerrilla actions, ranging from squad patrols and ambushes to company-sized search and destroy operations, were conducted in both the coastal rice lands and the mountainous jungle inland. These bitterly contested actions routed the enemy from his well-entrenched positions, denied him access to his source of food, restricted his freedom of movement, and removed his influence from the heavily populated areas. In numerous operations, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) demonstrated the great efficacy of combined operations with units of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. In July 1966, the Third Marine Division (Rein-



forced) moved to the north to counter major elements of the North Vietnamese Army moving across the Demilitarized Zone into the Province of Quang Tri; its units fought a series of savage battles against the enemy, repeatedly distinguishing themselves and, time and again, forcing the enemy to retreat back across the Demilitarized Zone. Imbued with an unrelenting combat spirit and initiative and undeterred by heavy hostile artillery and mortar fire, extremely difficult terrain, incessant heat and monsoon rains, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced), employing courageous ground, helicopter and amphibious assaults, complemented by intense and accurate air, artillery and naval gunfire support, inflicted great losses on the enemy and denied him the political and military victory he sought to achieve at any cost. The outstanding courage, resourcefulness and aggressive fighting spirit of the officers and men of the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) in battle after battle against a well-equipped and well-trained enemy, often numerically superior in strength, and the great humanitarianism constantly shown to the peoples of the Republic of Vietnam, reflected great credit upon the Marine Corps and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

#### A TRAGIC CRUSADE

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we shall hear much this week about crusades, about who is really helping whom, and about means and ends.

We shall be saying these things in discussing the future of a program which began in hope and now may end in dismantling an agency to express our frustrations.

The New York Times today, in the following analytical editorial on the politics of crusading, should make us suspicious of the dismembering of OEO which has been proposed and of the "opportunity," which its proponents see in their crusade:

#### WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"?

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, O.E.O. has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for preschool youngsters cannot be

made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program, which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start, now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now under way in the House.

Representatives Goodell of New York and Quie of Minnesota, the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty bill, insist they are all for the aims of the program but just want to improve it. But their voting record makes their substitute "Opportunity Crusade bill" look suspect.

In every year since the antipoverty program started in 1964, Messrs. Goodell and Quie have voted against final passage, for recommitment and for every crippling amendment. The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

#### POVERTY AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, the mood of our House, and of the Federal Government, is one of economy. This sentiment is proper and laudable and should be encouraged in our consideration of the antipoverty program.

I am especially concerned that economy become a working element within the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. To that goal, I shall propose amendments to the OEO authorization bill to insure that consumer action programs be given proper emphasis in ending the barriers of poverty which encircle one-fifth of our Nation.

For the word "economy" meant, in its original Greek form, "household management." It is both in this original meaning and in its popular form, that the word is appropriate to my amendments. I shall propose a plan to improve both the efficiency of the dollars we devote to the antipoverty program and the efficiency with which the poorer consumer spends his dollars.

That the "poor pay more" remains one of the paradoxes of our time. What is wrong with a system where the poor, who, by definition, have less than others, has to pay more than his affluent neighbors for food, for clothing, for his housing, and even for his credit?

The facile answer is that the poor must learn to shop more carefully, to compare before he buys, to favor those merchants who are fair and to shun the unscrupulous, that he must, in short, exercise the judgment, initiative, and resourcefulness which some critics of the poor modestly think are the hallmarks of the solid middle class.

Mr. Speaker, my experience with both the American consumer and with human nature itself, suggest two flaws in this criticism of the poor: First, the middle-class consumer, is not such a great shopper himself, especially if unaided in his

purchasing; and second, it is fruitless, and self-deceiving, to think that the poor will learn through exhortation and admonition, instead of by education, and practice.

What shall I propose is a program of education, self-help, and good example. A comprehensive consumer action, as conceived under this program, would help the poorer consumer to use existing and new institutions to become a better consumer.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that a few poor consumers can learn these hard lessons in the marketplace alone, through trial and error and through profit and loss. But we err, I believe, in thinking that the extraordinary effort, the rare and inspiring example of the few which constitutes heroism in any field, should be presented to the poor as the norm for their education and development.

And just as we should not expect only heroes in the ghetto (although we welcome them as they arise) we should not expect only villains, though there will be several of these also.

We should expect simply that people will respond when they are given hope, which this consumer education program will give them.

We do not need to look farther back than last summer's riots to see what hopelessness yields nor beyond our more enlightened moments in this House, for example, when we enacted the antipoverty legislation, to see what great good may come when people have hope.

#### WALT W. ROSTOW: ANOTHER ALGER HISS?

(Mr. RARICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17 and 18, 1967, on pages H13556 and A5125, respectively, I commented on the security status of Walt W. Rostow, now special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, with particular reference to the case of Otto F. Otepka and the recently proposed Panama treaties of which he is alleged to be the "chief architect."

The latest information concerning Rostow is an extensively documented article in the November 3, 1967, issue of the Herald of Freedom, which recommends a "thorough investigation" of his background and activities and predicts that such inquiry "should produce more shocking revelations than the Alger Hiss case."

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would invite special attention to Rostow's close association with Harold R. Isaacs, a research associate for the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for the establishment, which Rostow is alleged to have obtained a grant of \$6 million from the CIA and which is now subsidized by the State and Defense Departments as well as the CIA. Isaacs was formerly an editor in Shanghai, China, and had close connections with Miss Agnes Smedley and others involved in the celebrated spy



"TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

"Section 371, conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor."

The legislative history shows the Supreme Court interpreted this statute and said:

"The statute is broad enough in its terms to include any conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful functions of any department of government." (Italic supplied.)

"Any department" specifically includes the Department of Defense as defined in 18 USC Section 6 and 5 USC Section 1. Interestingly enough, this law does not include either the White House or the Capital in its provisions;

"TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

"Section 2387, Activities affecting Armed Forces generally

"(a) Whoever, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States:

"(1) advises, counsels, urges, or in any manner causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(2) distributes or attempts to distribute any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States—

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and

shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'military or naval forces of the United States' includes the Army of the United States, the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve of the United States; and, when any merchant vessel is commissioned in the Navy or is in the service of the Army or the Navy, includes the master, officers, and crew of such vessel. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 811; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, Section 46, 63 Stat. 96.)"

Enclosed for your convenience are xerox copies.

Charging the lawbreakers with a misdemeanor has not been successful in preventing further planned demonstrations which will obstruct the lawful functions of the Defense Department. These two laws make such obstruction a felony rather than a misdemeanor.

No longer can the enforcement of Section 371, "Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States" or Section 2387, "Activities affecting armed forces generally" be suspended.

Nowhere do I find that the Department of Justice or you as Attorney General are empowered to suspend the United States Criminal Code of the United States. Have I overlooked such suspension power granted to you under the Constitution? If so, please inform me. I feel that neither you nor any other

government official has the right to suspend laws of the United States except provided for by the Constitution of the United States; otherwise, there should be a debate in Congress on this point.

If you agree that these are valid enforceable laws and must be enforced rather than suspended, then you are petitioned to put these people on notice by:

1. formally and publicly announcing that any obstruction of the lawful functions of the Pentagon or interference with the armed forces anywhere will be dealt with as felonies punishable by up to 5 and 10 years in prison and \$10,000 fines under these two sections of the United States Criminal Code.

2. That as Attorney General, you have a sworn duty to uphold the United States laws which include these two laws; therefore, these laws must be enforced because you and the Department have no authority or power to act as judge and jury. The law must be applied and the dispositions, thereof, left to a Federal judge and jury. Forms of protest and petition exist within the framework of the law. If they choose to violate the law, you do not have a choice, but a duty to enforce the law and charge felonies.

The passing of new laws by Congress will be an exercise in futility unless the existing laws are enforced.

It takes great intestinal fortitude to stand up to a large number of demonstrators and enforce the law. The Department of Justice did this in Alabama and Mississippi. Now it has to do this at the Pentagon.

May God give you the moral strength and courage.

Sincerely,

WILSON C. LUCOM,  
President.

[From the United States Code]

§ 2387. ACTIVITIES AFFECTING ARMED FORCES GENERALLY

(a) Whoever, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States:

(1) advises, counsels, urges, or in any manner causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(2) distributes or attempts to distribute any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States—

shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "military or naval forces of the United States" includes the Army of the United States, the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve of the United States; and, when any merchant vessel is commissioned in the Navy or is in the service of the Army or the Navy, includes the master, officers, and crew of such vessel. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 811; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, § 46, 63 Stat. 96.)

[From the United States Code]

CHAPTER 19.—CONSPIRACY

Sec.

371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States.

372. Conspiracy to impede or injure officer.

§ 371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States.

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States,

or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 701.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,  
The Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I call your attention to the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine and the article contained therein commencing at page 154. I ask that you act to bar the distribution of this article through the United States mails in whatever form.

In my Opinion, this article is violative of Federal law and palpably obscene.

I hope and trust that you will act immediately in this matter so that any further distribution can be stopped, including the use of such injunctive procedures as may be necessary.

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1967.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter to the Attorney General dated October 26, 1967, regarding the November, 1967 issue of "Playboy" magazine. The Post Office Department has supplied us with a copy of this issue and we have reviewed the material which you referred to in your letter.

We note from Post Office intelligence reports that sale of this issue has been stopped at Dover, Exeter, Manchester and Portsmouth, New Hampshire. There is no comparable Federal statute under which we may ban or enjoin the sale or distribution of this issue. We must primarily rely on the Federal criminal statutes (18 U.S.C. 1461, Use of Mails, and 18 U.S.C. 1462, Use of Carrier for Interstate Shipment) to control the traffic in alleged obscene materials.

In order for material to be actionable under these statutes it must be established that (a) the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to a prurient interest in sex; (b) the material is patently offensive because it affronts contemporary community standards relating to the description or representation of sexual matters; and (c) the material is utterly without redeeming social importance. The latter test presents the most formidable obstacle to successful prosecution. In *Memoirs v. Massachusetts*, 383 U.S. 432 (1966) at footnote 7 the Supreme Court cited with approval the following language from *Zeitlin v. Arnebergh*, 383 P.2d 152 (1963):

"Material dealing with sex in a manner that advocates ideas . . . or has literary or scientific or artistic value or any other forms of social importance, may not be branded as obscenity and denied the constitutional protection. Nor may the constitutional status of the material be made to turn on a 'weighing' of its social importance against its prurient appeal, for a work cannot be proscribed unless it is 'utterly' without social importance."

We are unable to make the judgment, in a practical sense, that this issue of "Playboy" magazine or the article in question is without the modicum of social value which en-



titles it to constitutional protection. Further evidence of the stringency of this test is represented by the Supreme Court's per curiam decisions of May 8, 1967 and June 12, 1967, which together reversed two Federal criminal convictions and fourteen state cases both civil and criminal. See, e.g., *Redrup v. New York*, 386 U.S. —, 87 S. Ct. 1414, 18 L. Ed. 2d 515 (May 8, 1967).

We hope that this brief discussion of the inherent constitutional difficulties in the area of pornography will aid you in understanding our conclusion in this matter.

You will be pleased to know that the Congress has enacted Public Law 90-100 creating a Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography which was signed by the President on October 3, 1967. The Commission's duties call for a broad gauged study of the obscenity problem which will include an evaluation by leading constitutional authorities of the present definition of obscenity. We are hopeful that constructive legislative recommendations will be made by this study group.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,  
Assistant Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1967.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,  
Assistant Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Thank you for your letter with reference to my request that the Department act to take the Playboy article out of the U.S. mails. I appreciate your taking the time to reply as carefully as you have.

I do not agree with the opinions of the Supreme Court dealing with obscenity, either in regard to their substantive content or with the interpretation that has been placed upon them by prosecuting agencies. I believe that it is possible to limit the circulation of particular material, not yet ruled upon, on the grounds of obscenity. I cannot believe that even as loose as some of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions have been in this regard, that they require you to permit everything filthy to flood our mails without restraint.

I did not contend that the November issue of Playboy Magazine in which appeared the article to which I had reference was obscene. It was the article at page 154, not the issue, and the article could have been removed, and still could be removed, from the magazine to make it mailable. The Justice Department should enforce the law and protect the people against this sort of filth.

If the Court wants to put up the roadblocks, let it do so. This will only further arouse the American people to the staggering dimensions of the dilemma law enforcement faces from a Court that is unable to even selectively define obscenity and deliberately continues to hand down decisions that keep this country in a condition approaching civil chaos.

I am aware of the existence of the Presidential Commission, which of course undoubtedly will sometime present recommendations for legislation which may even extend to a constitutional amendment or two, but this is a long way off.

In the meantime, are we to stand helpless against the floods of pornography that are overtly available at virtually every local corner store throughout the land? I cannot believe this is made necessary for the Department of Justice merely because of the present confusion resulting from decisions of the High Court. They have not enjoined you in the Justice Department from protecting the people. Why don't you at least try

to take the smut off the shelves and let them holler—including the Court?

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(Mr. CAREY was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the bill S. 2388 earlier today I stated I would place in the RECORD statistics and figures on the status of community action programs as conducted in New York City.

I do this in response to the call of the minority as expressed on page 208 of the report where I am quoted as follows:

Mr. Carey had this observation:

"If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies \* \* \*. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation."

Since the minority believes it is my "public duty" to cite these matters in detail I will oblige.

First, however, let me place my criticism which is meant to be constructive in a proper context.

As I said earlier my observations referred to the organizational operation of community action programs in New York City and not elsewhere in the country.

The configurations and structures of these community action program agencies are in no way due to any action or policy directive of the OEO in Washington.

In fact, just the reverse is true. I have observed a succession of these regional OEO directors and officials of OEO in Washington who have diligently but vainly attempted to secure the cooperation of New York City officials in following OEO guidelines in CAP structure.

I have met not once but several times with Federal representatives and city officials in the past 2 years to indicate that the city was not following the intent of Congress nor the guidelines in setting up either its city-wide umbrella agency or its neighborhood community corporations.

These guidelines as I have indicated earlier today clearly provide—see "OEO Community Action Guide," October 1965, page 17, referring to participation in policymaking agencies—that there should be representatives of the chief elected official or officials of the community, and representatives of the leadership of elements of the community such as labor, business, religious, and minority groups. Combined with these five categories would be representatives from residents of the area and members of the groups to be served.

Briefly stated this is the one-third, one-third, one-third representation which we clearly intended in community action.

There has been, and is, valid and substantial reasons for this arrangement in the judgment of our communities.

The need for elected and appropriate public officials in the program is demonstrable. Those officials represent the entire community including the poor and they are needed to articulate the needs of the poor to the entirety of society. They can bring to community action programs the understanding and cooperation they need from other agencies of government, State and local, and legislation in such fields as housing, health, education, and so forth.

Most importantly when joining with the leadership of important elements of society they bring two indispensable strengths to community action.

First. They are in a position to build confidence and understanding of community action among the families in society who are in better income groups.

Second. They can through local action institute responsible and efficient management practices to see that excessive overhead and waste will not diminish the already limited flow of funds for programs aimed at ending dependency and building dignity and motivation among the poor.

Had these concepts been followed by the administration in New York City I am sure we would not have the situation existing today which I shall illustrate below.

To make certain that we will reform the programs in New York City and elsewhere for better benefits and greater impact I have joined with the gentle lady from Oregon in supporting the amendments to title II which would have this result.

All this amendment does is make statutory what the Congress intended in our legislation as indicated in the guidelines which have unfortunately been either demurred or defied by local officials.

Now what did happen in New York City? Did the poor organize and develop these programs and neighborhood structures? Hardly.

The mayor of New York appointed a human resources commission. In a dramatic demonstration of how to escalate income to escape poverty, he took a \$17,000 official of the New Haven poverty program and paid him \$45,000 to set up the New York City programs. This is no reflection on the individual, Mitchell Sviridoff who must be worth the money because he now is going to Ford Foundation where he will be paid \$55,000 after grappling for a year and a half with the problems of New York City.

But the commissioner was not expected to labor without adequate staff.

To head up the three major divisions in the poverty corps there was appointed one commissioner of community development at \$32,500—recruited from OEO-level \$15,000. One manpower commissioner at \$32,500—formerly with the Department of Labor at \$22,000. And one community relations director at \$32,000—formerly staff director for a New



Jersey community action program at \$17,000.

Then with Federal funds there was organized at 100 Church Street, New York City, in the highest rent district in the world several hundred strategic thinkers spread over several floors to man the command post.

So far the poor have not had much to say about running this program but good news is on the way.

If the poor had a hand in these programs, if public officials other than the plush-lined commissioners I have referred to above, and if leaders in other sectors of the community had a voice I doubt if they would condone the cost of the strategic direction center at 100 Church Street just one-half mile west of city hall.

This center, for salaries, for personnel service, for professional planning and research has its own withholding system. To make certain the poor will be well planned for it deducts over \$4.5 million from the city's direct poverty entitlement of \$34 million or 12½ percent.

This would not seem overly disproportionate if the poor received the remainder of 87½ percent.

Unfortunately such is not the case. An examination of typical budgets at the neighborhood level community corporations which will expend the 87½ percent will show that the amount available for actual conduct of programs probably does not exceed 20 percent of the entire \$34 million at best.

How can this be? Are not these programs controlled by the poor?

They are not. These community corporations are more structured for control of the poor than by the poor.

I wish to make it clear and definite that this system is in no way the fault or responsibility of the poor or their representatives in the areas to be served.

Had they devised their own budget and organized their own neighborhood corporations I doubt that the present condition would obtain.

Rather it becomes apparent that these budgets were handed down from above and the poor and their representatives were instructed to submit these budgets and they would be funded accordingly.

In order therefore not to cast any aspersion or criticism on the residents of the areas in question I shall designate them as area A, B, C. I am citing only these three although my study indicates that the remaining target areas in the city have almost identical balance sheets.

At the heading of each budget I have inserted the population of the target area and the number of welfare cases located within such area.

AREA A	
Population	56,436
Welfare cases	10,788
Personnel:	
	Salary 12 months
1 Executive director	\$15,000
1 Deputy director	12,200
1 Executive secretary	6,450
1 Secretary	5,050
Total	38,700

AREA A—Continued	
Urban development:	Salary 12 months
1 Assistant director (for community programs)	\$10,650
1 Information officer	8,300
1 Social service officer	8,750
4 Community organizers (at \$8,300 each)	33,200
1 Consumer specialist	8,300
3 Program specialists (at \$7,900 each)	23,700
2 Social service assistants (at \$5,550 each)	11,100
4 Neighborhood counselors assistants (at \$5,550 each)	22,200
4 Senior community workers (at \$6,450 each)	25,800
45 Block workers (at \$4,150 each)	186,750
20 Neighborhood aides (at \$4,150 each)	83,000
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
6 Clerical aides (at \$4,150 each)	24,900
Total	452,500

Training:	
1 Senior training officer	9,650
1 Training officer	6,800
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Clerical aide	4,150
Total	26,450

Manpower:	
1 Assistant director	10,650
1 Psychometric technician	8,300
2 Senior job placement officers (at \$8,300 each)	16,600
2 Job preparation counselors (at \$6,800 each)	13,600
1 Job counselor	6,450
1 Senior Job developer	8,750
3 Job developers (at \$6,450 each)	19,350
5 Neighborhood aides (at \$4,150)	20,750
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Secretary	5,050
3 Clerical aides (at \$4,150 each)	12,450
Total	127,800

Administration:	
1 Senior fiscal officer	9,650
1 Office manager	6,800
2 Bookkeepers (at \$6,450 each)	12,900
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
8 Clerical aides (\$4,150 each)	33,200
2 Messengers (\$4,150 each)	8,300
1 Stock clerk	4,150
1 Machine room operator	4,150
Total	85,000

Program evaluation and design:	
1 Assistant Director	10,650
2 Program analysts (\$8,300 each)	16,600
2 Research assistants (\$5,850 each)	11,900
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Clerical aide	4,150
20 Neighborhood aides (\$4,150 each)	83,000
Total	132,150

Personnel w/o fringe	862,600
15 percent fringe benefits	129,600
Total	991,990

AREA A—Continued	
Consultant services and contract:	Amount
Training consultants (15 days at \$50 per day)	\$750
Business consultants (10 days at \$75 per day)	750
Program specialists (12 days at \$50 per day)	600
Manpower development (10 days at \$50 per day)	500
Housing consultants (20 days at \$50 per day)	1,000
Medical consultants (30 days at \$75 per day)	1,500
Auditing services	800
Legal services (12 days at \$50 per day)	900
Total	6,800
Travel:	
Local (25 staff at 1.50 per week)	1,950
60 fieldworkers at 50 cents per day	7,200
Personnel:	
Out of town (4 trips—20 days at \$16 a day, plus \$75 per trip, also travel expense)	620
Rental of station wagon (\$250 per month. Including gas, oil, maintenance, insurance)	3,000
Total	12,770

Space costs:	
Central headquarters 8,000 sq. ft. (current lease)	18,000
4 satellites approximately 100 sq. ft. (2.50 per sq. ft. each)	10,000
Total	28,000

Consumable supplies:	
Office supplies (\$150 per person for 68 persons)	10,200
Postage (300 mailings per week at 5 cents each)	780
Total	10,980

Equipment (purchase):	
8 staff desks (\$90 each)	720
4 secretarial desks (\$105 each)	420
12 chairs swivel with arms (\$32 each)	380
1 electric typewriter	400
1 Electric typewriter, long carriage	480
4 Typewriters, manual	440
2 Calculator (\$460 each)	920
2 Adding machines (\$130 each)	260
12 File cabinets (\$55 each)	660
1 Tape recorder	150
50 Chairs w/arms (\$7 each)	350
Total	5,180

Equipment (rentals):	
1 Xerox machine (\$135 per month)	1,620
1 Postage meter (\$13.33 per month)	160
4 Water coolers (\$60 per year each)	240
Total	2,020
Total equipment	7,200

Other costs:	
Telephone installations	560
Costs 48 lines (\$20 per month)	11,520
Total	12,080

Maintenance costs (contract)	
Headquarters (\$400 per month)	
Satellites (\$100 month each)	9,600



AREA A—Continued		AREA B—Continued		AREA C—Continued	
	Amount		Amount		Amount
Equipment maintenance and repair	\$500	Community development:		Equipment (see attached schedule)	\$12,890
Printing (\$250 per month)	3,000	1 Assistant director	\$10,650		
Publications	400	1 Senior community organizer	8,750		
Insurance costs	700	3 Community organizers (\$8,300)	24,900	OTHER COSTS	
Security costs (installation and servicing of alarm system)	2,400	4 Community workers (\$5,550)	22,200	Telephone installation	1,900
Conference and meetings	200	60 Blockworkers (\$4,150)	249,000	40 lines at \$25/line/month	12,000
Total other costs	28,880	1 Supervising secretary	5,850		
		1 Secretary	4,800		
		3 Clerical aides (\$4,400)	13,200	Utilities: Central office at \$150/month, 3 satellites at \$20/month each	2,520
Grand total	1,091,860			Printing costs at \$175/month	2,100
				Insurance	500
AREA B		Total	669,600	Library at \$40/month	480
Population	133,913	Fringe benefits 15 percent	100,440	Meeting expenses at \$100/per month	1,200
Welfare cases	16,950			Security: Including installation and servicing of alarm system	2,400
[Budget 1967 (12 months)]				Total other costs	23,100
Personnel and category				Grand total	1,062,380
Executive:		Neighborhood aide trainees 50 at \$1.70/hr at 40 hrs/wk	176,800		
1 Director	\$15,000	Fringe benefits at 8 percent	14,140		
1 Deputy director	12,200				
1 Program analyst	8,300	Total personnel costs	960,980		
1 Information officer	8,300	Consultants and contract services:			
1 Program specialist	7,900	Consumer frauds consultant (\$50/day for 25 days)	1,250		
1 Executive secretary	6,450	Program development consultants (\$50/day for 25 days)	1,250		
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850	Health consultant (\$50/day for 36 days)	1,800		
1 Research assistant	5,850	Legal services (\$50/day for 18 days) per year	900		
1 Secretary	4,800	Accounting services (\$50/day for 18 days) per year	900		
	74,650		6,100		
Administration:		Travel:			
1 Senior fiscal officer	9,650	Local—100 employees (staff and nonprofessionals) at 40¢ per day for 240 days	9,600		
2 Bookkeepers (\$6,450)	12,900	Out of town: 3 trips—10 days at \$16/day plus \$75/trip travel expense	390		
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850	Rental of station wagon (including operating costs) \$250/month	3,000		
1 Maintenance man	4,400				
1 Payroll clerk	4,400	Space costs and rental			
2 Clerical aides (\$4,150)	8,300	Central office (current lease cost)	24,500		
1 Stock clerk	4,150	Three satellites at \$175/month each	6,300		
1 Machine operator	4,150				
1 Messenger	4,150				
	57,950				
Training:					
1 Senior training officer	9,650				
1 Training officer (step 1)	7,150				
3 Job preparation counselors (step 1 \$6,800)	20,400				
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850				
1 Clerical aide	4,150				
	47,200				
Manpower:					
1 Assistant director	10,650				
1 Supervising counselor (step 1)	9,200				
2 Senior job developers (1 at \$8,750, 1 at \$8,300)	17,050				
1 Senior job placement officer	8,300				
5 Senior job counselors (\$7,500)	37,500				
4 Job placement officers (\$6,150)	24,600				
4 Senior neighborhood aides (\$5,050)	20,200				
1 Psychometric technician	8,300				
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850				
2 Clerical aides (\$4,400)	8,800				
	150,450				



## AREA C

[Population, 169,491; welfare cases, 25,300]

## BUDGET 1967 (12 MONTHS)

<b>I. Office of the Director:</b>		
1 Executive Director.....	\$18,000.00	
1 Executive Secretary.....	7,000.00	
1 Typist-Clerical.....	4,770.00	
1 Switchboard Operator.....	4,770.00	
1 Assistant to the Director.....	11,500.00	
1 Senior Secretary.....	5,550.00	
		\$51,090.00
<b>II. Community Development Department:</b>		
1 Comm. Develop. Prog. Coord.....	10,500.00	
1 Program Secretary.....	6,450.00	
1 Typist-Clerical.....	4,770.00	
7 Sr. Comm. Organ's, at 8,870.....	62,890.00	
7 Jr. Comm. Organ's, at 7,770.....	54,390.00	
14 Blockworker's II, at 4,770.....	66,780.00	
14 Blockworker's I, at 4,576.....	64,064.00	
7 Intake Clericals, at 4,770.....	33,390.00	
1 Liaison Coordinator.....	5,200.00	
		307,634.00
<b>III. Manpower and Career Development Program</b> (Manp. Neigh. Serv. Center):		
(1) Administration:		
a. 1 Director for Manpower.....	13,100.00	
b. 1 Program Coordinator.....	10,500.00	
		23,600.00
(2) Intake:		
a. 1 Intake Counselor.....	7,500.00	
b. 1 Intake Assistant.....	5,400.00	
		12,900.00
(3) Job Corps:		
a. Screener.....	6,150.00	
b. Assistant Screener (CI Aide).....	4,800.00	
		10,950.00
(4) Job Development:		
a. 1 Junior Job.....	8,000.00	
b. Assistant Job.....	7,150.00	
		15,150.00
(5) Remediation and Job Preparation:		
a. 1 Supervisor.....	9,000.00	
b. 3 Teachers II, at 7,750.....	23,250.00	
c. 2 Teachers I, at 6,600.....	13,200.00	
		45,450.00
(6) Job Placement:		
a. Job Placement Officer.....	8,200.00	
b. Job Placement Coordinator.....	8,900.00	
c. Job Placement Follow-Up.....	6,200.00	
		23,300.00
(7) Testing:		
a. 1 Psychometric Teach. II.....	8,000.00	
b. 1 Psychometric Teach. I.....	7,500.00	
		15,500.00
(8) Counseling:		
a. 1 Supervisor.....	9,000.00	
b. 3 Sr. Counselors (Center Staff).....	24,600.00	
c. 3 Jr. Counselors at 7,150.....	21,450.00	
d. 4 Assistant Counselors at 6,200.....	24,800.00	
e. 7 Manpower Aides at 4,576.....	32,032.00	
		111,882.00
(9) Clerical:		
a. 1 Sr. Secret. (Ass't Director).....	6,189.00	
b. 1 Secretary (Program Coord.).....	5,050.00	
c. 4 Clerical Aides at 4,770.....	19,080.00	
		30,319.00
		289,051.00
<b>IV. Personnel-Budget and Fiscal Dept.:</b>		
1 Chief Fiscal Officer.....	10,500.00	
1 Ass't Fiscal Officer (Off-Mgr.).....	8,500.00	
1 Bookkeeper.....	6,500.00	
1 Typist-Clerical.....	4,770.00	
1 Clerical Aide (Stock-Cl.-Mach-Op.).....	4,770.00	
1 Driver-Messenger.....	5,200.00	
		40,240.00
<b>Maintenance Dept.:</b>		
1 Supt.-Watchman.....	5,200.00	
3 Porters at 4,420.....	13,260.00	
		18,460.00
<b>V. Public Information and Community Relations Dept.:</b>		
1 Public Information and Community Relations Director.....	10,500.00	
1 Resources Developer.....	6,150.00	
1 Program Secretary.....	5,050.00	
1 Translator-Typist.....	4,770.00	
		26,470.00
<b>VI. Research and Evaluation Program:</b>		
1 Evaluator-Researcher.....	9,000.00	
1 Research Statistical Aide.....	5,200.00	
1 Typist-Clerical.....	4,770.00	
		18,970.00

## BUDGET 1967 (12 MONTHS)—Continued

<b>VII. Training &amp; Education Program:</b>		
1 Sr. Training Officer.....	\$10,500.00	
1 Training & Educ. Ass't.....	5,580.00	
1 Typist-Clerical.....	4,770.00	
		\$20,850.00
15% Fringe Benefits.....		
		\$772,765.00
		115,914.75
		888,679.75
<b>Total.....</b>		
<b>Consultants and contract service:</b>		
(1) Training Consultants, 15 days at 50 Per.....	750.00	
(2) Training Sessions, 30 Sessions—25 Per.....	750.00	
(3) Auditing & Budget Analysis, 4 Qtrly Audits at 500 Per.....	2,000.00	
(4) Legal 10 days at 50 Per.....	500.00	
(5) Personnel & Administration Consultant 10 days at 50 Per.....	500.00	
(6) Statistical & Research Consultants 10 days at 50 Per.....	500.00	
		5,000.00
<b>Travel:</b>		
(1) Out of Town trips:		
4 trips at 5 days×16 per day.....	320.00	
4 Round trip air fares at 75.....	300.00	
		620.00
(2) Local:		
35 Non-Professionals at .80.....	1,456.00	
2 round trips average per wk.....	1,820.00	
(3) 35 Professionals at 1.00: Average per week.....	3,276.00	
(4) Car Rental, Station Wagon 12 months:		
At \$136.50 per.....	1,638.00	
Gas and Maint. \$8 wk-aver.....	416.00	
		2,054.00
		5,950.00
<b>Space Costs and Rentals:</b>		
<b>Rentals:</b>		
Will-Act Headquarters.....	30,000	
7 Comm. Action Centers, at \$150 aver.....	12,600.00	
		42,600.00
<b>Maintenance:</b>		
<b>Janitorial Supplies:</b>		
Central offices.....	360.00	
7 CAC's, at 5 per mo.....	420.00	
		780.00
<b>Consumable Supplies:</b>		
Postage 250 mailings, at 5 cents, total 240 days.....	3,000.00	
Office supplies.....	4,500.00	
55 Prof—75 per yr., 50 Non prof, at 25 per yr.....	1,250.00	
		8,750.00
<b>Other Costs:</b>		
<b>Rentals:</b>		
(1) Telephone-Switchboard 50 lines, at 20/mi/line.....	12,000.00	
Manpower Center 300-over/mo.....	3,600.00	
		15,600.00
(2) 9 water coolers, at 4.20 each per mo.....	453.60	
(3) Rental of 1 Xerox Mach., at 120 per mo.....	1,440.00	
(4) Rental 1 postage meter, at 8.50 per mo.....	100.00	
(5) Rental of 50 folding chairs for 12 wks, at 7.50 doz.....	390.00	
		17,983.60
<b>Utilities:</b>		
Electricity (7).....	1,200.00	
Central offices.....	3,000.00	
7 C.A.C.'s, at 20 mo.....	1,680.00	
		5,880.00
Heating, No. 6 oil (13.50).....	1,500.00	
		50,760.00
<b>Miscellaneous:</b>		
(1) Repairs and maintenance of equipment.....	500.00	
(2) Printing costs.....	2,400.00	
(3) Library.....	300.00	
(4) Meeting expenses 17 staff members, at 4 weeks.....	3,536.00	
(5) Security:		
Manpower center alarm, system install.....	250.00	
Monthly maintenance charge, at 10.....	240.00	
7 CAC's alarm systems maintenance.....	504.00	
		7,730.00
(6) Allowance for Community Committee meetings, at 12 full Comm. Comm. meetings, 50 members, at 5 per.....		
	3,000.00	
b. 6 Sub-comm. meetings, 7 Sub-comm., at 7 members each, at 5 per.....	1,050.00	
		4,050.00
(7) Emergency contingency fund.....		
	2,000.00	
		6,050.00
		990,903.35

Even the most cursory study of this financial picture for three typical areas will suggest several salient observations.

First is that there is a seeming lack of relationship between the number of residents to be served and the size of the outlay.

Although the target population varies from approximately 56,000 to 169,000 the budgets are each about \$1 million.

Second, they evidently reflect what some high-level mastermind believes each neighborhood community corporation should have in its professional and personnel echelon.

Each budget provides for program analysts—public information officers, psychometric specialists, budget and fiscal officers, et cetera.

The tragedy is that when all this

money is expended in the poverty superstructure there will be no action program funds for anyone to analyze, let alone a full-time program analyst.

The grief for the poor is that money designed for their benefit should not be used to place onboard psychometric specialists when such scarce professional types are now available in the State employment service offices in every neigh-



borhood. Unfortunately in New York City there is a détente between the manpower agency of the city and the State employment service so that a contractual arrangement to provide these services has been pending for several months but has not been executed.

The bad news for the poor is that the only function "public information officers" can fulfill is that a million dollars is coming into the neighborhoods but only professionals need apply.

Of course, there is provision for some neighborhood blockworkers and community organizers. These may be used to secure the maximum feasible participation of the indigenous poor as they gather on folding chairs around the water cooler only to be told by the staff director of the great things that are going to happen if they can get another million dollars to add to the million dollars for the official family of the local poverty "Pentagon."

I am actually no nitpicker in poverty spending but I doubt if the poor who drink tap water from leaky pipes ever wanted their funds allotted for water coolers as a status symbol.

Our job is to get the water cooler waste out of these neighborhood programs.

I am certain that dedicated public officials and community leaders joined with the poor can do a better job of getting benefits down to the poor than these budgets represent.

The criticism has been directed to title II that we are trying to set up patronage for politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the patronage is in the program now and the poor are being patronized to pay for it.

The job of the public officials must be to get the patronage out and get the poor in.

Mr. Speaker, I have deliberately not chosen the biggest budget for community action agencies in New York City—just the median-type agencies.

I cannot help but note however in studying one of the major funded programs that one of them is receiving over \$216,000 for guard service to protect their premises by a contractual arrangement with a uniformed force.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that we did not intend to carry on the war on poverty by having a poverty "Pentagon" with the general and top brass in every eligible neighborhood.

I am sure those poverty war "Pentagons" are not what the poor want or need and they do not represent their aspirations.

I believe the committee bill will help to correct these abuses and I urge its adoption.

If they do, why do we need over \$200,000 to protect the indigenous agencies for the poor from those who are inimical to it?

I believe the committee bill will help to correct these abuses and I urge its adoption.

**PRESIDENT NYERERE STATES POSITION OF TANZANIA ON EXECUTIVES AND PROFESSIONALS FROM FOREIGN LANDS**

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Julius Nyerere, the President of Tanzania, whom I have known for many years as a friend and who is one of the strong statesmen of Africa, in a speech at the Tanu Biannual Conference in Mwanza in Tanzania on October 17, 1967, outlined his policy of nonalignment with either East or West, to which policy by the way he has strictly and impartially adhered, and his determination that the development of Tanzania should come from the planning, the direction and the toil and sacrifices of Tanzanians. He made it clear, however, that where the need existed for foreigners, loyal to the Government of Tanzania, in the professions, the skills, and elsewhere they would be welcomed.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the first installment of President Nyerere's memorable address, as follows:

**TEXT OF ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT NYERERE**

Many things have happened since our last meeting, and it is the job of this Conference to examine the most important of them in the light of the objectives we set ourselves when we adopted the Arusha Declaration. For that Declaration was a commitment to the principles of self-reliance and socialism. It did not by itself bring either of these things: only hard thinking, and hard work in the right direction will do that. It is important that we should be very clear about this fact.

The Arusha Declaration did not cause miracles. It did not make the crops more fruitful, nor the rains more regular. It did not make everyone wealthy, nor change the level of our education. It did not change the habits of mind we have grown up with, nor create any other miraculous changes in our condition.

Our acceptance of the Arusha Declaration was like a young Christian's confirmation: it is a declaration of intent to live a certain kind of life and to act in a certain kind of manner for desired ends. We have no more become a socialist country because of the Arusha Declaration than a young boy becomes a good Christian or a good Muslim by the act of dedication.

The sincere act of dedication is important, but much more important are the actions which follow during his life. The question before us, therefore, is whether we have started to make the right decisions, and the right plans, and whether we have begun to act in a manner which will in time build socialism and self-reliance in Tanzania.

First, let us look at this question of self-reliance, for I believe that this has been widely misunderstood—by ourselves more than by others. Some of our people have spoken and acted as though it meant self-sufficiency in manpower and financial resources. It means nothing of the kind.

We would be extremely silly if we imagined that the Arusha Declaration has caused us to have more qualified doctors, engineers, teachers, administrators, and so on, so that the Development Plan target of self-sufficiency in skilled man-power by 1980 had suddenly become irrelevant. Self-reliance does not mean that for self-reliance is not a silly thing. Let us therefore be very clear what we do expect now, and what the policy of self-reliance means in the immediate future, and what it does not mean.

First, it means that we must make maximum use of the resources which we have. We want citizens to be given priority in every field as soon as they are capable of doing the job efficiently. And certainly we must have Tanzanians making policy; Tanzanians must control our country. But this is not an issue now; we have already achieved that.

The question at issue is whether we must at all costs have Tanzanian citizens in every executive position. And the answer we give must be a realistic one if we wish to fulfill our ambitions. For the truth is that we do not yet have enough qualified and experienced Tanzanian citizens to do all the jobs which have to be done if the policies we Tanzanians have decided upon are to be implemented.

The question, therefore, is whether we are prepared to make our plans wait until we have educated and trained a Tanzanian for every job which has to be done. And we long ago decided that this would not only be absurd, it would also be unnecessary. An accountant is an accountant, whether he is a citizen or not; a doctor is a doctor; a manager is either efficient or not efficient. What really matters in relation to such people—whether they be citizens or not citizens—is that they loyally and efficiently carry out the decisions made by our Government and our people.

To employ an inefficient person just because he is a Tanzanian, when the job he has to do is crucial for our development, is not self-reliance; it is stupidity. When we or members of our family fall ill, what we want is a competent doctor, not necessarily a citizen. When we have decided to build a bridge, what we want is a competent engineer who will be able to ensure that the bridge will be safe and effective for its purpose.

The questions we need to ask ourselves are these: Firstly, is this job essential to our plans? Secondly, do we have a citizen who is qualified and has the necessary experience for this particular job? And if there is no qualified citizens available, thirdly, can we obtain a qualified non-citizen who will be accountable to us for his loyal and efficient carrying out of the job? And fourthly, what plans do we have for the training of citizens to do this kind of work in due course? Then, if we decide that the job is essential, and if there is no qualified citizen available to do it, and if a non-citizen can be obtained, let us pay a non-citizen to do the job for us.

By doing this we might, for example, make it possible for a village in an outlying area to become self-reliant because it can sell its increased production and thus support improved conditions for its members. If we do not allow this bridge to be built simply because we have no citizen available to do it, then the village will remain on a low level and without any real possibility of becoming a self-reliant, prosperous community.

But in this country we also have a second thing which we really desire of the people working for us. Ideally we also need socialists in every job—which is not necessarily the same thing as wanting a citizen for every job, because not all Tanzanians are socialists. But if a competent doctor also has socialist attitudes, then he is surely an especially great asset to us. And the truth is that the international reputation of Tanzania is such that many socialists from other countries very much want to come and work with us.

One day in the future Tanzanian socialists may be able to assist other socialists to achieve their objectives. Today we should be ready and happy to welcome socialists from other countries who are ready to help us achieve our objectives. And we should remember that many socialists come from capitalist countries; it is sometimes the very fact that they cannot contribute to socialist objectives in their own country which makes them enthusiastic about working with us.

What all this means is that if we are to make progress towards the implementation of our policies of socialism and self-reliance, we should be ready to use all the people who are able to contribute towards these objectives. There are certain jobs which have to be done by citizens. Those we have now filled. There are other jobs which have to be done and done now or in the next few years,



WASHINGTON "THINK FACTORY" TRAINS  
EXTREMISTS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

A Washington based "think factory" helped train Stokely Carmichael and other extremists who incite violence in American cities. It's the Institute for Policy Studies, a tax-exempt organization of supposed "scholars." Educational research serves as a cover for intrigue and political agitation.

Through its conferences and seminars, the Institute for Policy Studies, located at 1502 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. exerts a continuing influence on the ideology and tactics of "the New Left." It serves as a model for a network of so-called "research" institutes and think factories that operate throughout our nation.

In its report titled "The First Three Years of the Institute for Policy Studies, 1963-1966," the Institute revealed that Carmichael, then of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and a Howard University student, participated in its civil rights seminars held in January-May 1964. The term "civil rights" which most Americans favor, is used nowadays as an umbrella for every sort of anti-democratic and anti-American activity.

In June of 1965, according to its report, the Institute hatched a Conference on Youth in Politics, under the chairmanship of Arthur Waskow and Robb Burlage, two of its Resident Fellows. The participants were Robert Parris (Moses), Donna Richards and Courtland Cox of SNCC, and Thomas Hayden, Phil Hutchings, Terry Jefferson, Mrs. Bessie Smith and Connie Brown of the Newark Community Union Project, and other activists in the so-called "freedom movement."

Waskow, a senior staff member of the Institute for Policy Studies, is an advocate of what he calls "creative disorder." Creative disorder means the use of illegal or nearly illegal techniques to force revolutionary changes in society. Examples given by Waskow range from the popularized lunch counter sit-ins of the early 1960's to the 1967 drive in the Quaker movement to send medical aid to North Vietnam. For example, before the Newark riot, the Institute invited activists to view virtual training films in community organization in Newark and to attend a seminar on "Poverty, Politics and Power."

This sort of indoctrination for young people, followed by agitation and anarchy, has been largely financed by grants to the Institute for Policy Studies from tax-exempt foundations. The contributing foundations as listed by the Institute in its 1964 report and 1963-1966 reports are the Ford Foundation, the National Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, Institute for International Order, the Milbank Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, Edgar Stern Family Fund, Fontenay Corporation, Joseph Ziskind Trust, Palisades Foundation, Community Research and Development, Inc., and the Samuel Rubin Foundation.

Foundation money has also helped the work of the Institute in shaping much of the strategy for the forthcoming "Peace" Party. The groundwork for this so-called Peace Party was laid out by advocates of civil rights, peace, and Communism at a five-day meeting in Chicago. The Convention was called by the National Conference for the New Politics, the latest in newly formed organizations with deceptive titles. They constitute the new united front, with penetration in depth by the Communists.

In a position paper prepared for the Chicago Convention entitled "Toward a Radical Taxman," Waskow, senior staff member of the Institute for Policy Studies urges that priority be given to what is in effect the established guerrilla warfare technique of creating "parallel institution." In this instance Waskow suggests training nurses,

teacher aides and others who when refused jobs would "sit-in" at the premises of their prospective employers, thus forcing their employment or arrest.

Another suggestion of Waskow is the creation of community institutions such as citizens groups to police the police, schools supposedly controlled by the students, and law firms that will cater to those in trouble over such an approach. In effect, what is outlined is an entire framework of a shadow government with shadow institutions.

The Institute for Policy Studies serves as a meeting place for Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) activists according to the underground "Washington Free Press," circulated here. The Institute also trains SDS members wishing to pursue the "activator vocation," a euphemism for revolutionary action.

Lee Webb, a past student of the Institute for Policy Studies, is a former national secretary of SDS. Todd Gitlin, past president of SDS and present Coordinator of its Peach Research and Education Project, was a fellow of Waskow's Peace Research Institute before it changed its name to the Institute for Policy Studies.

The influence of the Institute for Policy Studies extends beyond the radical elements outside Government. Congressional assistants and Federal Government officials participate in the Institutes comprehensive seminars on civil rights, new political structures, foreign aid, foreign policy, defense and disarmament, poverty, housing and urban planning and education and welfare. This gives Institute activists access to Government secrets as well as the opportunity to influence opinions and political developments.

We saw evidence of this summer when a faction among the temporary employees of the Congressional offices met and passed an anti-Vietnam war resolution. Obviously, the Institute is in a position to infiltrate persons into Government agencies who are indoctrinated in revolutionary ideology.

These agitation-propaganda networks function outside the institutions of a democracy. Their constituency is the rootless, urbanized mass whom they professionally mobilize around such simple slogans as "peace, jobs and freedom" and "everything for the kids."

## AN HONEST REPORTER AT LAST

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the absolute deception of most of the Washington press corps in calling Walter Washington the "mayor" of the Nation's Capital. They know full well that this is a misrepresentation. Some of the news media have said that it is hard to get the word "commissioner" in a headline, but this is a phony argument. It is not difficult or impossible to mention that correct title on radio or TV programs or carry the proper name in the body of a story.

Many of us have been looking for the honest reporter who would properly refer to Mr. Washington. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I mean no discredit to Mr. Washington. He knows what he is and, as far as I know, has not called himself something he is not. From what I have gathered and have heard in his TV interviews, he is a quite impressive person.

Viewing the Washington press corps, one is inclined to opine that Diogenes

might come to Washington looking for an honest reporter and 30 minutes later would be looking for his lamp.

Last night, I did finally witness an honest reporter. There may be others, but the first I have run into is Tony Sylvester who, on his 11 p.m. report on channel 9, gave a very good news report on Commissioner Washington and, guess what, referred to him by his right title. It did not impair his news reporting and, in fact, Mr. Washington's proper title sounded good.

Thanks, Mr. Sylvester, for proving that there is at least one honest man on the Washington press corps.

CHET HUNTLEY'S PLAIN TALK ON  
BRITISH SOCIALISM

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Chet Huntley gave a very succinct appraisal of British socialism in his NBC feature, Plain Talk, which was carried on July 27, 1967. I heard the program and was so struck by its candor and truth that I wrote and asked for the script of his message. He promptly sent it, and although I have delayed bringing it to the attention of the House, its timeliness is just as obvious today as when delivered more than 3 months ago.

On October 31, I included with my remarks an article from Barron's which pulled no punches in outlining the decline of the British industrial state. What two world wars were unable to do, the Labor Socialists have done in a few short years.

Mr. Huntley's remarks are particularly germane. He points out that in the modern welfare state, something has gone awry in communications. The benefits are preached from the rooftops, it would seem, but the obligations and costs are little known. To use his words:

There was too much publicity about the gains for the individual out of the welfare state and too little concerning the obligations. The result has been that the British have been living beyond their means and the nationalization of steel is going to make no difference.

Mr. Speaker, it is no pleasure to say "I told you so," particularly when it comes to the welfare and fate of your own nation. For some years now, many of us have been pointing out the crash course on which this Nation is headed under the bankrupt liberal policies of this administration. I do note recently that the scoffers are amazingly silent, however, and even the diehard planners and liberal economists sense the impending havoc they have wrought on our great Nation.

The Chet Huntley feature follows:

EMPHASIS, PLAIN TALK

Chet Huntley, Emphasis, Plain Talk.

Tomorrow a long and excruciating agony will come to an end in Britain: our friends on the other side will nationalize their steel industry for the second time in 18 years. That says something: the Labor Government, in spite of the fact that it came into office with a promise that it would nationalize the steel industry according to the scripture of Karl



Marx, has taken several years to bring itself to the awful decision. Now it nationalizes the industry with a minimum of promises and with a wry countenance.

The steel industry is a barometer of the decline of the British economy. One central fact tells a major portion of the story: three times as many employees are required in Britain to pour a ton of steel as are needed in the United States. British steel production fell substantially last year. The industry went into a recession, with little prospect of recovery; and no wonder, since the ominous threat of nationalization was hanging over the heads of the steel management.

The British steel industry reflects the extent to which a nation can get caught up in the habit of living beyond its means. The British have installed the so-called "cradle to the grave" social security system. All of that adds to the price of steel. Furthermore, British labor, in order to make work, has inflicted upon management a wilderness of feather-bedding contracts. To make more jobs, British labor has fought virtually every technological improvement which might reduce the cost of labor.

But not all of it can be laid at the doorstep of labor. British industrial management has been complacent. At this late stage of the game, there is a wide gap between British ownership and British industrial management. But here again we get back to attitudes of government. The present-day British industrial manager, representing the owners in all their corporate numbers, is inclined to bow to the tune out of Whitehall, and there the climate is not conducive to competitive British industrialism.

Something has gone awry with communications in the modern welfare state. The moment the various welfare programs are put into practice, there is no agony, whatsoever, about making their services known. On the other side of the coin, however, it becomes almost impossible for the state to communicate the notion, or the fact, that those programs have to be paid for. There is no sure way that the welfare government can get its people to work a little harder, to produce more, to trim wage demands, or to trim their new standard of living. There was too much publicity about the gains for the individual out of the welfare state and too little concerning the obligations. The result has been that the British have been living beyond their means and the nationalization of steel is going to make no difference . . . it will mean that a once-vital industry is now more in the doldrums than ever as it substitutes bureaucracy for disinterested management.

#### FURTHER TESTIMONY ON THE NEED FOR TITLE IV OF THE EOA AMENDMENTS

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are many problems that confront any small businessman in America. The problems for businessmen from minority groups and those in our ghetto areas are compounded far beyond the normal difficulties. Some of this was discussed by Julius Hernandez, executive director of Lower Manhattan Small Business Development and Opportunities Corp., in a prepared statement delivered before the social and economic development Mexican-American cabinet hearings in El Paso, Tex., on October 28, 1967.

Mr. Hernandez said:

The Mexican American in his native land has been exposed and involved in the full range of business and industrial activity common in the United States. He has complete freedom and opportunity of maximum participation in the business development of his country. However, although he has brought with him this tradition of entrepreneurship, this has not been his experience in the United States, especially the Southwest. As with other ethnic and minority groups, his limitation of expression in the English language, education, attainment and lack of work capital has made the Mexican American enter into small family types of retail and service business operations, almost to the exclusion of manufacturing operations. Consequently, the Mexican-American businessman has yet to make an impact upon the industrial sector. In addition the lack of opportunity and apathy has aggravated the situation. Further, no effort has really been made to bring him into the mainstream of economic life.

It has been proven, under specialized business programs, that with the proper orientation, know-how and accessibility to adequate financing, the economic development of the Mexican-American community can be strengthened and expanded. This development provides an opportunity for the furtherance of manpower resources for the unskilled and the frequently unemployed; for the orientation in and training of business skills; and for the advancement to managerial and executive positions which will generate leadership and new opportunities for the entire community.

Mr. Hernandez went on to say:

Thus, it is clear that until a substantial group of financially sound businessmen grows within the community, considerable help in these practices must come from an organized effort both from within the community itself and also from outside sources. However, the only program that has been meaningful to the small businessman is scheduled to be phased out. This is the small business development program. A substitute program passed by the Senate and being considered by the House under Senate Bill S. 2388 adequately fills the void.

Mr. Hernandez called for support of title IV when he urged that—

This conference support and recommend the passage of the Senate version of the Small Business amendment to the Economic Opportunity Bill, S. 2388, wherein there is a provision to improve the Small Business Program and provide substantial and meaningful funds to effectively carry out a program to assist small businessmen financially and technically, especially those in poor ghetto communities.

In closing, I would like to say that the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities have problems which are basically the same, with very few exceptions. Our problems can be more effectively and dynamically resolved by amalgamating our forces for the benefit of our communities. The recently proposed bilingual educational legislation by Congressman Scheuer of New York and Sen. Yarborough of Texas is an example of our bilateral and concerted efforts to support and foster legislation of mutual interest.

I have always been a proponent of programs initiated, administered and staffed by the people affected. It is only through the efficient operation of these self-help programs we can really tackle the problems and find resolutions to same. My office, the Lower Manhattan Small Business Development and Opportunities Corporation, has, and I say this very candidly, tried to relate itself intimately with the Puerto Rican community.

An insight into these problems was also supplied in a proposal submitted by the City of Philadelphia Fellowship Commission of the Drexel Institute of Technology. In that proposal, appendix A, an expanded discussion on developing opportunities for small business, states:

Small business occupies an important place in American life. The versatility of products and services offered contributes greatly to the economic strength of the United States. The mortality rate of small business, however, is high. The losses to both owners and creditors is appalling, resulting in human distress and frustration.

It is therefore important to study the various factors that make for business success and for business failure. Although much statistical data is available about both these topics, there is comparatively little that relates to that lowest segment of small business, those firms which are owner-operated, "with not more than three paid employees." For our purpose, Small Business is defined in a much more modest fashion than it is by the Small Business Administration. We are concerned with businesses whose total assets do not exceed \$50,000 and especially with those whose net worth may be from practically nothing to no more than \$10,000 or \$15,000—sometimes entitled "Little Business."

Philadelphia has traditionally been noted for the number, diversity and achievements of small business firms. Unemployment in Philadelphia could be reduced materially if a large number of small businesses could be launched in those fields of activity in which the chances of success are large. Our study will be focused on small business in the specific area of Metropolitan Philadelphia. Nevertheless, we find that the variety of businesses here is essentially similar to those throughout urban America.

The problems are: first, how can an individual or small group having limited capital, say not over \$15,000, get into a business; and second, once the business is started, how can it be managed so that it will become profitable? To succeed in both of these respects requires much planning, which means that our would-be businessman must act with almost special talents, and he may need more money than he had originally assumed.

The problem of the viability of firms of such modest dimensions is much graver than of firms with somewhat larger financial resources, which are still classified as "small business." The businessman must be aware—or made aware—of the pitfalls that force two out of three businesses to die within two years after the business starts. A small new enterprise, with limited capital, must struggle to survive the harsh competition of business firms that are financially stronger, with resources and experience far beyond the reach of this small concern.

Small Business means many types of activities, ranging from a carpenter or painter to a bustling neighborhood store or to a thriving automobile mechanic's shop. The businessman we are considering is not limited in his activities to any type of business. He, even with marginal capital, can enter into a wide variety of enterprises. For instance, many manufacturing processes can be handled by a small businessman; or he may assemble manufactured components, and market the finished product; or he may become a manufacturer's representative.

We shall also be interested in retail business, for so many individuals are attracted into the various lines of stores. The profusion here seems endless. Special problems, however, arise in this area that interest us. For example, what happens to the neighborhood store as it competes with chain stores and supermarkets? How does a small enterprise fare in a shopping center? How successful



are concessions in a department store or in a "farmer's market" when run by an individual?

In the numerous enterprises that may be classified as wholesale business are found many small firms. Again, certain activities in the business of transportation, whether for industry or for the consumer, lend themselves to profitable sources of livelihood for individuals with modest capital.

In the construction industry, an abundance of small concerns with exceedingly limited capital engage in a variety of activities. Home repairs and alterations have been profitable sources of livelihood for many enterprising individuals.

We shall find it useful to examine commercial services, ranging from brokers to bookkeeping to printing, and consumer services, such as electrician, TV service, or shoemaker or a cleaning and dyeing establishment.

To understand the problems of the variety of independent business, it will be necessary to examine not only the type of activity and its functional classification, but very often the geographic location.

#### ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE—POLL

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the views of the people I am privileged to represent are most valuable to me. It is, therefore, my custom to ask all of my constituents to express their views—and make them count—by participating in an annual questionnaire poll.

Questions in my 1967 questionnaire, being mailed this week, were formulated by the graduate students in the department of political science at the University of North Dakota. They have included a number of questions regarding the political views, age, income, occupation, and education of the respondents because they feel it will help them to more fairly evaluate the final tabulations.

The students did an outstanding job in drafting the questions and I insert them in the RECORD at this time. I will, of course, publish the results of the poll as soon as it is tabulated.

#### INTERNATIONAL MATTERS

1. Would you favor increasing trade in non-strategic goods to improve relations with:

- The Soviet Union?
- Other East European Communist nations?
- Both?
- Neither?

2. Which of the following policies would you favor regarding U.S. involvement in Viet Nam?

- Maintain the present policy.
- Increase bombing and extend ground operations.
- Halt the bombing and seek negotiations.
- Total withdrawal.
- Appeal to the United Nations for settlement.

3. In your opinion, what country is most friendly toward the United States?

4. Which of the following nations would you back in the Middle East situation?

- Israel.
- Egypt.
- Neither.

5. If you chose Egypt or Israel in the above question, to what extent do you feel

the U.S. should officially support that nation?

- Moral support only.
- Economic support only.
- Military support only.
- Economic and military support.

#### NATIONAL MATTERS

1. Several legislative proposals to restrict the sale of firearms have been made. Which would you prefer?

- Prohibit the mail-order sale of all firearms.
- Prohibit the mail-order sale of hand guns only.
- Permit the sale of firearms to persons who hold a valid local permit only.
- Place no further restrictions on the sale of firearms.

2. Also under consideration is the question of the registration of firearms. Do you feel:

- That all firearms should be registered?
- That only hand guns should be registered?
- That there should be no registration of firearms?

3. There has been considerable discussion recently concerning highway safety. Which of the following measures would you like to see become law? (Check any or all of the following:)

- Compulsory periodic mechanical inspection of all cars.
- Compulsory periodic physical examination of all drivers.
- Compulsory retirement of drivers over a certain age.
- Stricter laws dealing with intoxicated drivers. (Making blood tests compulsory for suspected drivers, for example.)
- Stricter requirements for obtaining a driver's license.
- Lowering the speed limit to a maximum of 50 m.p.h.
- None of the above, or other (specify)

4. The Selective Service System is a point of much discussion. Which do you feel would be most desirable?

- Abolish the draft, increase pay and rely on volunteers for the military forces.
- Select men for the service by means of a lottery.
- Establish compulsory military training for men at age 19.
- Leave the system the way it is now.

5. In view of present conditions, both domestic and international, would you be in favor of or opposed to the proposed tax increase?

- In favor of.
- In favor of, if accompanied by significant spending cuts.
- Opposed to.

6. In order to combat increasing crime, would you:

- Expand the FBI to form a national police force?
- Approve the formation of a new national police force?
- Improve local police effectiveness through local action?
- Improve local police effectiveness through Federal grants and assistance?
- Make no change?

7. In view of the recent Supreme Court decisions with respect to individual rights, do you feel the Court:

- Has over stressed the right of the individual to the detriment of society as a whole?
- Is attempting to bring the rights of the individual into balance with the rights of society?
- Has not done enough for the rights of the individual?
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Recently there have been riots in many American cities. What do you feel is their major underlying cause?

----Unemployment and substandard living conditions.

- Outside agitators.
- A basic disrespect for law and order.
- Biased law enforcement.
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Other than Viet Nam, which problem facing the government and the country are you most concerned about at the present time?

- Cost of living, inflation.
- Civil rights, racial issues.
- Taxes, government spending.
- Social welfare programs, Medicare, Social Security.
- Farm problems, farm prices.
- Foreign affairs, foreign aid.
- Labor problems, unemployment.
- Crime, juvenile delinquency.
- Trends in government.
- Schools, education.

10. What methods would you suggest the government use to solve the above problem which concerns you most?

11. Which of the following possible Republican Presidential candidates do you feel is the strongest?

- Nixon?
- Percy.
- Lindsay.
- Reagan.
- Rockefeller.
- Romney.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

12. Which of the following possible Democratic Presidential candidates do you feel is the strongest?

- Lyndon Johnson.
- Robert Kennedy.

13. Who would you support for President at this time?

14. Do you believe Congress should pass legislation giving farmers power to establish their prices, along with more responsibility for regulating their production and storing any excess?

- Yes.
- No.

#### RESPONDENT'S BACKGROUND

Male; Female.  
Education: Grade School; High School; Some College; College Degree; Graduate or Professional Degree.

Religious Affiliation: Protestant; Catholic; Jewish; Other; None.

Residence: Always lived in North Dakota; More than 10 years in North Dakota; One to 10 years in North Dakota; Less than 1 year in North Dakota; County \_\_\_\_\_

Main Employment of Head of Household: Agriculture; Industry; Professional; Service; Retail or Wholesale Trade; Government, incl. Military; Banking or Real Estate; Retired; Unemployed.

Approximate Annual Household Income: Less than \$5,000; \$5,000 to \$10,000; \$10,000 to \$20,000; More than \$20,000.

Do you normally consider yourself a: Democrat; Republican; Independent.

#### BIG CITIES' PROBLEMS

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read the October 20 editorial in the Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., entitled "Problems of Big Cities, Problems of All America." The editorial noted that our cities are taking the initiative in solving their own problems and



are not just waiting for the Federal Government to move in.

This editorial did not deny the need for Federal financial and planning aids to our cities, but they stressed the importance of the participation of the community itself, the municipal governments, the business enterprises, and the ordinary citizen.

It is a most encouraging sign that our cities are not becoming dependent on Federal aid programs. During the next year the Federal Government will channel several billion dollars into urban areas. With our cities willing to take the initiative and to make sure that the Federal expenditures are matched with local efforts, we can all look forward to a better urban America.

So that my colleagues might read this most informative article from the Forum, I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### PROBLEMS OF BIG CITIES PROBLEMS OF ALL AMERICA

Big things are happening in the cities of America, and they are not waiting for the federal government to move in and do the necessary jobs for them.

They will take all the help they can get in financial and planning aid, but the impetus to get things done has to come from the community itself, from the municipal governments, the business enterprises and the ordinary citizen.

One of the cities where things are happening on a major scale is Chicago, as Mayor Richard J. Daley told the Associated Press Managing Editors convention there Tuesday.

The city of today is concerned with far more than police and fire protection, he pointed out. In the last 20 years municipal government has been transformed from being a housekeeping agency to the point where the mayor is concerned "with poverty and jobs, the kind and quality of education, manpower training and merit employment, civil rights and human relations, welfare of youth and senior citizens, and conservation, rehabilitation and renewal of neighborhoods."

He emphasized that only local government is equipped to solve some of the problems that population growth and scientific breakthroughs have created. "Repetition of goals does not bring accomplishment of programs—only action under well planned programs can do that," he declared.

Even a brief visit to Chicago impresses one with the changes that have been accomplished there. Even the streets are cleaner, for one important thing. And the loop is jammed with people. The downtown is not going out of style, despite the hectic task of driving a car in Chicago traffic.

In Fargo and Moorhead, of course, municipal government has not become as deeply involved in all aspects of the community activity as it has in Chicago. There is a sharp separation of city government and school administration, for instance, but the time may soon come when a closer link between the city boards and the school boards may have to be forged. After all, they both look to the same property taxpayer for the bulk of their tax revenues.

Our problems are not comparable with those in Chicago at the moment, but Mayor Daley's speech made it apparent that the problems of big city America are the problems of all America. It is going to take strong, responsible local government to tackle the jobs outlined by Mayor Daley. A spirit of cooperation under which all urban communities work together for future improvement and progress would be most helpful.

#### WHY PAY MORE FOR LESS?

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, have we finally heard the last of Lincoln-Dickey? I certainly hope so, but I have my doubts. Last October 25, for the third time in the past 2 years, the House voted to eliminate from Public Works appropriations the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric dam project in the State of Maine. Last time, the measure was forced back upon us in conference by the other body with the threat of "no Lincoln-Dickey, no public works bill." Such a threat was enough to get a number of extra votes and so this ill-conceived project was kept alive.

Now there is some danger of this occurring again. It is my hope that the Senate will recognize the House as a co-equal partner in Congress, and will not try to again blackmail the House into approving this project. In this time of urban crisis, budget deficit and war, Congress can certainly find a more sensible use for the approximate \$380 million which this dam would cost the taxpayer by 1976.

There has been a great deal of talk about how high electric rates in New England are stifling the growth of new industry. This is nonsense. The percentage cost of the electricity used in manufacturing a product is extremely small in comparison to the final value of that product. In the textile industry, the average percentage cost is less than 1 percent. This fact holds true for most industries. Only in a small number of industries in the chemical, rubber, paper, and electrometallurgical fields does the percentage cost of the electricity climb much higher than 1 or 2 percent of the finished product's value. It is not the high cost of electricity that is slowing industrial development in New England. Factors such as the shortage in skilled labor and transportation needs are the principal retardants.

One more point. It is very clear that Lincoln-Dickey is not the answer to cheaper electric rates in New England. This hydroelectric dam, which would produce a total of 723,500 kilowatts annually, would cost approximately \$227 million. This does not include the necessary transmission lines and other costs boasting the estimated total cost to some \$380 million. A pump storage power project is presently being constructed at Northfield Mountain in Massachusetts at a cost of only \$74.35 million and will produce 1 million kilowatts annually. Why pay more for less?

Last month, when debate over Lincoln-Dickey was still raging, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post favoring the project. The editorial stated one by one a number of reasons why the Post thought the proposal was a good one.

I sent the editorial to the director of the information services for the Public Service Co., of New Hampshire, Mr. Sinville. In his reply, each of the statements made in the Post were refuted, one by one. Although this letter is only a small addition to the large volume of

evidence concerning the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric dam proposal, I believe it underscores with particular clarity many of the reasons why the project has little merit. It is true, of course, that Mr. Sinville has a bias, but his points are well made and worthy of consideration. I therefore submit the Post editorial and Mr. Sinville's rebuttal into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Oct. 17, 1967]

#### DICKEY-LINCOLN

Further planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam on the St. John River in Maine now depend on the House-Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill and it is to be hoped they will act favorably.

The Senate approved the Administration's request for \$1,676,000; the House did not approve it. The conferees should follow the Senate's lead. If they do not do so, previous appropriations of \$1.9 million for planning this hydroelectric project will be rendered sterile. The project has had trouble in Congress at each appearance, notwithstanding the thorough House study it got in 1965 when it was authorized.

Demand for the plant arose out of the power plight of New England where rates are the highest in the country. Since it was authorized there have been some downward revisions on the mere prospect of the plant. It will surely perform such a "yardstick" service when built. The rate structure has handicapped New England in the competition for new industry. The lower rates of the TVA have enticed into the South some old industries it might have held. Congress, in simple justice, owes New England one such plant.

It has been argued that conventional hydroelectric plants are outdated; but they continue to be essential power suppliers, with a national prospect that capacity of such plants will double in the next 25 years. Plants like Dickey-Lincoln are being built right now. Their usefulness as peak-load suppliers makes them efficient complements to steam or thermonuclear plants. Private interests now are planning a large thermonuclear plant at Wiscasset, Maine, but no one believes that it will be adequate to all future needs in the region. Some voices have been raised against its effect on recreational and wildlife values; but the foremost defenders of such resources support the project as vastly superior to an alternative site that would affect the wild-river program on the Allagash.

The project has been thoroughly studied. It contemplates the addition to the Nation's power resources of an efficient supply that will be available to private distributors, municipalities and cooperatives in a region where there is a deficit and where rates are high.

Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter of October 19 requesting comments on the Washington Post article about Dickey-Lincoln. Each statement in the article is restated below followed by our comments.

*Statement:* "Demand for the plant arose out of the power plight of New England where rates are the highest in the country."

*Comment:* This is not a true or factual statement. Enclosed is a comparison of industrial rates of the whole northeast. It shows that New England is in a favorable position when compared to other highly industrialized sections.

*Statement:* "It will surely perform such a 'yardstick' service when built."

*Comment:* To perform a "yardstick" service, Dickey would have to be competitive in the cost of construction and in total cost of producing power in 1975 and it definitely









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 9, 1967  
For actions of November 8, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 182

### CONTENTS

Agricultural exports....19	Food aid.....4,5	Organization.....29
Apples.....24	Foreign aid.....1	Personnel.....27
Appropriations.....2,13	Foreign trade....18,19,21	Poverty.....9,11,23
Budget.....17	Forest Service.....7	Resolutions.....10
Cooperatives.....6	Forestry.....12	Taxation.....8,15,28
Crop insurance.....16	Lands.....12	Vegetable oil.....18
Economy.....8	Legislative program...22	Water pollution.....7
Electrification.....6	Meat inspection.....3	Watersheds.....14
Employment.....26	Military construction...2	Wheat.....4
Farm Bureau.....20	National Grange.....25	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on foreign aid authorization bill. House debated poverty bill.

### SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 1872, the foreign aid authorization bill (pp. S16123-6, H14825-36). The bill will now be sent to the President. It would authorize a total of \$2.63 billion, of which \$2.1 billion is for economic aid and \$510 million for military assistance.
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed as reported H. R. 8569, the D. C. appropriation bill, and conferees were appointed (pp. S16075-6, S16080-96). House conferees were also appointed (p. H14922).

A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee completed work on H. R. 13606, the military construction appropriation bill. p. D1009

3. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Mondale urged a strong meat inspection program that would set standards comparable to those of Federal inspection to all meat sold to consumers. pp. S16127-9
4. WHEAT. Sen. Carlson discussed the "importance of the wheat industry in helping to meet this world food crisis." pp. S16042-4
5. WAR ON HUNGER. Sen. McGovern commended the President's message on the food aid program. pp. S16047-8
6. ELECTRIC CO-OPS. Sen. Metcalf criticized "large investor-owned utilities using their monopoly position to gouge small customer-owned systems," and inserted several reports on this subject. pp. S16057-9
7. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Metcalf criticized "Federal installations polluting public water supplies in Montana," including several Forest Service installations pp. S16061-3
8. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. McIntyre inserted a speech in support of the proposed tax increase. pp. S16069-71  
Sen. Proxmire disagreed with the proposed tax increase in light of the rise in the unemployment rate. pp. S16065-8
9. POVERTY. Sen. Hart recommended that necessary funds be appropriated to continue the war on poverty and inserted several articles in support of this program. pp. S16135-9
10. RESOLUTIONS. Sen. Brooke inserted several resolutions adopted by the recent Governors' conference on various legislative proposals, including items of interest to this Department. pp. S16044-7

HOUSE

11. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill. pp. H14836-922, H14932-6
12. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported H. R. 10864, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Saline County, Ark., to the Dierks Forest, Inc. (H. Rept. 897). p. H14948
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Rooney, Penn., inserted the statement by the President on the signing of the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill. pp. H14943-4
14. WATERSHEDS. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee approved for full committee action workplans for eight watershed projects. p. D1011
15. TAXATION. Rep. Hall stated that all the letters he has received in response to the President's request for people to write their Congressmen to help his "tax increase" have been "in opposition to a tax increase." pp. H14923-4



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 200, not voting 36, as follows:

## [Roll No. 374]

## YEAS—196

Abbutt	Flynt	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
Adair	Fulton, Pa.	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Fuqua	Poff
Andrews, N. Dak.	Galifianakis	Pollock
Arends	Gardner	Pool
Ashbrook	Gathings	Price, Tex.
Ashmore	Goodling	Quillen
Ayres	Gross	Railsback
Baring	Grover	Randall
Battin	Gubser	Rarick
Belcher	Gurney	Reid, Ill.
Bell	Haley	Reifel
Bennett	Hall	Reinecke
Berry	Hammer-	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	schmidt	Riegle
Bevill	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Biester	Harrison	Rogers, Fla.
Blackburn	Harsha	Roth
Blanton	Harvey	Roudebush
Bow	Heckler, Mass.	Roush
Bray	Henderson	Ruppe
Brinkley	Hull	Sandman
Brock	Hunt	Satterfield
Brotzman	Hutchinson	Saylor
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Schadeberg
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Schweiker
Buchanan	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Burke, Fla.	King, N.Y.	Scott
Burton, Utah	Kleppe	Selden
Bush	Kornegay	Shipley
Carter	Kuykendall	Shriver
Casey	Kyl	Skubitz
Cederberg	Laird	Smith, Okla.
Chamberlain	Landrum	Snyder
Clancy	Langen	Springer
Clausen, Don H.	Latta	Stanton
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Steiger, Wis.
Colmer	Lloyd	Stephens
Conyers	Long, La.	Stuckey
Corbett	Lukens	Talcott
Cowder	McClary	Taylor
Cramer	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Thompson, Ga.
Curtis	McDade	Thompson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	McDonald, Mich.	Tuck
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	Vander Jagt
Denney	Marsh	Waggonner
Devine	Martin	Walker
Dickinson	May	Watkins
Dorn	Meskill	Watson
Dowdy	Michel	Whalley
Dowling	Miller, Ohio	Whitener
Duncan	Mills	Whitten
Edwards, La.	Minshall	Williams, Pa.
Esch	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Eshleman	Moore	Winn
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	Wylder
Feighan	Myers	Wylie
Findley	Natcher	Wyman
Fino	Nelsen	Zion
Fisher	Nichols	Zwach
	O'Konski	

## NAYS—200

Adams	Brooks	Daddario
Addabbo	Brown, Calif.	Daniels
Albert	Burke, Mass.	Dawson
Anderson, Tenn.	Burleson	de la Garza
Ashley	Burton, Calif.	Delaney
Aspinall	Byrne, Pa.	Dellenback
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	Dent
Bates	Cabell	Diggs
Bingham	Cahill	Dingell
Blatnik	Carey	Donohue
Boggs	Celler	Dow
Boland	Clark	Dulski
Bolling	Cohelan	Dwyer
Bolton	Conable	Eckhardt
Brademas	Conte	Edmondson
Brasco	Corman	Edwards, Calif.
	Culver	Eilberg

Evans, Colo.	Keith	Quie
Fallon	Kelly	Rees
Farbstein	King, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Fascell	Kirwan	Reuss
Flood	Kluczynski	Rhodes, Pa.
Foley	Kupferman	Roberts
Ford, William D.	Kyros	Robison
Fraser	Leggett	Rodino
Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.	Rogers, Colo.
Friedel	McCarthy	Ronan
Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen	Rooney, N.Y.
Gallagher	McFall	Rooney, Pa.
Garmatz	MacGregor	Rosenthal
Gettys	Machen	Rostenkowski
Gialmo	Madden	Roybal
Gibbons	Mahon	Rumsfeld
Gilbert	Mailliard	Ryan
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	St Germain
Goodell	Mayne	Scheuer
Gray	Meeds	Sisk
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Slack
Green, Pa.	Mink	Smith, Iowa
Griffiths	Mize	Smith, N.Y.
Gude	Monagan	Stafford
Halpern	Moorhead	Staggers
Hamilton	Morgan	Steed
Hanley	Morris, N. Mex.	Stubblefield
Hansen, Wash.	Morse, Mass.	Sullivan
Hardy	Mosher	Taft
Hathaway	Moss	Tenzer
Hawkins	Multer	Thompson, N.J.
Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Tieman
Hechler, W. Va.	Murphy, N.Y.	Tunney
Helstoski	Nedzi	Udall
Hicks	Nix	Ullman
Holifield	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Holland	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik
Horton	Olsen	Vigorito
Howard	Ottenger	Waldie
Hungate	Patman	Whalen
Irwin	Patten	White
Jacobs	Pepper	Widnall
Joelson	Perkins	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Philbin	Charles H.
Jones, Ala.	Pickle	Wolff
Karsten	Pike	Wright
Karth	Pirnie	Wyatt
Kastenmeier	Price, Ill.	Yates
Kazen	Pryor	Young
Kee	Rucinski	Zablocki
	Purcell	

## NOT VOTING—36

Anderson, Ill.	Hanna	Resnick
Annunzio	Hébert	St. Onge
Broomfield	Herlong	Sikes
Button	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Jones, Mo.	Stratton
Derwinski	Macdonald, Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Dole	Mathias, Calif.	Utt
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias, Md.	Wampler
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Everett	O'Neill, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Fountain	Pelly	Willis
Hagan	Pettis	
Halleck		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Hagan for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Mathias of Maryland against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Button against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Dole for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Mathias of California for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Everett with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Halleck.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ZION changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. QUIE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LEGGETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GETTYS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WHITE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WOLFF changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MORTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 187, not voting 40, as follows:

## [Roll No. 375]

## YEAS—205

Adams	Fraser	Morse, Mass.
Addabbo	Frelinghuysen	Moss
Albert	Friedel	Multer
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Arends	Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Gallagher	Nedzi
Aspinall	Garmatz	Nix
Ayres	Gialmo	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Gibbons	O'Hara, Mich.
Bates	Gilbert	Olsen
Bell	Gonzalez	Ottenger
Biester	Gray	Patman
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Patten
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Boggs	Griffiths	Perkins
Bolling	Gude	Philbin
Bolton	Halpern	Pickle
Brademas	Hamilton	Pike
Brasco	Hanley	Pirnie
Brooks	Brasco	Price, Ill.
Brotzman	Brooks	Pucinski
Burke, Mass.	Brotzman	Purcell
Burton, Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Quie
Bush	Burton, Calif.	Railsback
Byrne, Pa.	Bush	Reid, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Byrne, Pa.	Reuss
Cabell	Byrnes, Wis.	Rhodes, Pa.
Cahill	Cabell	Roberts
Carey	Cahill	Robison
Celler	Carey	Rodino
Clark	Celler	Rogers, Colo.
Cleveland	Clark	Ronan
Cohelan	Cleveland	Rooney, N.Y.
Conable	Cohelan	Rooney, Pa.
Conte	Conable	Rosenthal
Corbett	Conte	Rostenkowski
Corman	Corbett	Roybal
Culver	Corman	Ryan
Daddario	Culver	St Germain
Daniels	Daddario	Scheuer
Dawson	Daniels	Schneebeli
Delaney	Dawson	Schweiker
Dellenback	Delaney	Schwengel
Dent	Dellenback	Selden
Diggs	Dent	Sisk
Dingell	Diggs	Slack
Donohue	Dingell	Smith, Iowa
Downing	Donohue	Smith, N.Y.
Dulski	Downing	Springer
Dwyer	Dulski	Stafford
Eckhardt	Dwyer	Steed
Edmondson	Eckhardt	Sullivan
Edwards, Calif.	Edmondson	Taft
Eilberg	Edwards, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Erlenborn	Eilberg	Tenzer
Esch	Erlenborn	Thompson, N.J.
Evans, Colo.	Esch	Tieman
Fallon	Evans, Colo.	Tunney
Farbstein	Fallon	Udall
Fascell	Farbstein	Ullman
Feighan	Fascell	Van Deerlin
Flood	Feighan	Vanik
Ford, Gerald R.	Flood	Vigorito
Ford, William D.	Ford, Gerald R.	Waldie
	Ford, William D.	Whalen



White  
Widnall  
Wilson,  
Charles H.

Wolf  
Wright  
Wylder  
Yates

Young  
zablocki

# **NAYS—187**

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Baring  
Battin  
Belcher  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blackburn  
Blanton  
Bow  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brown, Calif.  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Fla.  
Burleson  
Burton, Utah  
Carter  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Colmer  
Conyers  
Cowger  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Denney  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Dorn  
Dowdy  
Duncan  
Edwards, La.  
Eshleman  
Evins, Tenn.  
Findley  
Fino  
Fisher  
Flynt  
Foley  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis  
Gardner

# **NOT VOTING—40**

Anderson, Ill.  
Annunzio  
Boland  
Broomfield  
Button  
Collier  
Derwinski  
Dole  
Dow  
Edwards, Ala.  
Everett  
Fountain  
Goodell  
Hagan

Halleck  
Hanna  
Hébert  
Herlong  
Hosmer  
Jones, Mo.  
McMillan  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathias, Md.  
Meeds  
Miller, Calif.  
O'Neill, Mass.

Pelly  
Pettis  
Resnick  
St. Onge  
Sikes  
Smith, Calif.  
Stratton  
Teague, Tex.  
Utt  
Wampler  
Watts  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis

Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Pettis against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Wampler against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.

Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. Watts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Everett with Mr. Halleck.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# **GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS**

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

# **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader if he could give Members any indication or guidelines concerning the program for the rest of the week including the consideration of the poverty program and the possibility of business on Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me to reply to this inquiry?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we will begin now the reconsideration of the OEO bill. Tomorrow we have to consider a conference report, I think it is the conference report on the public works appropriation bill which will be the first order of business tomorrow. Then we will return to the consideration of the OEO bill.

It is our purpose, and the distinguished gentleman and I have discussed this matter, and discussed it with the Speaker, that if we do not finish the poverty bill by tomorrow evening to put over further consideration of that bill until Monday next.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I think one of the critical questions being asked is whether we are going to reach a point tomorrow or today, when we have finished the general debate, and will start reading the bill for amendment. It would appear that with the two conference reports, one which we have completed, and another one before us, and with almost 3 hours of general debate, if we are going

to do that we are going into the evening hours and it would help a great deal if the Members could have some concept as to whether you plan to start reading the bill for amendments.

Mr. ALBERT. I am not in a position at this hour to advise the gentleman as to when we are going to start reading the bill for amendment. But, of course, the leadership will be governed this evening by the leadership of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GOODELL. Is there any particular concept at this point as to when the committee will rise today?

Mr. ALBERT. I should say that we should rise at a normal hour today. But I am making that statement on my own responsibility.

I am going to confer with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking Member and with the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Speaker with reference to that. But I see no reason not to make it just a normal day—and I say that, as I said, speaking for myself.

# **FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8569. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8569) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SPONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

# **ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMEND- MENTS OF 1967**

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Fountain against.  
Mr. Bolland for, with Mr. Sikes against.  
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Hagan against.  
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Willis against.  
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Utt against.  
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Smith of California against.  
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Collier against.  
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Dole against.



on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

-Mr. ROONEY of New York. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] had 1 hour and 40 minutes remaining, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] had 1 hour and 11 minutes remaining.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am enthusiastically in favor of the entire program, but I shall address myself in particular to title VIII of the bill at this moment. Subsequently I shall have an amendment relating to section 406 which would assign responsibilities which, in my judgment, properly belong to the Small Business Administration, back to them.

Mr. Chairman, title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act, as presented to the House in this bill, amends, improves, and strengthens one of the strongest and least controversial parts of the entire poverty effort—the VISTA program.

As in the Peace Corps, which is probably the most widely praised part of all our Nation's efforts abroad, so in the VISTA program, the basic willingness of Americans to ask what they can do for their fellow human beings, has been demonstrated from one end of this Nation to another. Americans of all ages, of all walks of life, have left the comfort of their homes, the security of their classrooms or their retirement cottages and have gone where they had to go, where their compassion and their need to serve have insisted they go.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because, in a sense I agree with those who contend that the VISTA volunteers are not truly volunteers. The VISTA worker who has gone to live in a slum or on an Indian reservation, or in an Appalachian valley or an Eskimo village, is not moved by his own whims. He is not doing this for kicks, Mr. Chairman. He has been drafted by an authority from which there is no appeal—he has been forced into this kind of work by his own conscience, the most difficult force any of us can ever have to resist. Paul Claudel tells us:

Youth is made for heroism, not for pleasure.

The quiet, unglamorous heroism of the VISTA volunteer is the final and irrefutable answer to those who would try to persuade us that this generation of young Americans are a bunch of irresponsible, self-serving beatniks. The hippie may get the headlines, the New Left may get the television coverage, but the young people—and not only the young but the middle-aged and the elderly people, too, Mr. Chairman—are far better represented by the VISTA volunteer than by the Dupont Circle dropouts.

Let us take a look, Mr. Chairman, at some of the VISTA volunteers:

In Delray Beach, Fla., 21-year-old Jim Hall of Everett, Wash., has organized a tutoring program for the children of migratory farmworkers. He has recruited something like 300 education majors at Florida Atlantic University who work as tutors in 10 migrant camps, at no expense to the taxpayers. Although Jim Hall has completed his VISTA service, the tutoring project remains a part of the curriculum at Florida Atlantic.

Fletcher Low, a 73-year-old former college professor, once a pitcher for the Boston Braves and very recently a Republican member of the New Hampshire State Legislature, is tutoring Job Corpsmen at Tremont Job Corps Center in Townsend, Tenn., in math and English.

Jim Rayburn, of Charlotte, N.C., is 24 years old. He was assigned to work in Houston, Tex., in an area known as the Bottom. To prosperous, bustling Houston, the Bottom was the home of 800 apathetic poor Mexican-Americans and Negroes. The population has not changed that much since Jim Rayburn came there, but apathy has fled.

Jim was one of the chief influences in founding the People's Civic Club, a neighborhood group which is working to improve the neighborhood. The club obtained playground equipment, collected food for the neighborhood's neediest residents at Christmas, and sponsored a clean-up campaign.

Last January, Mayor Louie Welch of Houston announced "Project Partner," in which the city and the Civic Club are working together to help the people of the Bottom do for themselves what needs to be done. Mayor Welch's assistant gives VISTA great credit for bringing the partners together. Jim may hail from North Carolina, Mr. Chairman, but in this case, once again, the name Rayburn stands for service to the State of Texas and to America.

Arlene Isaacson, of Beverly, Mass., has been working with the Valley Migrant League in West Stayton, Oreg. With other VISTA volunteers, Arlene persuaded the Marion County Health Association to hire two doctors for a free clinic for crop pickers, many of whom had never seen a doctor before in their lives. The clinic, financed under the Migrant Health Act, has provided medical services for hundreds of migrant workers.

Not content with this, Arlene and her fellow volunteers also persuaded optometry students at Pacific University to provide eye examinations for an entire migrant camp. When many children and adults in the camp were found to be in need of glasses, the volunteers found them for a nominal fee.

Dr. Catherine Nutterville, of Roseburg, Oreg., is working here in the District of Columbia to teach young slum dwellers their rights and their responsibilities under the law. Dr. Nutterville, a retired teacher and clinical psychologist, at the age of 79 has begun a new career of bringing her knowledge and abilities to the service of her fellow men, and our neighbors in this Capital City.

There are others, Mr. Chairman. There are a long list of Americans, young and old, from rich homes, from middle-class

homes, and yes, some from the poor communities as well, who have answered the call to service which VISTA has extended.

A great grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt, the son of a Member of this body, the daughter of one and the niece of another Republican Senator, the son of a member of President Eisenhower's cabinet, the nephew of a prominent Republican Governor—these are some of the young people from famous American families who have gone into VISTA. There is an interesting footnote on this, Mr. Chairman. I have not named these volunteers, not because their parents are not proud of them, indeed they are, but because these volunteers, in so many cases, have asked that their family connections not be publicized simply because they want to do what they are doing and make the contribution they are making, on the strength of their own ability and dedication.

These kids are not publicity seekers or thrill seekers. They are not, I reiterate, VISTA volunteers because it is fashionable. They are in this service because their conscience demands it.

These are the men and women who have answered the challenge to service in the VISTA program. Their country is in their debt.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there will be many amendments offered to title VIII, the VISTA sections of this bill. The bill before us makes some amendments to existing law, and makes them with the enthusiastic support of both majority and minority members of the committee.

The major changes are to be found in part B of the title, which expands VISTA's authority to mobilize auxiliary, part-time and special volunteers, either working part of each day, or for short periods of full-time service, and working for the most part in or near the communities of which they are residents. This is not a new concept, but this year's bill gives it a firmer legislative base.

Our colleagues on the minority side, and particularly the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUINN] claim, and indeed deserve, great credit for the major part they have played in the furthering of this concept. Not every American whose conscience demands from him a contribution to the war on poverty is able to leave his home for a year. But there are dark corners of our society in every city, in every State, within walking distance of every well-kept suburb. The home town VISTA concept is one which will enable us to tap this rich vein of sacrifice that underlies the American character in even greater profusion than we have done with the full-time volunteer program thus far.

The volunteers themselves are an impressive tribute to the program. But let us look, also, at the impact which VISTA has had in various parts of the country. In West Virginia, VISTA volunteers working with a statewide mental health program have saved the State and the taxpayers of the State, an estimated \$486,000 by working with mental hospitals and in communities. That figure, Mr. Chairman, is the informed estimate of



Dr. H. Mitchell Bateman, director of the West Virginia Department of Mental Health, and it was made last June 10. In this letter in which he set forth this estimate, Dr. Bateman said:

A most significant result of VISTA service in the Department of Mental Health in West Virginia is that we are now planning a three-year program to recruit and train local workers from the poverty level who will be employed to render the same kinds of services VISTA's give today.

In VISTA's rural Santa Clara project, in California, it is reliably estimated that VISTA workers have generated a direct benefit to the community of \$1.8 million.

In New Hampshire, 33 VISTA volunteers have spent 29,500 hours and reached 16,000 people—80 percent of whom have become active participants in such activities as Headstart, Upward Bound, NYC, Senior Citizens' Clubs, and the like. To the net income in New Hampshire, \$243,600 annually has been added.

In Arizona, 2,000 migrant children have been enrolled in VISTA preschool programs.

In Pittsburgh, VISTA has assisted 5,000 residents of a poverty area in establishing a credit union.

In Texas, 11,000 seasonal workers have been interviewed by VISTA volunteers, 5,000 TB examinations administered, and 600 children given care in VISTA-manned clinics.

In California, 2,000 youths and adults participate in 100 VISTA-run recreation programs.

A Las Vegas slum now boasts a 5,000 volume library established by VISTA volunteers.

In North Carolina, more than 1,000 children participated in summer-long tutorial programs organized by VISTA in six communities. The average daily attendance at these programs was 661 children, and the tutoring was offered by 496 North Carolinians who offered their time to the VISTA-organized project without cost. This project's total cost added up to 72 cents per child per day.

The States of California, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Florida have VISTA bail bond projects, in which volunteers undertook the heavy case load of interviewing prisoners. It is estimated that these four projects alone saved these States in excess of \$2 million.

I could go on like this. I could mention VISTA programs in 49 of the 50 States, and in every State, I could quote from citizens and public officials who will praise VISTA to the skies.

Let me quote just a few. The Governor of North Carolina, Hon. Dan K. Moore, says:

The contribution being made by VISTA Volunteers to the people of North Carolina is deeply appreciated.

The Governor of Montana, Hon. Tim Babcock:

I do hereby salute these unselfish Volunteers in Service to America.

The mayor of Richmond, Va., Hon. Morrill M. Crowe:

In recognition of the sacrificial work and inspirational leadership of VISTA, I urge the citizens of Richmond to catch the idealism

of these gifted and dedicated people, to cooperate with them in their noble endeavors to serve the poor and the unfortunate.

The mayor of Davenport, Iowa, Hon. John H. Jebens:

The efforts of individuals who live and work with the poor is one of the most effective means of combating poverty.

The mayor of Detroit, Hon. Jerome Cavanagh:

The potential inherent in the Volunteers in Service to America program certainly was realized in Detroit following our recent riot.

Even before the rioting had ended, some of the almost 200 VISTA workers assigned to Detroit began arriving.

During the emergency, the volunteers helped in practically all phases of recovery. They assisted in emergency food distribution. They helped with the basic clean-up necessary throughout the inner city. They drove trucks removing rubble from the inner city and bringing emergency supplies back into the troubled area. They helped with legal services provided those involved in the rioting and assisted the courts in the processing of cases arising from the disturbance. They gave emergency assistance at Detroit General Hospital where most riot injury cases were taken. And they formed a large part of the post-riot Rat Patrol, mixing and placing rat poison in areas of widespread destruction where the danger of rats had increased.

One of the most important post-riot tasks was handled almost exclusively by the VISTA workers. This was a door-to-door census of the riot area in an attempt to identify victims of the riot and their problems. This information was organized by Detroit's Community Action Agency, the Mayor's Committee for Human Resources Development (HRD), which sent its workers to assist those persons in need.

The volunteers were hard-working, energetic, dedicated and, without exception, they were a credit to their program.

Again I thank you and each of the volunteers who helped.

One further observation, Mr. Chairman. In this Congress in particular, cost and cost effectiveness is a major consideration whenever we take up a bill. On no program has the question of cost been more persistently, and, indeed more properly, raised than on the poverty program.

VISTA's record in this respect has been a proud one. Over the past 3 years, there has been a steady reduction in the per unit cost of recruiting, training, and supporting a VISTA volunteer in the field.

In 1966, the per unit cost—the entire VISTA budget divided by the yearend volunteer strength—was \$8,520. In 1967, the per unit cost was reduced to \$6,995, an 18 percent reduction. And in 1968, the per unit cost is expected to go down by another 10 percent to \$6,288.

In my judgment \$6,288 is a very small price to pay for the kind of service the people of this Nation receive from a VISTA volunteer. By way of comparison, we might examine what it really costs to employ and backstop a teacher or a social worker.

The Office of Education advises that the average teachers' salary is \$6,820 per year for 9 months service. But to recruit, to train, to pay the administrative backup expense that the hiring of one teacher commits a community to, costs an additional \$5,000. In one large Western city, which is justly proud of

its educational system, the per unit cost of a school teacher, if calculated the same way I have just calculated the per unit cost of a VISTA volunteer, would be \$14,000 for 9 months service—more than twice what it costs for the 12 months' service of a volunteer.

If we want to turn to professional social workers, the average salary is \$8,200 per year. Adding in the other costs, the per unit cost of professional social work is \$12,240 per year—not quite twice the cost of a VISTA volunteer.

I do not say this to downgrade teachers or social workers or indicate that I think they are overpaid. On the contrary, I think there is no competent teacher in this country who is, or even could be paid adequately for the incredibly important task we give them. And few if any are adequately paid even by the normal standards of the market place. I point to these contrasts simply to suggest what a fantastic bargain you and I and every American taxpayer is getting when we invest \$6,200 in a VISTA volunteer.

Mr. Chairman, the VISTA program hardly needs defense on this floor. In every part of this country, it has fervent defenders. It has advocates an eager customers among the Nation's mayors and Governors. It has the support of Republicans and Democrats, of conservatives and liberals. It is defended, if defense is needed—let me say rather, Mr. Chairman, it is exemplified—by the best of America's young people.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, my respected colleague from Oregon yesterday stated that many of our people are caught in the eye of a social hurricane. My only quarrel with her statement is that it falls short of recognizing the breadth of America's present predicament. All of America lies in the path of the devastating winds that have begun to blow—I have no fear whether America will survive the blasts that are beginning to blow. But I do fear for the changes that we will find when the winds abate—for the destruction that will have been wrought, not just to property, but to the relationships between Americans.

And if we do not somehow reach the winds at their source—if we do not, while we still can, separate and divert and calm the winds of unequal education and insufficient job opportunities and inadequate housing that blow on much of America, these winds will converge and join together. And all of us, whatever our politics and whatever the color of our skin and whatever the level of our education or the size of our bank accounts, all of us will be in the path of the resulting blast and will be injured—perhaps not fatally, but certainly seriously.

The Economic Opportunity Act was not conceived as a panacea for all of America's ills—even for all of the ills of the poor. It was originally intended as an act to create exactly what its name



implies—economic opportunities for the poor. It was not intended as a shotgun, to reach with inadequate aid and insufficient force all of America's social problems. It was intended as a rifle that would zero in on the target of lack of jobs for the poor and try to strike that target with adequate aid and sufficient force to have a real effect. It has failed to do so in large part because the original purpose of the act has been lost in a broad-scale dream that, perhaps understandably, sought to make of the act a different caliber weapon than the blueprints called for it to be and sought to change its target, and ended by rendering it ineffective to do even that which it was capable of doing really well.

If you listened to certain of those who spoke during debate yesterday, you would think that on one side were the forces of good attacking the causes of poverty, and on the other side the forces of evil attacking the war on poverty. That obviously is not true.

Both sides agree there is a problem. The real question is whether all of the present law's expensive, ineffective programs are going to be continued as is, or whether we are going to succeed in making some meaningful and badly needed improvements in applicable present law.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] yesterday indicated that there were at issue before us only two questions—one, the amount of money to be authorized, and two, the so-called Green amendment. These are points at issue, but they involve only two of the changes which we feel should be made in the bill before us.

In addition, we propose a number of other amendments which will serve to improve and redirect the aim of the poverty program. They include:

First. A material increase in involvement of all aspects of our free enterprise economy.

Second. A reduction in Federal fund appropriations, coupled with change in application of such funds to serve as seed money so that total funds devoted to restructured programs will increase.

Third. An increase in State involvement, both in planning and in implementation.

Fourth. A restructuring of community action programs to place increased emphasis on jobs and improved training therefor for people who want to work.

Fifth. A phasing over of Job Corps into vocational education, including residential centers, with resulting drastic reduction in unit costs.

Sixth. A transfer of basic responsibility for educational programs like Headstart to the Department of HEW, with retention of parent involvement and of tie to local community.

Seventh. A restructuring of community action agency boards to retain involvement of the poor and to increase involvement of local government, industry, labor, and community agencies.

Eighth. An elimination of political activities by community action agencies.

Ninth. Some allocation of funds between programs for urban poor and programs for rural poor.

Tenth. The creation of a Council of Economic Advisers to the President.

Eleventh. The creation of a military career training program.

Mr. Chairman, there was discussion yesterday by members of the committee of the so-called Green amendment, to sections 210 and 211. May I just in passing comment briefly on a couple of the aspects thereof. May I comment on two of the impacts in the city of New York that would arise from this particular amendment. One, the 51-person limit on community action boards would seriously cripple some of the 15 community action agencies that have already been established in that city.

Second, the flat requirement for one-third public official membership on each of these boards will, again, serve to seriously cripple most of these boards in New York City which have already been established.

In addition, this amendment proposes control of the community action agencies by local officials. The program which we propose would provide for increased involvement of local officials, but without absolute control on the part of local officials.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who sat through the committee hearings on this particular measure are aware of the fact that witness after witness after witness testified that one of the great advantages that came from the OEO was innovation. And it is our deep concern that if there be not only involvement of local officials, but if active control of community action be handed over to local officials, we will be destroying, or going a long way toward destroying, this innovation which has been so effective up until this point.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the supposed bypassing feature of the Green amendment. At the proper time when we can go into the details of this amendment, I propose that we examine very carefully the particular provisions of sections 210 (a) and (d). The question should be raised as to what would happen if a State had submitted a plan and it had been approved and reviewed, and that State refused or failed to move forward under that plan. What then would happen insofar as bypassing this particular State is concerned?

Permit me to say this, as I draw toward the conclusion of my remarks. The restructuring of community action provided for in the opportunity crusade is more than a change of language.

We are here talking about basically redirecting this program in the direction of jobs. We have inserted a provision for the creation of job opportunity boards; we have inserted a provision for the creation of an independent Youth Corps; we have provided that there must be a certain percentage of the money involved in community action devoted not to peripheral problems, but zeroed in upon the primary purpose of jobs, job training, and job placement.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that the Congress not only be aware that there are special problems faced by both the urban poor and the rural poor in America, but that the Congress also demonstrate its capacity and deep desire to propose soundly conceived programs in order to help in the elimination of the

problems which cause such poverty. We seek support from both sides of the aisle as we attempt in amendments here on the floor to correct the weaknesses and improve the effectiveness of this phase of our national struggle with the problems of our disadvantaged.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, there are over 4,000 Volunteers in Service to America living in poverty neighborhoods around the country. On October 23 those VISTA volunteers were issued their last paycheck. That paycheck, a very meager one, pays for their food and their rent. Unless Congress acts, they will receive no more money.

We see today a situation where the very people who were to help America's poor must now be helped by those same poor. Across the country, VISTA's are being taken in by the people in the neighborhoods they serve. They are being provided with food and lodging by the very people they were sent to help.

The VISTA's have not left those neighborhoods. Hundreds of telegrams and letters have affirmed their desire to remain where they are to continue to work for the poor. I myself received a letter from a 79-year-old woman who until recently was a VISTA volunteer. Dr. Catherine Nutterville spent her life working in teaching and in clinical psychology. She chose not to retire but to volunteer her services to help others. While assigned to the neighborhood legal services project here in the District, she prepared a booklet entitled "How To Make Rights and Responsibilities Meaningful to the Poor."

The book contains programs which will teach slum children their legal and human rights. It also teaches them their responsibilities to the law. The ideas in that booklet were used in a program for sixth-grade students at the Nichols Elementary school in the spring of 1966. The program was so successful that it was expanded to include six additional schools in the District.

The services of people like Dr. Nutterville are valuable to our country. And yet today those people must rely on the goodwill of their neighbors to survive. I would like to read you the letter that Dr. Nutterville sent to me. It shows how people who have dedicated their service to our country feel about that service being lightly thrown away:

NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES PROJECT,  
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1967.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ARNOLD: I am deeply distressed about the status of the VISTA workers in Washington. As you know, for two years I was one of them. I cannot be comfortable knowing that those VISTA workers are cut off from their very meager living allowances.

All of them are from other parts of the United States and do not have the security of depending either upon relatives or friends in a crisis where their very existence is challenged.



My first reaction this morning was to attempt to call one of them and ask her to consider my meager apartment her home during this crisis; this would be only a "drop-in-the-bucket." My next idea was to start a fund that would meet, in part, this immediate crisis. That I may still do. I have an appointment tomorrow that may bring about plans for such a "passing of the hat."

I am dismayed that these volunteers who have come into this program seriously dedicated to the needs of the poor should find themselves in such a position as that described in the morning Washington Post. I am sure that the American people will not accede to such treatment of the VISTA Volunteers.

I am taking this drastic method of getting this message to you immediately. I shall not go into detail but you will know by the time you read it what I have done.

I shall be in my office all of this afternoon and if there is any message you wish to convey to me do not hesitate to have someone call me. I know that you are "in session" now.

With my fullest confidence, I am always,  
Sincerely yours,

CATHERINE NUTTERVILLE,  
Volunteers In Service To America,  
Veteran 1965-67.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967. As all of my colleagues know, I have been a strong supporter of the war on poverty because I felt in my heart that it was good for this Nation. It is for this same reason that I have voted in this House for programs which benefited parts of this Nation far removed from the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey. Today, however, for the first time in my career I take this floor to plead with my colleagues to aid my friends and neighbors in my native Jersey City, where I have lived for all of my 59 years.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this House has read the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "The War Against the Poverty War."

I think that this editorial points out the desperate situation in Jersey City where CANDO, our community action program, is now totally out of funds. As the editorial points out, by Thanksgiving some 35 other community action programs will be in the same shape as we are in Jersey City.

Mr. Chairman, the poverty program is going on in Jersey City with anti-poverty workers continuing in the jobs because they believe in the Congress of the United States—because they believe that this great House will do its duty to America's poor. The poor in Jersey City do not believe that this House will be blind to their needs. I hope that their faith and the hopes of the 10,000 families in Jersey City are not going to be dashed on the shoals of partisan politics and indifference.

Mr. Chairman, this program is not perfect—no program ever enacted was

or can be perfect—but it is, despite any shortcomings, a good program and it is one which has performed notable work, not just in Jersey City, but all over the State of New Jersey and throughout each of these United States.

Through the Office of Economic Opportunity we have served more than a quarter million persons in my own State.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you some of the impact this program has had in New Jersey. At this time, Mr. Chairman, each of New Jersey's 21 counties have community action programs. Six counties have VISTA volunteer programs. Three counties have Job Corps camps. Nineteen counties have Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. All of our counties had Headstart programs during the summers of 1965, 1966, and 1967. Nineteen counties had adult basic education programs. Seven counties have work experience projects. Five counties have small business loan programs. Seventeen counties have rural loan programs.

New Jersey has a vital share in this program, and this despite the fact that we are in the upper quarter of the States in terms of per capita income. Our State is unique in that we have both great pockets of wealth and areas where dismal poverty is a fact of life. Every Member has had impressed upon him just how bad conditions can be in the pockets of poverty which exist within the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I know from my own personal experience that our antipoverty efforts in New Jersey are reaching the poor and the disadvantaged. I know also it is a great spurt of help and encouragement to many who have been deprived of the goods things of this life because of prejudice, lack of opportunity, or unfamiliarity with the English language. I am now making my appeal to those Members of this House who may have honest doubts about this program but who will look at this program objectively. I can assure each of you that this program is vitally needed in our great urban areas. I cannot urge upon you too strongly the need to support the committee bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant feeling to oppose the majority views of my committee which has labored faithfully and diligently to recommend a bill which might be both workable and approvable. In two areas, however, serious changes have been made which, while not improving the chances for final passage, would wipe out great gains we have made in the war against poverty. These are referred to as the Green amendment on community action structures, and the Gibbons amendment to require 20-percent non-Federal financial participation, one-half of which must be in cash.

The Green amendment wipes out involvement of the poor in policymaking; the Gibbons amendment eliminates them

in program operation. With such friendly amendments little room is left for bad ones except in reducing the already inadequate authorized appropriations. Such amendments will lengthen the seasons of the long hot summers.

The Green amendment seeks in an antipoverty bill not to improve the position of the poor but to protect elected officials who themselves are not seeking such protection.

First, the Green amendment changes selection of representatives of the poor by the residents of poverty areas—page 89 of the report—to their selection by elected officials although the language vaguely makes reference to "democratic selection procedures"—page 174, S. 2388.

Already the poor have been too long deceived for us not to clearly spell out precisely what they may expect. If we do not intend for them to name their own representatives, let us not delude them into believing so while making them subservient at the same time to elected officials.

Second, the Green amendment—section 211(c), page 175, S. 2388—goes far beyond the official community action governing board in requiring that even community boards or councils that advise on policy or administration of programs shall also include one-third public officials. For public officials already overworked this might well become known as the tired blood amendment. Policy-wise it is an invasion of the autonomous and indigenous character that should remain with community groups seeking self-help and self-determination.

The Green amendment also violates sound public policy on separation of legislative and administrative duties. Busy and sincere public officials might better leave to others membership on antipoverty boards. Politically they would be wise to do so.

The October 31 issue of the Washington Post carried an article entitled "U.S. Riots Blamed on Cities." The article indicated that the Presidential Commission on Civil Disorders in its interim report expected about January 1, 1968, "will put primary emphasis on realigning and improving municipal government" as a result of its findings that "the lack of responsiveness of most city administrations to the problems of ghetto residents" was a major cause for last summer's "riots."

I do not believe local government alone should be blamed but if these disorders in 107 cities last summer were caused to any substantial extent by the reaction "of an alienated community to unresponsive city government," then we should carefully reevaluate the role of cities under the Economic Opportunity Act before changing the law in a way that may further alienate the poor from their elected officials.

Poverty is a critical national problem which demands something more than the casual attention of local governments that out of necessity often subordinate problems affecting the poor to other interests backed by strongly organized groups. Hopefully, such cities as Chicago, St. Louis, and Pittsburgh have done an excellent job.



But most of our cities are already overburdened with noise, growth, congestion, pollution, crime, tax, and school problems. Operating an antipoverty program is a full-time activity of its own that demands something more than overburdened cities can now provide in time and leadership.

Perhaps this is why the cities themselves did not seek this new agency responsibility of the Green amendment even though they had available over 26 days of public hearings. Actually the U.S. Conference of Mayors opposed "requiring local CAP's being either units of government or private nonprofit corporations." In other words, they want the flexibility of existing law so that they can move ahead with programs already developed by broadly based community action agencies.

It seems that local public officials are wiser than we are in resisting a restructuring at this time that will not only result in confusion and delays but which also are likely to produce reactions of social disorders and even more violence.

The amendment referred to follows:

Amendment to S. 2388 offered by Mr. HAWKINS: Beginning with line 5 on page 171, strike out everything down through line 9 on page 172, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**"COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

**"SEC. 210. (a) A 'community action program' is a program which—**

**"(1) mobilizes and utilizes in an attack on poverty resources, public or private, of any community;**

**"(2) provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;**

**"(3) is developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the group served; and**

**"(4) is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency (other than a political party) or a combination thereof (hereinafter referred to as a 'community action agency').**

On page 173, strike out lines 4 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**"(d)(1) The Director shall not approve or continue to fund a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.**

**"(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership. The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor. In communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree."**

Beginning with line 1 on page 174, strike out everything down through line 15 on page 176.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, we must bear constantly in mind, I believe, during these deliberations, that this Nation is facing its most serious domestic crisis since the Civil War. It is a crisis that, more than hot summers and cities in turmoil, involves rights and opportunities of 30 million Americans too long deferred.

Any cutback in funds below the \$2 billion request of the OEO would attest to the poverty of this House's commitment. It would break faith and it would dash a solemn commitment and a solemn promise made to America's poor; our defenseless, disadvantaged, and poverty ravaged.

Rather than making coherent progress toward solving their consuming problems, our cities' plight daily grows more grave. The fact is that our unemployment rate is up for the second consecutive month and that more than 8 million wage earners are employed at jobs that do not maximize their earning potential—if they are employed at all. There are still, and I repeat, 30 million Americans living in poverty—and data released last week by the President indicates that the percentage of those non-white slum families with incomes below the poverty level has remained constant at about 36 percent over the last 6 years. In New York City, however, that percentage increased from 28 percent in 1960 to 35 percent today.

Clearly, our principal need is for more job opportunities—employment of permanence and substance, based on meaningful on-the-job training programs that not only upgrade skills but, as well, identify potential, so that an individual may climb the ladder of increased skills until he is realizing the full measure of that potential. The significance of this need is made even more poignant—lest there be any doubt—by figures just released by the Department of Labor which indicate that in September and October there was a decline of 88,000 in the number of jobs available and yet an increase of 300,000 in the number of those actively seeking work.

Our urgent task is to bring these figures more nearly into balance and to reach those now without those necessary skills and without hope.

The poverty program has made progress in a number of areas—and has the potential and the creativity of approach, given improvement, to make further strides.

We must not subject to destructive debate the already totally inadequate authorization for this program. Nor can we give serious consideration to amendments that may well cripple the operation of this program. A spirit of innovation and a capacity for creativity has characterized several of the endeavors undertaken through the antipoverty program, and we must permit these to go forward:

Headstart has changed the future for more than 2 million youngsters.

The legal services program has assured the poor the right to equal justice which more fortunate Americans have so long enjoyed.

Neighborhood health centers have helped to break the vicious cycle of poor health and poverty for residents of 35 low-income areas.

Upward Bound has opened the doors of a higher education to some 27,000 young men and women whose potential might not otherwise have been recognized and encouraged.

The 700 neighborhood centers established by community action agencies as a multiservice unit have brought a large reservoir of heretofore untapped manpower and services to bear on the total needs of individuals and families.

The Follow Through program, which seeks to provide services of the type offered in Headstart programs to youngsters who have moved on to kindergarten and first grade, is now underway on an experimental basis for some 190,000 children, and holds promise as a meaningful addition to the regular curriculum of educationally deprived children in public schools.

Also, we should recall that there are over 300,000 Americans today providing at least 1 day a week in support of anti-poverty efforts. We should not forget that the conscience of America has been tapped and has been touched, and we should support it.

Mr. Chairman, there are two committee amendments in the bill right now that may well do incalculable damage to the antipoverty program, and particularly to the successful enterprises that I have just mentioned. To bring privately operated community action programs directly under the control of public officials would place the responsibility for innovation with city hall, a place which usually does not radiate creativity and progress, with several exceptions, notably, of course, New York City. Private agencies should be free to pioneer in a whole range of innovations.

Further, the amendment requiring that one-half of the local share be cash—amounting to 10 percent—will effectively rule out participation of many communities whose financial situation precludes or whose officials choose not to obligate tax funds for this purpose. Many of those, no doubt, will be the localities whose residents most need the help and training in community action agencies which CAP could provide.

Yet, no matter how serious, even these could pale in importance if we further reduce the too limited authorization for this bill. To cut back the program to \$1.4 billion—or \$1.2 billion—in the face of the clear need and in the face of our too little honored commitment will demonstrate that this Congress has again turned its back on the cities and that this Congress cares little about the Americans to whom we have made too many unfulfilled promises. As the New York Times has stated:

A retreat now would be a fresh insult to those who have been victims and losers too often.

Let us resolve in this debate to recapture the initiative and press forward in a quest—founded on commitment—to right the wrongs which have too long obtained.



(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased and proud to support the very fine statement of my colleague from New York [Mr. REID], and to urge my colleagues to ponder the compelling logic and necessity of giving full support to the antipoverty funds authorized under S. 2388.

Since 1964, at the inception of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its antipoverty programs, I have supported each and every poverty authorization and appropriation bill to come before this body. Each one of these bills has been met with cries of "mismanagement and inefficiency" in the antipoverty effort, but as the programs have developed, their administration and efficiency have improved.

I certainly agree that the program, even as set out in the bill before us, is not perfect, but as we learn more about the problems of poverty, joblessness, and lack of education, we are improving our approach to solving them.

An example is the Job Corps program, which after its first year of operation was widely criticized for extravagance and mismanagement. I can proudly stand before this body today and say that great strides have been made in the Job Corps—both in its costs and its program success. I have seen firsthand the Job Corps centers in Breckinridge, Ky., and Huntington, W. Va., which are run by my constituent corporations, Graflex and Xerox. Both of these contractors have demonstrated at their respective centers that job orientation of deprived and impoverished men and women can be accomplished at reasonable cost.

By its very nature, the economic opportunity program is the type of effort which cannot be expected to produce dramatic results in the short run. Each of the many facets of this war on poverty is directed toward changing a fundamental aspect of life for some significant portion of our population. The Headstart program, which has been strikingly successful in both Monroe and Wayne Counties, N.Y., which I represent, is intended to arouse the interest of both the child and his parents in the educational process. When Headstart is successful, it is usually the first time that such interest has been aroused in the household. It, therefore, is unrealistic to expect that Headstart would instill in its "graduates" an immediate and unquenchable thirst for knowledge. What may realistically be expected, and what in fact has been achieved in my district and elsewhere, is that the combination of the Headstart and Followthrough programs will enable the educationally deprived to gain the maximum benefit from our educational system.

There are two areas in the bill before us which deserve special mention. First, is the provision under title II which would take from nonprofit, private agencies the direction of community action agencies. I will be the first to admit that there are growing pains, sometimes serious, involved in providing a meaningful role for the poor in the operation of these

programs. But despite blunders and difficulties in administration, we cannot throw up our hands and turn the direction of community action agencies over to city hall. By doing this we remove the independent antipoverty force from a place of influence and prominence in the community, and we make community action agencies more susceptible to political involvement.

The second point is the provision in the committee bill which would require greater cash contributions on the part of localities. As it stands now, local governments can make up a large part of their contribution to the poverty effort in kind, by providing office space and other needed facilities. Every one of my colleagues knows that local tax revenues are stretched to the limit. Many local tax dollars are, in fact, spent as contributions to other Federal programs such as the war against pollution. To require 50 percent of the local share in cash serves only to risk the life of the antipoverty program in localities which are already having difficulty providing the necessary funds.

I know my colleagues will review with care the proposals that are before us. But whatever criticisms are voiced, whatever charges are levied against this effort—none will erase the fact of poverty—both urban and rural—in every region of our land; and none can explain away our responsibility to provide hope, funds, and guidance toward a longrun solution to the presence of poverty.

The specter of last summer's disturbances should turn the head of every Member of Congress toward the realities of poverty in the United States. Sadly, three in every 20 Americans lives in poverty as we meet today. In many millions of impoverished families, the cycle of deprivation, undereducation, and joblessness will persist for at least another generation—because a large percentage of these Americans have not yet been reached by either public or private antipoverty job and education programs.

The Federal antipoverty program, directed by OEO, has focused for the most part on youth—and rightly so. If we are to arrest the cycle of poverty we must prepare the children of the poor for a positive, productive, and self-sufficient role in our abundant society. Through job-orientation programs, through Headstart, Followthrough and other OEO-funded programs, we are doing just that. But let no one be misled into thinking that OEO has reached out and afforded adequate economic and educational opportunity to all of our poor. Many of the local programs have barely scratched the surface of filling the need for attention to impoverished people. It has taken time to find and equip skilled people to staff and execute these programs, and it will take additional funds to extend them to the poor.

We are at a crucial stage in the poverty program. The urban riots of last summer have laid bare the roots of deprivation and indirection of the urban poor. But we have in OEO a structure which, if sufficiently and wisely nourished, can, by providing help and concern where

it is needed, help to snip off these roots, and replant them as roots of productivity and accomplishment more in keeping with the mainstream of America.

It may well be that a few years from now, when the antipoverty effort has matured, and hopefully when the dire need for attention and action on this problem has diminished, we can look toward turning over some of OEO's program functions to long-established Federal agencies. I think it would be a serious mistake to sacrifice the OEO structure at this point. OEO is geared to concentrate, to specialize in problems of the poor. More than ever before, we need the capacity to focus directly on poverty, and to snuff it out. Other larger and longer established agencies have many-faceted responsibilities beyond the problem of poverty. Let us not turn over to the builders the job of rebuilding until after the firemen have put out the fire. OEO's independence in the war on poverty is essential to program success; OEO was built to quench the fire of poverty, and if provided with the tools and money it needs, it can do the job.

It is also appropriate to take this opportunity to note the increased responsibility for the economically deprived which private industry has assumed since the inception of OEO. Industry is to be commended for the initiative it has shown in joining forces with the Federal Government to combat poverty and its consequences. Rochester Jobs, Inc., a nonprofit organization sponsored by some 40 of Rochester, N.Y., leading employers, has made significant progress in placing previously unemployed or underemployed residents of the inner in productive jobs. This example, which can be duplicated many times across the Nation, should be a source of much encouragement to all Americans.

The \$2.06 billion authorized under this bill is only a modest increase in the funding level over last year. We can provide no less, unless we choose to turn our heads from the squalor and misery in our own midst.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say at the outset that I have spent many hours on deep consideration of this bill. I have noted with dismay the large expenditure of moneys and the seemingly small results as the program got underway. Of course, I have not been able to study each program but I seem to have reached a point where I can look at the overall of mistakes and successes from a new vantage point: What is being accomplished in the matter of human values. Let me remind you here that new ventures almost always go through a period of errors of judgment both financially and in the personnel field.

Many years ago a group with which I was associated proposed to establish a magazine for teenage girls. There was not any such thing in existence at the time. The professionals who studied the field advised us we would have to plan for at least 5 years of functioning in the red before the project began to break even and actually pay. Five years. That was



considered a very short period, dealing with a new area.

We have not been operating anywhere near 5 years on the poverty program yet. The so-called poverty bill came into being in 1964. It opened the door to a new world—a world of deep desire to put an end to poverty. I am sure that many people found a Bible phrase echoing in their minds that gave them a sort of alibi: "The poor ye have always with you." Yes, probably they will be with us as long as even the youngest Member now in this House lives. But is that a valid reason to fail to try to lift the youngsters out of the quagmires and the deserts of their lives today? For myself, I do not think it is.

This does not mean that I accept the money wastes and the inadequately prepared personnel as necessary. No, indeed. But I do believe that much has been learned in these some 36 months that will make the going easier. And I believe we should give the whole idea a longer time for what is really an experimental period.

Some of you, I know, are working with youngsters. Have you not found that the one thing you have to do first is prove to them that you care about them and for them? Only then do they listen to your words and watch your actions, absorbing the realities of the examples you become to them.

As a matter of fact, is it not possible that this bill is the result of a guilt consciousness we have been carrying not only for years, but even for centuries? Perhaps the impact of a new sense of responsibility as citizens of a free country has made us attack the problem too emotionally. We seem to have felt that money could be made to answer all needs. But have we not found that it does not answer? We are too impatient to achieve results and try to reach goals with the cold metal of money. How long will it take us to believe that caring, that loving is what is needed, that is the essential ingredient that must be used if we are to help people, both the deprived and the depraved?

How much money have we put into this so-called poverty program, in these 36 months?

The first year—approximately \$800 to \$900 million.

The second year, 1965, \$1,500,000,000—Public Law 89-253.

The third year, 1966, \$1,612,000,000—Public Law 89-794—with a supplement of \$75 million for the summer.

For 1967 we are asked for \$2.06 billion. I am not here in this well to say we must give so huge a sum—certainly not before every effort has been made to cut down and do a better job. We should be able to do much more and do better with less. I am here to say that I cannot live with myself if we stop the doing.

When I was a little girl, my father insisted on my reporting to him each week on what I did with the very large sum of 10 cents, which was my weekly allowance. The first time I took it to him, he was as cross as he could be. I said, "What is the matter? Is it not accurate?" "Yes," he said, "it is accurate." I said, "What is the matter?" He said, "You have used it

all on yourself—you have done nothing for anyone else."

From that day on I have done all that I knew how to do, with the light I had, for people less fortunate than I. Each of life's experiences has given me more light, the inestimable privilege of membership in this great body most of all. Here I have had to reach out into every area of living. With each new revelation there has come a greater sense of the responsibility carried by those who have had opportunity for those who have not.

How to know which way to go, which decision to make? My New England blood keeps my feet on the ground even when my heart cries out for larger giving. I have learned that one has no right to weaken people by too much and too easy giving.

Character building is the basis for all growth. Discipline is needed. This poverty bill has that still to learn, I believe.

These youngsters are working in the Job Corps. We have put in quite a bit of money for them.

We have provided a lot of money, but without the Job Corps the cost would be \$15 million a year in welfare, prison, and other expenses. That is what it would have cost us if they had not gone into the Job Corps.

It is expected that this will produce \$5 million a year in tax revenues.

The 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act place a ceiling of \$7,500 as the amount which can be spent on a single enrollee in a center or a camp.

I want to say something about that. This is not just sending children to school. It is not that by any manner of means. Many of these youngsters have no shoes. Most of them do not have adequate clothing, to make it possible for them to go, with their heads in the air, into a new environment or into a new school.

Why do we send them across the country, to go to different places? We know perfectly well that when a child spends his day with us and then goes home, that child reabsorbs at home faster than he absorbs anything from us in the daytime. It is far better to send them across the country. Yes, it costs more; but it does not cost what it would cost, this \$15 million a year.

We had a Job Corps center in Cleveland that was a disgrace. It was just too bad. Then they changed the personnel, and the new top administrator, the director, was Zelma George, Dr. George. She has her degrees in social welfare and so on.

This is now called the miracle of Ansel Avenue.

I have spent a day there. It is the most wonderful place I was ever in.

Dr. George's attitude toward those young people, and their attitude toward her, makes me very proud—proud that this should have come as a result of a bill passed by the House. She is never through. If a girl wants her, she is there. If there is a need, she is there.

I believe that a great deal of the difficulty in respect to the Job Corps has been the matter of a lack of understanding on our part, because we have assumed it was just going to school, having schoolbooks,

and things like that. No, it is much more than that. These youngsters must have a home. They must have clothing. They must have discipline when they go out and around.

We have extra police, and many things like that, to make the place adequate and safe for the girls, for them to be in that area. It is a very bad area, but so far we have been unable to find any other place to have the center.

There are 350 girls. Seventy percent of them get jobs and keep them. After all, that is pretty good.

I have seen them and I have talked with them. They have done all kinds of things. I have been very proud that this House saw fit to provide that program.

I am not proud of many of the things done as a result of the poverty bill by the poverty people. They have not understood the problem, either. I would just like to shake the ones who have not done well, to put them over my knee and to give them a good firm spanking, because there is no excuse for treating people as some of those youngsters and some of the oldsters have been treated. But we learn, all too slowly, perhaps, but fast enough to be able to feel justified in continuing our effort to share the better things of life with all our increasing ability.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as an individual Member of Congress who feels strongly that we have a problem which must be resolved in the area of poverty, I had hoped that the members of the Education and Labor Committee of this body would be able to hammer out generally acceptable amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act so that this legislation could be adopted by the Congress upon the recommendation of those in the House who are most expert in the field.

Unfortunately, the 1967 Economic Opportunity Amendments, as reported by the Education and Labor Committee, have been strongly criticized by both minority and majority members of that committee. And there is even disagreement within the ranks of the members from each party who serve on that committee.

Apparently, therefore, efforts to amend the legislation by which the program is governed must be hammered out on the floor of the House. This is not always the satisfactory way for the Congress to produce good legislation. But it is my hope that we can work out a bill that will be truly in the interest of the poor and will provide disadvantaged young people with a real opportunity to break out of the ghettos and become useful members of our society. For we all know that brilliance can be bred in poverty as well as in affluence.

We have an obligation to recognize and nurture productive citizenship wherever it may be and see that it has an opportunity to develop. The economic growth and prosperity of our Nation and the world require that human talents be given an opportunity to develop in the



same way we would attempt to develop our other natural resources.

I feel Republican criticism has made every effort to be constructive in the hope of improving the good points of the war on poverty and correcting or eliminating the bad points, with the ultimate aim of trying to salvage the whole program from the stench of politics and bad administration. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also made sincerely constructive suggestions.

Perhaps the best suggestion that has been made thus far was by the Director of the program himself who suggested that he would resign if he did not receive from Congress all that he felt the program should contain. I doubt that this threat from the administrator of the program, which has generally been badly administered, will frighten many Members of Congress away from the exercise of their own good judgment concerning the program.

Personally, I intend to pick and choose very carefully among the many amendments which will be submitted to the House within the next few days, because some of the programs which have received nationwide criticism have worked effectively in communities in my area and some of the programs which have received the widest praise nationally have not been considered as successful or vital in the communities which I represent.

Our primary concern should be how we can break up the hard core of poverty which finds some individuals, some families, or some groups of people in certain localities unable to maintain themselves at economic standards which the rest of society has grown to consider as minimal. We should get down to the business of finding jobs for the poor; and, particularly, we should concentrate on those disadvantaged young people whose lives lie ahead of them. To fail to do so means that the self-sustaining, hard-working American citizen will have to carry the inadequate poor for the rest of their lives.

During the course of this debate, we have frequently heard the Biblical quotation that "the poor are always with us." That may well be true. And there may be a significant segment of our population which we will never be able to reach through self-help programs. But, while most of us are willing to be our brother's keeper, most of us would also like to have our brother be able to keep himself, if at all possible, so that we do not have to carry the added burden. Simply stated, I feel this is what this program is all about. Toward this end, I feel that determination of priorities of community action programs should be made at the local level. After all, where better can the judgments be made about the local needs and opportunities. A program may be most appropriate to the ghetto area of Harlem and highly successful there, but it may be completely inappropriate in the Appalachia area and predictably unsuccessful. I also feel that there should be representation by the poor who have a sincere desire to improve their lot and the lot of others. These poor, who do not want to be poor,

can contribute greatly toward better determinations of what programs and priorities in their communities should be.

In the interests of economy and efficiency, I feel that the administration of Headstart and Job Corps programs should be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps should be administered by Health, Education, and Welfare and/or the Department of Labor.

But it must be remembered that we are facing the real possibility of a severe economic crisis in this country if we do not reduce Federal spending. We are spending in 1 month in Vietnam the total cost of the 1967 OEO amendments. We must make wise and judicious use of the taxpayers' money and not squander it recklessly. We are going to have to cut back on a number of programs, including the war on poverty. Indeed, we have already done so in many vital and worthy areas.

If the OEO program can be administered more economically and efficiently at a lower cost than the \$2.06 billion authorized in the committee bill, then I feel every effort should be made to see that this is done. In my opinion, it would be better to put limited funds into a soundly based program, rather than throw money away on generally unproven or clearly unsuccessful programs and continue to create a bad public reaction to the total OEO program, including some successful and promising areas.

I also feel that the aid and assistance of the private sector of our economy should be enlisted in the war on poverty. For this reason, I have introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job-training programs.

I also want to draw attention to the program originated in Philadelphia by Rev. Leon H. Sullivan—Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC)—in which he thoroughly involved leaders of business and industry. It is a self-help, self-motivated program to train or retrain men and women with untapped talents and unknown skills, who are unemployed or underemployed.

Reverend Sullivan also thoroughly involved the Negro community of Philadelphia in his program and the early financial backing and the ideas came from the people themselves. In the words of Reverend Sullivan:

All manpower programs do not succeed and they fail because they are handed down from the top and the people never identify with the mechanism of the program. OIC came from the people.

The Philadelphia program prepares trainees for jobs that already exist, and the training is realistic, based on advice from companies where they will be employed. It is considered an unqualified success and similar centers are being established across the country. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and business and industrial leaders have expressed interest in it. Within the past 2 weeks the national chamber passed a resolution urging chambers of commerce all over

the country to establish training programs similar to the OIC program.

We can and must involve more voluntary help from the private sector of our economy in resolving the problems of poverty. This is particularly true because of the needs in the poverty area and the desperate fiscal situation of the Federal Government which makes it unlikely that Federal funds alone can meet these needs. More involvement is also desirable from State and local levels of government.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to vote to kill the poverty program. Some program in this area of need should be fostered. But neither do I intend to flinch from the logic of eliminating wasteful and unsuccessful portions of the program, nor from the responsibility of reorganizing it for increased efficiency. Nor, Mr. Chairman, will I be reluctant to vote to reduce the amount of Federal funds which should go into this program at this time, because our Nation's fiscal situation requires that exercise of judgment, and to fail to do so could reduce all Americans to desperate economic circumstances. If we are to have a government which can attempt to resolve the problems of the poor, that government must be an economically sound one.

As public servants, we must have a heart and a hand for the needs of the less fortunate, even when these less fortunate may not seem to deserve our full sympathy. But we must also have a head and a backbone to protect the interest of Federal solvency and the American taxpayers—including some who feel that they are poor—who ultimately pay the bills for such programs.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to read a prepared copy of an analysis of the so-called Goodell-Quie substitute. I would rather just say a few words relative to this serious subject.

Poverty is not hard to define. It starts out first as an inconvenience, progresses to a hardship, and ends up as an affliction. Throughout the lifetime of man there has not come forth an economist or a doctor of any kind who has developed a serum either to prevent it or to cure it. The ancient Athenians tried it with their make work programs. The Romans tried to do something about it with their food programs. But throughout the lifetime of man it appears that as civilization has bettered the general lot of people, somehow or other property has increased in the same proportion.

Poverty is awfully hard for one to understand who has not brushed closely up against it or, in fact, lived with it. So it goes beyond being a political issue to some of us. Perhaps as legislators we do not see a perfect bill before us or a perfect answer to the question of how best to do that which no other civilized nation has ever attempted to do; namely, to eliminate poverty as a way of life. Oh, nations have tried, yes, to alleviate the



miseries of poverty, but in most cases it has been nothing but a program of hand-out relief or some other method of quieting the poverty stricken so that their voices could not be heard. Many of us who have grown up in communities that have died have watched poverty like a creeping paralysis spread over the community and its people. Once prosperous merchants find themselves packing their chattels and leaving the stricken ghost towns. Doctors and lawyers, officeholders. Last are those who have little or nothing to take with them or little or nothing to use or to move out with them or who have no place to go. These become the derelicts who drift into the large urban centers. Then they are identified, because poverty has a way of isolating itself. You do not have to isolate poverty. By its very nature it compels isolation, because we walk past it. If we recognize it, we turn our heads away from it. If we do not recognize it, we go just as happily along. I know that there are going to be many arguments made and many amendments offered. There will be almost as many as there are Members of Congress. I say that because none of us have the answer to poverty as such. We will not believe, either, that anyone else has the answer. This committee does not have the answer, and we would be the first to admit it. I admire the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who plainly said to this House that all new ventures have problems.

And, there are features of the program as it is now in existence and as there will be, no matter what comes from this action on the part of the House and on the part of the other body, they will be objectionable to many people. But, Mr. Chairman, if in the end we achieve some measure of success in doing that which no nation has succeeded in doing—and we are now near the end of the 20th century of man, and yet there are those who demand on this floor that we do in a decade what mankind has no been able to do in almost 20 centuries. No, Mr. Chairman, we will not cure poverty and its causes, yesterday, nor today, nor tomorrow, because it is a self-breeding institution. But if we can make a start, first, by recognizing the symptoms and the disease, we shall be able to come up with a formula that will give to the future an answer to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, what is the good of the great progress which this Nation has made, progress which has been made more than any other nation in the history of the world, toward a greater prosperity, progress which has been made more than any nation on the face of the earth toward a greater personal wealth and more luxury than was ever conceived to be possible for the ordinary citizen?

Mr. Chairman, what good is all this if we, as the gentleman from New York said, have some 30 million of our people living in poverty? Poverty does not only represent the need and demands of the belly; it is also the needs of the mind.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this program while I myself have had serious doubts as to whether our approach was right and that, perhaps, we ought to do nothing but aim toward a job for each family

which is suffering in poverty, I find upon second, third, and fourth thoughts that, perhaps, there has to be more than a job.

Mr. Chairman, I know that insofar as poverty itself is concerned, the matter of the economics of poverty are concerned, that the ills will not be cured until there is an income-producing factor entered into the poverty families. But, Mr. Chairman, I find also that many who are not qualified to be in the poverty area because of the fact that their income must be above the minimal income we have established as a qualification, no less, to be considered in poverty, that amongst these citizens, there are many with incomes far beyond the minimal aim we have set, many who would be described as "poverty families," because they have not had all of the things that make up the complete, as I understand it to be, the complete way of life of those of us in the United States more fortunate and perhaps amongst them, Members of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are those to whom the word "poverty" might bring up some memories, and while today they happen to be treading the great highway of affluence, without any worries about their financial status, their economic well-being, they know that only by a fluke of nature and being at the right place at the right moment, or making the right decision at the right time, they have been denied that great privilege of being counted amongst the poverty-stricken.

Mr. Chairman, there are many in this House who will oppose merely for the sake of opposition. There are those who will sincerely oppose because they believe that we are going down the wrong road. But, there are many who will oppose simply because they believe they can find a political advantage in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, no one can measure the temper of the people to the point that they can establish positively how the people feel about what we are doing in the antipoverty program.

Sure, there are those who have abused the privileges of the positions they have gained under this program, but that you will find right here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just say in closing, before the Members make their final decision, they should just think as they go past one of these slum areas in their district, and think to themselves "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of my remarks I referred to an analysis of the so-called Quie-Goodell substitute. The analysis is as follows:

GOODELL-QUIE SUBSTITUTE FOR TITLE II OF  
H.R. 13894

If ever there was a case that illustrated the dangers of trying to bring a major legislative proposal directly to the floor of the House without the benefit of Committee consideration, this is it. The measure is a disjointed, badly drafted scheme which raises numerous questions. It seems to have resulted from a marathon Hollywood script conference. Every participant has thrown in his own spur-of-the-moment "zowie" idea.

This proposal won't fly; it won't even get off the ground. It's a mixture of uncon-

nected parts, with no center of gravity, no overall design. As might be imagined the drafting problems are numerous and severe.

Before considering the proposal in its various parts, the major problems should be identified.

#### INCOHERENT STRUCTURE—CONFLICTING POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AT FOUR LEVELS

The authors could not finally decide whom they wanted to do what under their proposal. Instead, they've provided something for everyone but the end result is likely to be delay and less for the poor.

#### IRRESPONSIBLE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS

At the lowest level there are Neighborhood Councils and Committees. These neighborhood groups may not only propose programs for their own neighborhoods; they may also veto programs that they don't like, and apparently they can do that even after the programs have started with their blessing. They needn't give any reasons for a change of heart.

Given this absolute power, one would expect the authors to make it very clear who has the responsibility for establishing these councils, what areas they are to serve, when they are to have elections, what is to be done when two factions are in disagreement, and the like. But there isn't one word about any of those things. For all one can tell, a community action agency would be helpless to step in if a neighborhood council or committee collapsed or was seized by one clique or found itself stalemated.

These Job Opportunity Boards deserve separate consideration in their own right, but the first point about them is that apparently the community action agencies have no power to modify or revise the proposals of those highly unrepresentative Boards. At least the proposal gives no basis for claiming such a power.

#### STATE AGENCIES WITH ONLY THE POWER TO CONFUSE AND DELAY

Under this proposal, the States are given great responsibilities. Yet there is hardly anything they can do that the Federal Government cannot undo or modify as it sees fit. The net result is that they have the power to unscramble the community action agency's eggs, but the Federal Government can rescrumble them according to its own liking. What this finally comes down to is the power of the State to delay and confuse a process which is already long and complicated enough.

The States not only define communities and select community action agencies (and/or qualified substitute agencies). They also review and approve or disapprove locally proposed programs, for inclusion in or omission from a State plan. But, again, the Federal Government can disapprove, modify or ignore the plan. Indeed, the Director of OEO can ignore the State agency in which these powers are to be vested and "assume the responsibility of the State agency" in his own right!

No one should think that because the State has final power in these areas, it won't have plenty of political leverage to exert influence over local programs. The ability to delay programs or to disapprove them subject to Federal intervention is in itself a political power. The point is that it is a negative power since the State is not required to contribute one cent of its own resources to community action programs. Irresponsible power is the worst kind. It makes people light-headed and arbitrary.

All responsibility for training, technical assistance, and evaluations in connection with community action programs is placed in the State. Why this should be so is not clear, since States have no special competence in designing or conducting local programs.



On the other hand, the States are not given authority to conduct regional or rural area programs, where everyone concedes that they have a valuable role. The result is that the poorer rural counties are left largely to their own devices.

**FEDERAL SUPERVISION—TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE TO BE MEANINGFUL**

Finally, after a simple proposal for a neighborhood center has navigated this long tortuous passage, it reaches the Director—if it isn't already too late to run the program, he can re-examine it and perhaps do the whole thing over. One might well ask why it reaches him, or conversely, why a State agency has been needlessly interposed when it has not been given the power to contribute anything but delay and confusion.

Furthermore under the structure proposed, it would be impossible to delegate programs to other Federal agencies, if at some future time this should be desired.

**ENDLESS DELAYS—AN OBSTACLE COURSE TO FUNDING**

The substitute proposal will add intolerably to the already lengthy funding process. At present in big cities the preparation, submission, review, approval, and funding of community action programs is nearly a year-round process. In every community it takes at least several months. The substitute proposal adds three more stages which will at least double this time.

Before a community action agency can even approve programs for submission to the State, it must clear them with local neighborhood councils even though those councils are not acting as delegate agencies for the programs. It must also wait for the local Job Opportunities Board to develop manpower programs which may use half or more of the community's allocated funds. At the same time, a qualified substitute agency for the same community may be developing its own proposals, so that neither agency can be sure just how much money is available to it.

The State agency must review the proposed programs and may require modifications. So the whole matter may have to be marched back down the hill again. Moreover, each local program will have to be held up until every other part of the State plan is approved. This is the convoy system where everyone must travel at the rate of the slowest community action agency.

Finally, the proposed program reaches OEO for review. But the Director must review not only several thousand local proposals but 50 different State plans. Moreover, if he disagrees with a State's plan, he must offer it an opportunity to answer his criticism before he decides. And if he finally disapproves a State's plan he must reallocate the money to other States, even though their plans may not anticipate that.

This entire process must be completed before the start of a new fiscal year. This means that the Director must have the manpower to handle an almost incredible traffic jam each spring. He would be unable to space proposals out through 12 months as OEO has tried to do in the past. Assuming that he can do this, the administrative costs will be huge and the time span from local program preparation to final Federal funding will probably be well over 12 months. Moreover, the reallocation authority is really a theoretical one—the funds will have lapsed long before they can be reallocated.

**STATE PLANS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION—A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS AND A FALSE ANALOGY**

The paradox that State governments should be the arbiters of the specific needs and solutions of local communities would be laughed out of any modern State legislature. It goes squarely against the trend to increasing home rule. It is only in Congress, which has no real responsibility for State-local relations, that such a notion would seriously be proposed.

What does it add to the existing statutory framework of community action? Delay, friction and confusion. Delay, because the State's review of local proposals and formulation (subject to reconsideration at the Federal level) cannot help but add another three or more months to the funding process if the State is to take its responsibilities seriously.

There is bound to be friction because the State is not required to contribute any program resources and community residents are bound to resent being told by someone in the State Capitol that they haven't properly conceived their own local problems and needs. Suppose, for example, the community agency proposes to run a legal services program and the State disapproves because the head of the State community action program thinks family planning is more important.

Confusion is certain, because State governments have no competence to assess grass-roots needs and formulate programs to meet them. The sponsors of this proposal recognized that when they proved that the Director could override all or any portion of a State agency's plan and would even assume the functions of the State agency. In other words, the whole idea is hedged. When someone hasn't got the courage of his convictions, it is time to consider whether they are good convictions.

But if the community action agency can appeal over the head of the State agency to the Federal Government, it still has no certainty about where its program proposals stand until the very end of a long process.

Delay, friction and confusion are only part of the problem. Partisan politics are bound to dominate in any case where the parties in control of City Hall and the State Capitol are different. It is ironic that those who have criticized the poverty program for excessive involvement with politics should put forth a scheme which would make such involvement inevitable in virtually every State.

Moreover, each State is to prepare a State "plan"—this sounds like organization. But what would a State "plan" look like? It would not in any sense be a real plan with interlocking and mutually consistent parts. It would almost certainly end up being simply a list of the approved (as modified) proposals for various local communities within the State. It would not bear any resemblance to the State plans for Federal welfare and educational assistance because the community action program doesn't really resemble them. The entire idea is based on a false analogy, as a moment's thought demonstrates.

In the first place, community action is not a single purpose concept. It runs the range from neighborhood health services to legal services to consumer action to day care to manpower programs. Its variety is limited only by resources, ingenuity and outer legal limits. Indeed the substitute proposal recognizes this. Thus, there is no one State department that can provide guidance. For some types of programs, such as consumer action, there may be no competence at all at the State level.

Moreover, unlike welfare and education there is no tradition of State supervision or of State contribution of tax resources. No such contribution is called for by this proposal. Lastly, health, welfare and education problems affect every community, but other problems which the community action program attacks are not universal at all and, even if they were, the solutions will differ immensely between a rural community and a large city. Take legal services, for example. In a rural area, a circuit rider arrangement or a modification of judicare may be the best solution. In a big city neighborhood law offices are more likely to be needed. The type of caseloads will also be different. In one case the local bar may oppose a solution which is embraced in another place. The poor may respond

differently in different areas to the same kinds of programs. Local people best understand these matters.

The State plan is another case of a foolish consistency which can only cause mischief. It takes no account of the changes made by the Committee on Education and Labor to insure a strong voice for local public officials in community action agencies. Nor does it recognize that that bill, with its provisions for Governor's review and State technical assistance, provides plenty of leverage for any State to assist its local communities and secure modification of the occasional proposal that runs counter to basic public policy.

On the other hand, under the substitute proposal the State is not permitted to undertake one vital function for which it clearly does have the best competence that is, to assist sparse rural areas in developing and conducting programs. There is no provision, as in the Committee bill, for the State to serve as a temporary or permanent sponsor of community action in those areas.

**CONFUSING FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS**

Evidently beset by doubts that the States could really discharge the major responsibilities imposed on them under this proposal, the authors have hedged their bets at every point by permitting OEO to overrule, ignore, or bypass the State agency and its plan at every point. Subject to certain procedural requirements, it can—

Disapprove the participation of a State altogether;

Suspend grant to a State agency;

Overrule any action by a State agency;

Assume the responsibilities of a State agency in his own right;

Disapprove in whole or in part a State plan. He can even modify specific local program components or make grants or contracts in disregard of the plan;

Bypass a recognized community action agency and contract with a qualified substitute agency.

What this means primarily is that nothing is ever settled at the State level and the time required to settle it at the Federal level will add substantially to the delays already inherent in the State plan scheme.

It is also a built-in source of friction and uncertainty because it invites second-guessing of the State by the Director and controversy between the two over the standards which the Director is to apply in his review of State plans.

The problem of Federal review is particularly acute because the authors have not done any better in the way of establishing standards for the Director. For all it appears, he can simply second-guess the State, disregard its recommendations, and substitute his own personal standards in doing so. Indeed, his discretion is emphasized at every point in the enumeration of his powers.

It is not uncommon that broad discretion is given to Federal agencies administering grant-in-aid programs, but this is usually in the context of a statute which makes no provision for the State plan. The concept that the State is to have a major responsibility for screening the proposal on which the Federal Government must act implies clear standards and relationships. They are totally lacking here.

**MORE MONEY FOR JOB PROGRAMS—BUT WILL THEY HELP PEOPLE GET JOBS**

As much as 50% of all title II money would henceforth be available only for manpower programs proposed by the local Job Opportunities Boards. The uncertainty arises from the fact that some part of this money would have to be made available for qualified substitute agencies approved under State plans or by the OEO.

This is a drastic shift in the past uses of title II funds. The money set aside for man-



power programs would presumably be in addition to other funds provided expressly for those purposes under other titles of the substitute proposal. Compared to other needs in particular communities, this may be a case of overskill.

In any event, the local Job Opportunities Boards will be grossly unrepresentative both of organized labor and of many other relevant interests within their communities. At least half the membership of those boards must consist of representatives of private employers. The remainder shall be representatives of the poor. In other words, organized labor may be shut out completely from the development of programs which vitally affects its interests. Moreover, there will be no representation of public nonprofit agencies in the community service fields which constitute the second biggest labor market in the country today.

The kinds of programs which Job Opportunities Boards may develop for use of this half of all title II assistance are curious, to say the least. They must be designed to eliminate conditions "which inhibit or prevent the poor from seeking full-time jobs." Those conditions are relatively few: discrimination, physical disability, and the problem of mothers with small children. The basic employment obstacles suffered by the poor are those which prevent them from securing (rather than seeking) decent jobs. The sponsors of this proposal are apparently not concerned with under-employment, substandard wages, and other obstacles to employability of those who seek employment every day.

They certainly are not concerned with substandard wages because they have made no provisions for a minimum wage rate in these programs.

#### SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS WITH THE WRONG EMPHASIS

This proposal makes hash of some of OEO's most successful special emphasis programs. In some cases, only the name remains the same, and sometimes not even that. "Comprehensive Health Services" has become "Basic Health Services" and in the metamorphosis it loses everything of value. Under the new program, only certain named diseases could be treated—these are the very disease areas in which the Federal, State and local governments are already concentrating their resources. To make it worse—these are not the ailments which most seriously plague the poor.

The concept of the comprehensive health services program is to provide a one-stop, one-door operation which would deliver the full-range of medical services. The project integrates existing sources of funds and OEO funds are used to fill the gaps. The idea is to do away with fragmentation which has become so severe that in most cities there are over 25 different clinics or agencies scattered about, each treating a different disease, some treating only children and not their parents and vice-versa.

This bill fails to provide the kinds of support for medical care that is most needed. Instead, it duplicates existing programs in a way that perpetuates all their widely recognized faults.

In the subsection on day care, the sponsors have added requirements which they failed to think through. First, preference for day care benefits is given to those who are receiving benefits under other specific Federal assistance programs relating to job training or placement. Superficially the idea has merit, but it ignores the fact that there are many women who are not in such programs but are receiving similar non-Federal benefits and there are others who, even without such benefits, could support themselves and their children if their children were in a day care program. For these women, day care is all the leverage needed to escape from poverty. Secondly, it requires that the parent

repay the cost of the day care provided while he was in a training program as soon as his financial circumstances improve. Beneficiaries of work-training programs for the needy generally begin to work at salaries not very much above the poverty line. This day care provision gives a person a chance to escape from poverty only to snatch it away again as soon as he starts to work.

The proposal is likely to undercut incentives for the poor to enter training projects. Why should someone study, look for a job, work hard when there is little net gain—and given the costs of day-care in even the most minimal sorts of programs—when he may even emerge less well off than he was before.

The restrictions also make it impossible to coordinate day care with Head Start on a systematic basis and thus reduce the costs and increase the benefits of the child custody.

#### NO MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT—FEDERAL AID MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR LOCAL SUPPORT

Ironically, in a proposal to make sure that community action programs assist the States and urban and rural communities . . . to eliminate the principal causes of poverty, the sponsors have omitted any requirement that Federal aid be in addition to rather than instead of previous non-Federal support for the same services.

What that means is that Title II aid can be used to pick up the costs of local programs that have been operated for years and that a portion of the past non-Federal support for those same programs may be accepted as the required 20% matching share. Federal aid thus becomes a form of transfer payment.

The areas in which this omission invites the greatest abuse is in the vaunted bonus program which calls for a 50% non-Federal contribution.

So, whether by inadvertance or by design, the stirring intent stated in the preamble to this substitute Title II, namely, that States and local communities should bear the major responsibility for attacking poverty within their borders, is undercut by the absence of any requirement that they maintain even their past efforts in order to qualify for Federal aid to new efforts.

#### THE STATE BONUS PLAN—A SNARE AND DELUSION FOR POOR STATES

The most touted innovation of the sponsors of this proposal is the provision that a certain amount of title II funds should be set aside for bonus grants on a 50-50 matching basis to States which come up with plans for supplementary assistance. Since the proponents are advocates of economy, it cannot be assumed that they mean to provide additional money for these bonus plans. What they really mean to do is to cut back on the amount of 80-20 money and require that some of the funds under title II must be matched on a 50-50 basis.

The net result will be a corresponding reduction in the basic community action program assistance, i.e., 80-20 assistance available to each State. But in a peculiar inversion of language, the sponsors treat this as if it were a reward for good conduct.

The other major consequence is equally clear. The poorer States which cannot come up with 50 percent matching contributions will lose their bonus money and the richer States will get it by default. It is the rich States which will be able to raise the additional local money necessary to qualify for the bonus. They will pick up the bonus money at the expense of the areas, such as the Appalachian and Southern States, that need the money most.

The one qualification that must be made to these predictions is the fact that the sponsors have omitted any maintenance-of-effort requirement. It may be, therefore, that any State can automatically get its bonus money

by treating its existing programs of aid to the poor as its matching contribution and simply using the bonus money to enlarge those programs or to supplant a part of the non-Federal assistance formerly given to them.

If that can be done, the pieties at the beginning of this substitute for title II are meaningless. On the other hand, if the omission of the maintenance-of-effort requirement is corrected, the result will be that the bonus money will go to those States that cannot afford to do so will lose part of the money that they have been getting under the present law. Either way, the proposal is nothing more than an ill-conceived brainstorm.

#### MAJOR REALLOCATION OF FUNDS

In a number of ways the sponsors have managed to alter the existing allocations of funds so that virtually everyone is hurt.

1. The States will lose some part of their present CAP allocations for 80-20 assistance because of the 50-50 bonus idea. The idea itself is to describe as a reward what is really a penalty in terms of present allocations, because whatever money is set aside for bonuses will come out of the basic pot of money—unless the sponsors intend to increase the over-all total of Title II by the same amount.

2. Each State will lose about 3 percent more its present funding entitlement because the amount set aside for Puerto Rico and the Territories will be increased from 2 percent to 5 percent.

3. Within each community, the community action agency will suffer a drastic cut in funds under its control, because at least half of local CAP funds must be set aside for manpower-related programs developed by Job Opportunities Boards and other programs developed by qualified substitute agencies.

4. Other shifts will occur because of the division of each State's allocation into urban and rural portions, which are to be reallocated to other States if they cannot be used for those purposes within the first State of allocation. Assuming that data can be developed on a State-by-State basis, as the sponsors intend, these shifts can be expected to follow the dominance of urban or rural interests in the State administration and legislature.

5. To further complicate matters, certain programs have been chosen for poverty treatment. But what sort of national emphasis can be placed on programs that have little chance of receiving the funding necessary? Of the monies available for community action programs under the state plans, 5% is reserved for Puerto Rico and the territories, and 5% more for the so-called "bonus program" delusion. The State is authorized to take out its cut of 10% to run its State Commission, and must then divide the pot into urban and rural segments. Out of the dwindling monies the community action agency then receives, at least 50% must be set aside for manpower programs, or programs run by "substitute agencies" other than itself. Some monies are needed for administration of community action programs. The funds left will hardly make a ripple—much less enable meaningful progress—in meeting any of the needs singled out for special attention.

#### A NEW ALLOCATION FORMULA WITH CURIOUS RESULTS BUT NO REAL HELP FOR THE RURAL POOR

The proposal to divide each State's title II allotment into urban and rural portions introduces a new formula and an element of rigidity without getting at the real reasons why the rural poor have not been getting their fair share of those funds.

The real reasons are that the poor rural areas haven't been able to develop their own community action agencies and they haven't the resources to provide the required matching non-Federal share under title II. The Education and Labor Committee's bill would



start to remedy both problems by encouraging the States to serve as community action agencies in those poorer areas.

The substitute proposal makes no attempt to solve the problem. It does not contemplate that States will serve as community action agencies in rural areas. Yet it requires each State to spend its title II money proportionately on its rural poor or else lose the money to another State. The inevitable result of that will be to penalize the big cities, reward the wealthier farm areas, and leave the poorest rural areas not much better off than they have been because they will not be able to utilize the funds theoretically available to them.

In some States where OEO has made special efforts to help the rural poor, it is even possible that rural communities will be worse off because of this rigid bifurcation of urban and rural poverty. For example, in terms of the needs of its poor, Mississippi's money would be better spent in meaningful grants to the rural areas, rather than spent proportionately in cities such as Jackson and Biloxi which have relatively better resources to attack local poverty.

There are other anomalies in this feature of the substitute proposal. It permits the definitions of urban and rural poverty to vary from State to State, yet the Director of OEO has the last word. While he is expected to consult with the State agencies, he alone makes the decision. Yet, here if anywhere one would expect the authors of the substitute to have chosen to let the States make a binding decision.

The substitute also provides that any unused money in the urban portion of a State's allotment must be reallocated to other States only for urban uses; the same rule would govern each State's rural portion. One effect of this split arrangement is likely to be that money which might at least indirectly aid some of the poorer rural areas if it were spent in nearby urban and market centers of the same States will go by default to rural areas of wealthier States. Another consequence is that funds which were set aside but never used for the farm areas of one State (e.g., communities of 2500 or less) will be reallocated to towns and small cities in another State (e.g., communities of 25,000 or less) because of different definitions of rural poverty in the two States.

Lastly, under this proposal the reallocation problems will be made more difficult in any case because of the end-of-the-fiscal year timing for approval of State plans, but they will be doubly acute if at the last minute the Federal Government must fit reallocated funds into the urban and rural portions of other States' plans.

#### NO PROVISION FOR PROGRAM TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE UNLESS THE STATES PROVIDE THEM

If a State failed to discharge its training and technical assistance responsibilities, the local community action agencies and the Federal Government would have no authority or funds to remedy the deficiency.

Given the fact that State governments have little or no competence in many types of CAP programs (e.g., legal services and consumer action) it can safely be predicted that many communities will simply limp along without adequate help.

Of course, it would be possible for a State government which was hostile to a local agency simply to starve it out by not providing adequate training or technical assistance. If the Director concluded that the State agency was not doing its job, he could take over its functions, but it is extremely unlikely that he would or could do that because of failure adequately to serve specific communities.

#### DISCOURAGEMENT OF NEW DELEGATE AGENCIES

If ever a program needed to be open to new groups with new ideas, it is the community

action program with its emphasis on a wide range of services, mobilization of local resources, and program innovation.

It is surprising, therefore, that the only agencies other than neighborhood councils and committees, that can qualify under this proposal to conduct local programs as delegate agencies of community action agencies are those that have "had experience in administration of similar programs." This limitation is as inexplicable as it is self-defeating. It makes a "clique" out of community action, keeping out newcomers in favor of the established agencies. If it had been adopted in 1964, many of the most successful local programs today would never have been started.

It works an especial hardship in rural and small-town communities where there are few, if any, established agencies. It would prevent the formation of any new legal services programs in areas where there was no existing legal aid society and the local bar association was either unable or unwilling to serve as a delegate agency. Only the Planned Parenthood Association would be eligible to run a family planning program in many communities.

#### STATE AND FEDERAL DICTATION OF LOCAL PERSONNEL AND PAY STANDARDS

It is surprising that those who protest most strongly their concern for local determination of programs should propose to leave community action agencies as powerless as they would be under the substitute version of title II. The most glaring case is the requirement that those agencies abide by personnel and pay standards which would be set by the Federal and State governments. Suppose the community action agency was a city or county agency subject to its local civil service requirements. Or suppose some Federal and State bureaucrats set a salary scale that was either higher or lower than necessary to secure capable personnel for a particular community. The result would be waste in one case and stultification in the other.

#### A SWITCH IN SIGNALS WITHOUT ANY TIME TO ADJUST

The last major problem with this new approach is that it changes virtually every major feature of the present law without allowing any time for an orderly transition. The result will be major disruptions and chaos at every level. It is as if the sponsors had set out to cause as much confusion as possible. Even though no one doubts their good intentions and sincerity, the result will be the same.

Consider just a few of the major changes that would be necessary under this proposal:

First, each state would have to reconstitute its present Economic Opportunity Act agency, to provide for greatly enlarged functions and a board representing a great variety of interests and groups throughout the state. It would also have to establish personnel and pay standards for all CAP agencies within the state.

Next, the state agency would have to divide the state into communities. In the process many existing communities would lose funds and others would have to adjust their boundaries.

Local community action agencies would have to designate job opportunities boards.

Neighborhoods would have to establish their own councils or committees if they have not already done so.

Funds within each State would have to be divided into urban and rural portions.

Community action agencies which are now on one refunding cycle would have to shift to another in order to satisfy the requirement that a State plan be submitted to the Director of OEO before the beginning of each new fiscal year, beginning now.

Communities would have to close down many programs in order to set aside money for manpower programs.

Ongoing special emphasis programs might need adjustment because of new statutory requirements. For instance, non-qualifying families in day care programs would have to be terminated.

Procedures for Federal review of State plans, including hearing procedures would have to be established.

These are merely some of the drastic changes required under this proposal. It can safely be predicted that more than one year would be required to accomplish all of them without the most serious disruptions. Meanwhile, the changes themselves will impose substantial hardship on the poor in whose name they are proposed. No business could possibly run satisfactorily if it were subject to preemptory reorganizations on this scale.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill brought to the floor by the Committee on Education and Labor. This has not been the easiest bill to fashion for a presentation on the floor or that I have seen pass through that committee in my short 3 years here. There has been a great deal of compromise and there has been, as always in that committee—which is a very volatile group of people—a great difference of opinion with regard to certain parts of this legislation, and there are differences that still exist. However, I feel that the overriding importance of the Economic Opportunity Act to the people of this country—to whom promises have been repeatedly made and repeatedly broken by both political parties represented in this body—is such that my personal apprehensions about some portions of the bill are overridden by my feeling that I must support it. I hope that we can induce those who see here an opportunity for a short-term political gain by opposition to the bill, to see the light and come our way. I have no doubt that even in my own congressional district there would be short-term political mileage to be made by getting up here and tearing into this bill; or by talking about waste, talking about highly paid employees, and all the other shibboleths that we have heard for the last 3 years with regard to this legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not tempted in the least to this kind of action, because I strongly feel that the American people are beginning to awaken in terms of recognition of what this program is. We who support this legislation have said from the beginning that it is a program, to make taxpayers out of tax users, which rewards no one for just "being," but rewards them only for ambition and "doing."

I rise particularly today to speak in favor of the Job Corps. I am so very pleased to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio. I believe she has very eloquently pointed out the humanitarian reasons for continuation of this very worthwhile program, and also the sound economic reasons for continuing the program. I believe we can demonstrate that any attempts to cut the Job Corps will really be a cut in the future of this country, both in human resources and—for those who



like to measure it in this fashion—in dollars and cents.

I am extremely hopeful that other members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle will, as I have, examine the importance of the real issue here. That being, whether we shall continue the OEO programs as a successful experiment in human relations, or whether we should not continue them. I hope each of them will determine to support the committee bill as it now stands. To join forces here as a group of people with some differences of opinion on specific aspects of the legislation but with no difference of opinion as to the importance of the ultimate passage of this bill, and that we may work together toward that end.

I am hopeful that there will be no severe cut, or any cut at all, in the really very limited amount of money that we are asking for. I believe that it is nothing short of shameful that we have to come to this Congress at this very important time in the history of this country—and I believe the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] defined it very well when she said that we are in the eye of a social hurricane—with hat in hand, and ask for a literally barebones program. Even if it were financed fully by this Congress, this bill would not begin to meet the needs that we have already recognized and which can no longer be ignored.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman because in the last couple of days the gentleman is the first member of this committee to admit that this is a barebones program—a bare minimum—even if we got everything we were asking for. In that statement, I agree with my colleague completely.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I rise to give my enthusiastic and unqualified support for the Job Corps program.

It has been charged that the Job Corps has been a "tragic failure." Let me say that the Job Corps record of accomplishments does not sound like that of a failure. It sounds much more like an outstanding success.

The Job Corps has taken nearly 150,000 youngsters from city slums and rural backwaters and given them things that most Americans take for granted—things like clothing that fits, three decent meals a day, adequate medical care, proper education and job training to prepare them for a satisfying adult career.

Of the estimated 109,000 youngsters who have already been helped by Job Corps, nearly 60,000 are known to be employed, another 9,000 have returned to school, and another 8,000 are in military service. Of the other 30,000 most of them did not complete their courses, and probably half of them face poor job prospects in the future. But even these 30,000 who were not placed in jobs have been inspired and motivated to at least improve their position in life.

Two significant statistics help attest to the improved success of Job Corps.

First, the dropout rate—resignations during the first 30 days—has been cut from 30 percent in fiscal 1966 to 19 percent last year; and, second, youngsters who have completed Job Corps training are now earning an average of \$1.70 an hour.

This second figure gives a key to the benefits of Job Corps. A recent study shows that for every \$1 invested in Job Corps, \$1.18 in benefits is returned to the young men and women in the program. This is a conservative estimate that does not take into account the intangible benefits that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. How can you measure the costs to society if these youths were not working? You would have to include the negative factors such as costs of welfare payments, unemployment compensation; losses due to crime, violence and vandalism, the cost of social rehabilitation for problem youths, and the cost of prison for those who graduate from delinquency to crime.

These are the facts and figures to keep in mind when Job Corps opponents contend that the program is too costly and that the results do not justify the investment.

Of course there were problems as Job Corps was developed. This is true in any new program which is created to meet an emergency. But these problems and weaknesses have been discovered and corrected. The result has been lower costs, tighter discipline, and better assistance for the youngsters. For example, the annual per enrollee cost of operating Job Corps Centers has been reduced from \$8,470 in fiscal 1966, to \$7,025 in 1967. This figure can and will be reduced even further, to perhaps \$6,700.

But any thought of cutting the per-enrollee cost beneath \$6,700 is utterly unrealistic. It would negate the entire concept of human renewal which is the very basis of Job Corps success. It would mean scrapping such things as medical and dental care, counseling, and education. It would mean sacrificing more than 12,500 poverty youths who would remain functional illiterates and who would be denied the opportunity for identity with society and the opportunity to assume roles as responsible and responsive young citizens.

There is no reason for such a sacrifice. Job Corps is not only financially self-sustaining; it is financially profitable to this Nation.

Assume that Job Corpsmen continue to earn \$1.71 an hour for the rest of their working lifetimes, for 40 years, he would pay back to the Government a total of \$11,200 in income taxes. If only 26,500 Job Corps graduates—less than a third of this year's output—continue to work for 40 years, they will pay back in taxes nearly \$300,000,000—a figure higher than the Job Corps' requested budget of \$295 million for the coming year.

Job Corps is successful. It is a new and different approach to an old problem. Those who would transfer it to HEW or the Labor Department are demonstrating that they completely misunderstand the objectives of the Job Corps and have no perception of its accomplishments. The simple fact is that one either believes in the program, or he does not.

One either believes in the rightness of education, counseling, medical care, job training, or one does not. Those of us who believe in Job Corps accept the fact that these things cost money. Those who do not believe in Job Corps cannot justify any cost, no matter how low it might be cut.

There is one group of Americans who do believe in Job Corps—those who have directly benefited from the program. These are youngsters who previously were qualified only for such menial tasks as carwashers or babysitters. Today they are auto mechanics or office workers or salesmen. Their average pay before Job Corps was \$700 a year; now it is about \$3,600. And they have learned more than just the bare essentials of their jobs—they have learned respect, punctuality, dependability and how to get along with their coworkers.

Some critics complain that corpsmen are not placed in jobs for which they were trained. This may be true in some instances, but these auxiliary skills that they have learned will help them to success in any vocational field.

Job Corps opponents have reached deep into the barrel to find ammunition for criticism. They have come up with the failure of the program for non-residential employees. It is true that this aspect of Job Corps has been a disappointment. Job Corps experimented with some 600 nonresidential enrollees. These youths continued to live at home, and were transported by bus to and from the Job Corps Center each morning and night.

These nonresidents received the same clothing, medical and dental treatment, the same allowances and services that the resident enrollees received, but there was one big difference. The nonresident did not enjoy the evening advantages—movies, the hobby shop, live entertainment, group discussion and after-hours counseling. Instead, he returned each night to the "losing" environment of broken homes, families on welfare, unemployed males and working females. Too often, the dope peddler or pick-pocket was the only successful male in sight.

But the success of the residential Job Corps program remains as a bright light that no amount of criticism can diminish.

There are still two basic problems facing Job Corps today—a pathetic lack of unanimous support right here in Congress, and the fact that the Job Corps program is still far too small to meet the tremendous need that exists.

These are two problems that cannot be solved anywhere but here in this Congress, and in the minds and consciences of those who will decide the future of Job Corps.

In closing I would ask that you look very closely at the "opportunity charade"—and I am not misspeaking myself because I think for far too long the semantics game has been played with the so-called opportunity crusade. I think that correct semantics would dictate that it should be recognized for what it is—an "opportunity charade." It has been for 3 years a thinly veiled bomb used exclusively for the purpose of blowing



this program out of the water. It is dressed up in a little fancier covering this time than ever before, but it is still a charade and will always remain that way.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard time and time again of these so-called Poverty Warriors engaging in partisan political activity in clear violation of the Hatch Act.

In yesterday's local elections just across the river in Virginia we witnessed the executive director of the United Planning Organization of Arlington County for the second consecutive year working the polls in Glebe precinct.

Mr. John Robinson, field supervisor for the Arlington community action program at an annual salary of \$6,396, was not only openly representing the Democratic Party, but he was handing out Democratic ticket sample ballots and verbally instructing Negro voters of this precinct that this was how they should vote.

Mr. Chairman, these voters were bused to the polls, their names were written down—which incidentally is not the general practice in Arlington—they were given a Democratic sample ballot and told to vote according to the ballot.

This is a clearcut violation of the Hatch Act by a Federal employee and we have witnesses to prove it.

I just hope that when we get to reading this bill for amendment we will write in some strong prohibitive language closing the door to this illegal electioneering activity.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me to make this observation.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I certainly hope that now that he has made this revelation that some action will be taken.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to consider what should be done at this point in history with the problems of the poor in this Nation.

A few years ago politically—cynically, politically conceived was the so-called war on poverty. For several years it has been administered in a cynical, political manner.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, because we have any number of instances such as the gentleman from Illinois has just revealed where community action programs have been used for political activities.

Any number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle can tell you of instances where the person who has been his opponent in a political campaign, or his predecessor in office—if he happened to defeat an incumbent—have wound up as employees of the war on poverty in one place or another.

In my own instance, for example, in 1964 my Democratic opponent within a few short months after being defeated wound up as the director of a Job Corps camp. He did not last very long because a few months after that there were riots at that camp and he subsequently was relieved of his employment as director of that Job Corps camp.

Only too often we have seen positions in this war on poverty used to reward the Democratic faithful—and this has been documented time after time.

Mr. Chairman, the question now is: Are we going to continue a program that has as its basis a theory that the ills of this country can be solved with a program conceived in Washington, financed almost solely with Federal funds, and directed from Washington?

For my own part, I think this is folly, to think that we could have the resources solely at the Federal level, either financial, moral, or manpowerwise, to solve the poverty that exists across the Nation. That is why the opportunity crusade has been designed to mobilize the resources at State and local level and, most important, the resources available to us in the private sector of our economy.

Take the Neighborhood Youth Corps as just one example. Here we have a program that involves either employment in public agencies or employment with Federal funds. As contrasted to this is the Industry Youth Corps that is provided for in the opportunity crusade, which would involve the active participation of the private sector. What could be more sensible than to have the employers who need the skills of these youths and these underprivileged, undereducated, under-skilled, determine what skills are needed, and to provide the training so that these people can be useful in the places where the employment is available?

The Job Corps, at least up until recently—and I would hope that if the committee bill passes there might be some change in this—but the Job Corps throughout its history, at least until recently, has not at all been job-oriented. It has been taking youths out of their environment and putting them in residential training schools, teaching them skills, giving them a diploma, and sending them home. There has not been any job relation. If there is anything that will be a final answer to the problem of the poor, it is meaningful employment; not training, and retraining that leads to a dead end.

The opportunity crusade is job-oriented. In the community action program it would require that at least 50 percent of the funds allocated to community action would go toward programs that were job-oriented. It would require that the community action agencies would, in seeking funds and in mounting programs in the neighborhoods, form job opportunity boards involving industry, involving the business community in that neighborhood, and I think, therefore, leading to meaningful employment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate very much the point that you are now making that

in order to do an adequate job of job training—I do not care whether it is the Job Corps, the Manpower Training Act, or whatever it is—we need certain tools, and I think it is time that the House of Representatives zeroed in on the fact that we still have not developed the jobs-available statistics which were not only recommended but were required in the Manpower Training Act. This administration did not even submit a request again this year for the cost of \$2.5 million. How in the name of Heaven can you conduct any job training without this essential tool?

The Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee 2 years ago held hearings to be certain that we were not in error in thinking that jobs-available statistics were feasible and were really of this great need. The witnesses without exception, save one person, Mr. Goldfinger of the AFL-CIO, testified that these statistics were feasible and just as necessary as I am trying to express here in any intelligent training program. The reason given by Mr. Goldfinger—and his testimony, incidentally, ought to be read by as many as possible in the House and throughout the country—was that, if you develop these statistics, they would be misused to try to create the impression that there was not a problem in the field of unemployment.

Granted, any statistics can be misused, but I think it is a crying shame that for the past years and at the present time, for the lack of \$2.5 million, or the concern of this administration and Secretary Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor—for the lack of \$2.5 million—all of our job-training programs, whether in the private sector, Government, or whatever, have been badly hampered. The gentleman has put his finger right on a crucial point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLBORN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with him wholeheartedly. We cannot have any meaningful program when we do not know what jobs are available and what to train these people for.

I would like very quickly just to make two additional points. The Green of Oregon amendment, which was adopted in the committee, was adopted without any testimony from those who are affected. I just wonder about it, and I hope this debate will bring out answers to a few of the questions in my mind. I wonder how many States can qualify as community action agencies when under the Green of Oregon amendment they must qualify to be channels for these funds. I think many will be legally prohibited by their constitutions from being legally the action agencies. Let me quote the provisions on page 218 of section 603(b) of the act, as amended, and this is being added to the act:

*Provided*, That the Director may issue such regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort to become a registered voter according to the laws of the State of his residence.

In other words, you had better be ready and able to show you can deliver your vote, or you cannot get the benefits of this act. I would like to have those who



drafted this bill give some rationale for language such as this in the act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have the following telegram:

Urge your approval of S. 2300, Economic Opportunity Amendments providing greater State involvement in OEO programs. Hope you will resist any attempt to reduce proposed \$2.6 billion authorization.

That is signed by Harold E. Hughes, the Governor of Iowa.

Evidently the Governor does not know the bill number is S. 2388.

My response to the Governor is this:

You express hope in your telegram that I "will resist any attempt to reduce proposed \$2.6 billion authorization" for economic opportunity program. In view of financial crisis with which we are faced, I am shocked you would recommend an authorization which exceeds by more than one-half billion dollars amount recommended by President Johnson and House Education and Labor Committee, and which exceeds by almost one billion dollars the amount spent last year.

In so doing, I can only assume you have not had access to the documented evidence of waste and extremely high administrative costs in poverty program; evidence which is too overwhelming to permit me to support the administration's request, let alone the higher amount you recommend.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

(Mr. HATHAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the swirling controversy about OEO; the conflicting statistics, charges, and countercharges may obscure what OEO represents.

It is a new awareness, attitude, and approach to poverty.

In the Bible, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse threaten to scourge mankind. There are, however, four ways of thinking about poverty that are as destructive to the future of mankind as any Biblical prophecy.

The first way of thinking about poverty is not to. To deny its very existence, Michael Harrington's book "The Other America" revealed the extent of this society's blindness to its own disease. Society's inability to check its own health is not new. The roaring twenties were for many people a wonderful time. Unfortunately, they were followed by the great depression and the grim thirties. All the factors—economic imbalance—uncontrolled speculation—the worsening state of the farmers that caused the depression were easily discernible in the twenties.

The second delusive way of thinking about poverty is that it is isolated and temporary. This attitude is reinforced by the self-made egotist who asserts "I was born in a slum and look at me now." Without challenging his premise that he made this miraculous transubstantiation unassisted and emerged unscarred by his experience, the fact is that fewer and fewer people are escaping from poverty on their own.

Third, there is still a vestige of the feeling that a poor person is somehow personally at fault. We are all conditioned by our environment and most poor people are born poor. For the philosophical purist, I can only say that to assist people who need help is not to deny free will.

Finally, there is an inane way of non-thinking, that assistance to the poor only creates more poverty: that people love squalor so much that if given financial assistance they will create other people to enjoy their poverty.

Fortunately and none too early, OEO is a rejection of these pernicious attitudes and a recognition of the extent and the challenges of poverty.

Of course, poverty is not new. The traditional way of handling the poor was to provide distraction and the dole. OEO is a legislative determination that while poverty has long been a fact of life it need not be an inevitable part of life. Such an attitude seems consistent with our American ideal and our belief in the perfectability of man.

While poverty is not new, poverty in the 20th century creates new dangers. The steady increase in population means that an increasing number of people were poor. These people were becoming alienated from our society, a dangerous condition for any society but particularly dangerous for a democracy that assumes that its citizens are able and will participate in its government, but poverty destroys people's mental and physical ability to participate in democracy. If you assume that every citizen should have a vote in his government, then we must insure that every citizen's vote is meaningful.

This is merely another example of democracy being a more costly form of government than totalitarian governments which are not dependent on the mental well-being of its citizens. Instead of considering cutting appropriations for this program, we should increase funds for OEO. The United States has a tradition of combining ambitious ideals with an unwillingness to pay for them. The juvenile court system, public education available to all and yet maintaining quality, even democracy itself are failing because of our inability to commit our resources in a manner consistent with our ideals.

OEO is also a new approach to poverty. It is a concentration of services to remedy poverty. Traditional institutions were not only apathetic to the special needs of the poor but were not structured to handle them. The teacher could not follow the student into his home, the social worker could not, for the most part, change the child's environment: the doctor could not enter the classroom. Basic services were fragmented and scattered. The inability to recognize the difference in OEO's approach as for example the Job Corps and the community health service centers and the present attempt to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity is the inability of many to admit or recognize that past solutions do not always work; that sending a boy to school does not always result in that boy being a productive member of society.

The Job Corps has been a victim of this kind of thinking. Critics have brilliantly noted that a boy could be sent to Harvard for less money or that one could receive vocational training as an automobile mechanic for less money. These critics apparently cannot see that these comparisons are invalid because the job corps is not a college or vocational education institute. In short, it is not a traditional institute. Like most of OEO programs it is a panoply of desperately needed services from dental care to social adjustment.

Critics of the job corps while denying its problems, demand instant success. Figures of its cost have been bantered about proving only the willingness of some people to believe. The truth is that the Job Corps is a well-managed, and closely supervised organization. Its costs are steadily being lowered and it is engaged in a constant evaluation of its performances and methods; a willingness to criticize and check on its own operations that is not matched by any of our traditional institutions.

Another OEO program that is frequently criticized is the community action programs. Let us be honest with ourselves. For the most part, community action programs have earned their critics. Community action programs are an attempt to make the poor a part of the community. To change the poor from alienated to active. This, of course, challenges the status quo and those who want conditions to remain as they are. When people with a vested interest in the status quo complain, it usually means that community action programs are doing their job. They are putting the idea of democracy into action. They are stimulating ideas and creating new solutions to old community problems. The growth of the Federal Government in the last 30 years was due in part to the failure of communities to solve or even to recognize their problems. For the community action programs are an attempt to make democracy relevant to the conditions of the 20th century. An attempt that is long overdue.

Some maintain that this attempt to make democracy meaningful at the local level is revolutionary. If this be revolution, let us achieve it peacefully.

Last summer suggests the alternative. What has Congress done about the riots? It tried to pin the blame on one political party or another, introduced a spate of bills requesting millions for law enforcement, indulged in pious cries for law and order, and done nothing. OEO and the civil rights movement preceded and exists independent of riots. OEO recognized the anarchy in our society before it was revealed in the streets of Newark and Cleveland.

In conclusion I can only quote a recent Look magazine editorial entitled "We Can't Quit Now":

It is up to the Office of Economic Opportunity, not only to cope with the problems of poverty, but to argue the just demands of the poor from within the Government . . . We must make up our minds to do the whole job. It will be costly. It can't be done overnight. Business as much as Government must help. But we can end welfare waste, earn back our investment from the taxes and increased production of millions of new con-



sumers. We have promised to let the poor in—and we can't quit now.

Mr. Chairman, let me go on and particularize about a program in my district about which I am particularly proud.

It has been said that "When you teach a man, you teach an individual: When you teach a woman, you teach a family." There is a great deal of sense to this expression, and I think it represents one of the main arguments for the continuation of such programs as the Women's Job Corps.

There are about a half million young girls growing into womanhood in this country who will multiply the economic and spiritual poverty of their own lives in their children—unless they can be imbued with a will and spirit that reaches out for the benefits of American society. The Women's Job Corps is not merely a program to train women for jobs: it is a preparation for a life that is self-fulfilling—a life that will influence and guide a family. It is the means through which an educationally, socially, and economically deprived young woman can find the security, the motivation, and the basic equipment to be capable of achievement in this world. It is one of the few and best weapons she has against the unjust and arbitrary contingencies of the life into which she was born.

The Women's Job Corps program is an entirely new educational experiment aimed at a renewal of the total human being. Eligible for this program are young women between the ages of 16 and 22 who are out of school, unable to find an adequate job, and in need of a change of environment in order to become useful and productive citizens. They come from broken homes, from poor schools and economically deprived communities—they have no skill, but have normal and often above average intelligence.

Because young women who enter the Job Corps have derived little benefit from conventional schooling, contractors operating women's centers are encouraged to develop new approaches, methods, and materials to provide the necessary education and work skills for the enrollees to become self-sufficient and responsible citizens. The basic skills prerequisite to all other learning—such as remedial, intermediate, and developmental reading, writing, speech and conversation, mathematics, social studies, and elementary science—are taught by qualified instructors in small classes.

Optimum opportunities are also made available to the corpswomen for self-teaching and continual learning processes through audiovisual materials, programmed study courses, libraries, special tutoring, and group activity at the center and in the community.

Mr. Chairman, one of the best examples of the Women's Job Corps program in action is the Poland Spring Center located in my home district in southwestern Maine.

I have spoken before about the accomplishments of this project and about the public recognition and community support for these young Job Corps women. On the Poland Spring grounds, where Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft,

Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge once relaxed, young women from all sections of the country are now learning social amenities, sports and a vocation. In the building where Gene Tunney trained for his fight with Harry Greb in 1923 and Sonny Liston trained for his ill-fated battle with Cassius Clay 40 years later, typing, shorthand, and office management is now being studied.

Locally run, locally controlled, and mutually beneficial to both the area residents and the trainees, the Poland Spring Center is an excellent example of local success. An indication of the confidence that American industries have placed in the quality of Job Corps training is evident in the list of employers of Poland Spring graduates. Among the many respected names appear those of IBM, Blue Cross, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Veteran's Administration, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., the First National Bank of New York, the Department of Mental Hygiene of the State of New York, Avco, the New York Telephone Co., Sanders Associates, and the Microwave Corp. In hiring Job Corps youngsters, these industries—perhaps the best judges of any training program in the final analysis—have expressed a vote of confidence in the Job Corps program. I have already read to you the remarks of several of these employers on the satisfaction they feel over the work that these Job Corps women are now doing. I should like to add to this support my own vote of confidence and my determination that the Job Corps program be continued as an integral part of the total war on poverty.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Esch].

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, this week and next, in this Chamber, the House will work its will reflecting the general attitude of the American citizen. This House, by its actions will give direction to its intent regarding the war on poverty.

There are two major facts that should not be overlooked here. First, there is the matter of continuing appropriations. By reducing the appropriation of the Office of Economic Opportunity from \$1.4 to \$1.2 billion, the House membership overwhelmingly indicated its lack of faith in the present system, and its desire to re-examine, redefine, and restructure the so-called war on poverty. But the greater significance of the House action dealing with the Office of Economic Opportunity was that it did not reject the poor and the war on poverty en toto—as many administration charges would have you believe. The truth is that Members stated their willingness to retain a major portion of the war on poverty by their vote for the retention of \$1.2 billion.

Certainly public reports should emphasize equally the fact that this membership went on record in support of such a program. What remains now for Congress is the major task to forge in the next 10 days a redirected, improved program reaching out to break the no-

education, no-employment, no-housing, false-hope, lawbreaking, riot cycle. Let us not allow a doctrinaire approach to obstruct the most basic need of this country—that of facing up to the social ills of our cities.

It is within this framework that we must expand the alternatives:

First. Do we desire to have the community action programs controlled by irresponsible political structures, or do we wish to have a balanced group involving community agencies, local officials, and the poor in decisionmaking? Clearly and objectively the latter is more desirable.

Second. Just how high a priority should the poverty program give to emphasizing technical and cooperative training programs for the unemployed and underemployed? While the committee's bill indeed places more emphasis in this area clearly the thrust is inadequate. We must develop a more efficient structure involving private industry. The substitute will do this.

Third. To what degree and in what way can this body give emphasis to special programs—such as the essential family planning program? Both the committee bill and the substitute recognize this need and include provisions for it.

Fourth. Should we reexamine the administration of these programs toward a more efficient operation of the war on poverty? The committee bill allows much inefficiency to continue—the minority bill strikes out against inefficient administration.

These are but a few of the major issues.

Let the issues, not emotions, prevail in the next 10 days. Let us not be so unreasoning as to think that any one of the over 80 committee amendments was an "improvement"—while any one of the amendments presented on the floor by the minority is an attempt to dismantle, to destroy, to kill the program. Let us forge an effective and efficient program to help the poor and then let us have the courage to fund it—not at the \$1.6 billion level as proposed by the majority member, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but at a figure approaching the \$2 billion level.

If we are to set priorities in this Congress, let us give the highest domestic priority to our Nation's No. 1 problem—that of solving the social ills of our cities.

Mr. Chairman, together with a number of my colleagues, we have prepared an analysis of the differences between the two approaches, which I append as an extension of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, we favor a fundamental redirection of the war on poverty to meet the needs of our fellow citizens who are trapped in poverty.

America today desperately needs an effective program to help the poor in a meaningful way. Our proposals would provide for proper administration of major segments of the existing anti-poverty programs while redirecting the remainder strongly toward overcoming unemployment and dependency. It would use Federal funds in large part as seed money to help enlist the enormous resources of our free enterprise economy



and to increase the scope of State participation.

Our opportunity crusade proposals, for example, would authorize an annual Federal expenditure of less than \$1.4 billion, but would generate a total investment of public and private funds well over \$3 billion. The resultant revitalization of the program is impossible to calculate in dollars.

#### COMMITTEE BILL IS WINDOW DRESSING

The Democratic majority rejected out of hand all major proposals for progressive changes in the present program. The majority tinkered with various window-dressing changes that would cure none of the basic problems with the programs. Then they came to the section on community action, and responded to the most regressive demands of members of their party who apparently have little sympathy for the concept of involvement of the poor. They carved the very heart out of community action in an attempt to pick up enough votes to pass this bill.

We have long proposed that State and local governments be involved in community action in a truly meaningful way. The majority, having utterly ignored such suggestions for 3 years, overacted, and now propose to turn the whole program over to city hall.

Other than this, and an unfortunate dilution of the residential character of the Job Corps by the additional of a non-residential component, the committee bill would not substantially change the faltering "war on poverty."

#### OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE CHARTS A NEW COURSE

The proposal rejected by the majority would chart a new course for the war on poverty and give new hope that the problems of poverty in America can indeed be solved without bitter and interminable dissension and without squandering tax moneys in a time of fiscal crisis.

We would make the following basic changes:

First. Community action programs would be continued but would be reoriented in a major degree toward helping the poor obtain decent jobs; agencies would continue to be independent with a strong representation of the poor, but there would be an effective mechanism for the participation of State governments and an assured role for local governments.

Second. The taint of politics and of political manipulation—which characterizes the program at all levels of administration and which would be institutionalized by the committee bill—would be removed.

Third. New initiatives—such as the establishment of an Industry Youth Corps and the automation of job opportunity data—would be taken to strengthen employment opportunities and to involve the enormous capabilities of the private economy in providing training and jobs.

Fourth. Education programs—such as Headstart, Job Corps, Upward Bound, and in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps—would be transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; programs having a basic manpower orientation, such as the out-of-school NYC, would be transferred to the Secre-

tary of Labor to be conducted in conjunction with manpower development and training;

Fifth. The Job Corps would be phased into the State vocational education system to provide residential vocational education for young people who need it, and to strengthen our national efforts in vocational education.

Sixth. The States would be given a key role in Headstart while retaining parental and nonpublic agency participation, and Followthrough would be expanded into an early years program to include elementary children who have not had the advantage of Headstart experience, but who need extra educational, social, health, and nutritional services in the early elementary grades.

#### COMMITTEE BILL LEADS TO A DEAD END

The committee bill continues the dead-end approach of doing everything with Federal dollars; even in a time of fiscal crisis it ignores the many possibilities to generate private investment in meeting the problems of the poor. This approach leads to a dead end, because, unless private industry is involved in these programs, employment will continue to be of the make-work variety.

The committee bill leads to a dead end in other respects, as well. It is perfectly apparent that the Office of Economic Opportunity has neither the competence nor the structure to administer educational and job training programs, yet the committee bill leaves it with this power. We believe that there is at least a role for the OEO in administering a community action program with greater State participation, and in serving as a coordinating agency. We would leave it with these functions in the hope that once unburdened of tasks it is not equipped to perform the agency might do an effective job.

Even most of the majority members have acknowledged that the functions we propose to transfer should be "spun off" to other agencies charged with responsibility in these fields, but "at a later date." We think that the time is now to start putting together an effective war on poverty.

We shall attempt to offer a legislative package which will carry out the objectives outlined in these views.

#### POVERTY PROGRAM IN DEEP TROUBLE

The war on poverty is in deep trouble, a situation which has very little connection with the stringencies of the present crisis of the budget. It is in trouble because of its failure to meet the real needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor for decent jobs; because all over the country it has been mired in partisan politics and factionalism; because a very large part of the funds appropriated to help the poor has been spent for grossly inflated administrative expenses and high salaries; because its management has been incredibly inept; because programs such as the Job Corps have produced dismal results at enormous costs when administered by a Federal agency having no competence in education; and because it has failed to involve the resources of either private industry or the States in any meaningful way. Fundamentally, American tax-

payers are no longer willing to tolerate such a shoddy performance.

#### DISCUSSION OF MAJOR ISSUES

The foregoing comments point up the deep divisions within the committee on the fundamental issues that will, in turn, be decided on the floor of the House of Representatives. These issues tend to fall into three major categories: The future role and structure of the community action program; the administration at the Federal level of programs which are primarily educational or training for employment; and the extent of the involvement of private and other non-Federal resources in meeting the needs of the poor.

We hope that the following discussion will be helpful to both Members of Congress and the general public in putting these issues in perspective and understanding the crucial differences between our proposal and the committee bill.

#### THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

Despite all of the justified and well-documented criticisms of the community action program, it does—in our judgment—hold a great, though largely unrealized, potential for helping to break the cycle of poverty at critical points. There are, however, some absolutely essential conditions for the success of this program:

First. It must represent the felt needs of the poor through a genuine and effective representation in the decisionmaking process;

Second. It must operate through independent agencies in which local public officials have a strong voice and with which the State can participate in a stronger role in the program;

Third. It must be disengaged so thoroughly from local political struggles, both partisan and nonpartisan, that it can become neither the instrument nor the target of political factionalism; and

Fourth. It must be redirected toward given the highest priority to overcoming the unemployment, underemployment, and hopeless dependence upon welfare which lies at the heart of the condition of poverty.

The committee bill fails so miserably as a measure to do any of these things that it offends both those who have been the strongest defenders and those who have been the most vigorous opponents of CAP. The bill fails most of all in its abandonment of the concept of an independent CAP in which the poor themselves can have an effective voice.

The committee bill provides that "community action agencies shall be a State or a political subdivision of a State" and all else that follows about participation of the poor is thereby rendered largely meaningless. In attempting to remedy the administrative vagaries and operating excesses of the program, the committee has reversed itself 180 degrees and turned the entire program over to city hall politicians—not as a partner with the poor and with business, labor, and social organizations but as the dominant and controlling power.

The consequences of this action are all too obvious. Where city hall is unsympathetic to the needs of the poor or to this program, the CAP is dead without



the decency of a burial; where city hall seizes upon CAP as an instrument for political power, it will become just that and nothing more; where city hall is sympathetic to the needs of the poor and too scrupulous to use the program for political advantage, it will nevertheless dominate it to such an extent that effective participation of the poor—particularly when it becomes abrasive—cannot be realized. In short, CAP would be the creature of the dominant political organization.

If this is the price paid to "save" the community action program in the House of Representatives, the program seems hardly worth the effort.

The true intent of the majority with respect to CAP was further illuminated by their action on an amendment—proposed by Mr. GARDNER—to absolutely forbid the use of the program for political purposes. In place of a positive requirement of law, they substituted a much weaker provision leaving it up to the Director of OEO to issue regulations and impose requirements. Considering the history of the OEO operation—which is notorious as a highly paid refuge for Democratic politicians and political managers between political engagements—this is like leaving the cat at home to watch the bird.

Having turned the CAP program over to city hall and having empowered the OEO Director to define and enforce restrictions against political activity in the program, the majority has created a bonanza for political patronage.

There are effective and constructive ways to assure a voice for State and local government in the operation of community action programs and to involve the positive contribution of State and local resources. Our proposals—which were casually dismissed in toto by the majority—provided for State involvement through a State bonus community action program which would give financial assistance to the States to involve State government in assisting community action and other antipoverty programs and in coordinating State, local, and Federal programs. At the local level, we provided for the representation of local public officials on community action boards.

But our proposals—unlike the committee bill—would preserve the CAP agencies as independent entities. Without this crucial factor, the program loses its very reason for existence.

Finally, despite all the evidence that CAP has failed to reach the poor in a meaningful way, the committee bill proposes no basic redirection of the elements of the program, as opposed to its administrative structure. Our contention is that the basic thrust of community action programs should be toward eliminating the fundamental conditions of poverty—hard core unemployment and underemployment.

We have proposed that the major concern of community action should be the elimination of unemployment—including sporadic employment in low-wage jobs requiring no training. With unemployment running up to 40 percent of the work force in the inner city ghettos—and just as high in areas of Appalachia—

jobs should be the first order of business for any antipoverty effort.

There are many, many constructive tasks in this field that could best be carried out by an independent, alert community action agency. Merely locating the unemployed and informing them of training opportunities is a major task not fulfilled by any governmental agency, and it is one best undertaken by those who have the confidence of or at least some contact with, the poor. The positive involvement of employers and labor unions in training and other employment programs should be a part of every community action program. When these things are done the further possibilities for effective action are limited only by the imagination and ingenuity of people working together within a community. Transportation problems could be attacked; day care centers should be established for the children of employed mothers; health and vocational rehabilitation services could be made available to those who are unaware of their existence; and a wide variety of special training programs could be established.

The committee bill fails to give this emphasis to the fundamental cause of poverty. It thereby perpetuates the past failures of the community action programs.

In originally offering the Opportunity Crusade, we sought a more effective kind of community action. During 7 weeks of committee hearings and 3 weeks of markup, we have been refining and sharpening our proposals to concentrate even more on creating employment opportunities in a free enterprise economy, and we have sought the advice of a wide spectrum of organizations and individuals for this purpose.

Accordingly, we are prepared to offer a far more effective community action program than the one contained in S. 2388 as amended by the committee majority.

#### TRANSFER OF HEADSTART

If the community action program is the most controversial part of the war on poverty, the Headstart component—accounting for nearly one-half of the CAP funds for fiscal 1967—is easily the most accepted part. Yet so little was preschool education considered by the planners of the Economic Opportunity Act that Republican members of this committee had to call the only expert witness on child problems heard during the 1964 hearings. This was consistent with the view—advanced by minority members long before 1964—that preschool programs are a key to interrupting the cycle of educational failure, unemployment, and poverty.

We support the Headstart program and, moreover, believe that it contains important features not generally found in regular school programs, such as the involvement of parents, provisions for dealing with health, nutrition, and family problems, and the utilization of the resources of private agencies and organizations. We propose to retain these features in a continuation of the program.

Headstart, despite its comparative success, has suffered unnecessarily from the administrative weaknesses of the Office

of Economic Opportunity and its operations. Approval and funding of projects has been subject to long delays and in many areas to interminable disputes between the CAP and the public schools, or between contending private groups. There has also been inadequate coordination between Headstart and similar preschool programs funded under title I of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act. Weaknesses have developed further in the failure to follow up on Headstart children when they reach the regular schools, a problem that is unlikely to be cured by the initiation of a follow-through program delegated to a Federal agency other than the one administering Headstart. Our proposed early years program—which is expanded to include both Headstart children and needy children who have not had the advantage of Headstart—would be administered as an extension of Headstart and designed to serve both public and private schoolchildren.

There also exists in all too many instances a lack of professional qualifications in the personnel selected to conduct the Headstart program, and a tendency to treat the program as one being designed primarily to employ the poor rather than to prepare children for learning. As a result of all these factors, even Headstart has lagged far behind its potential. Accordingly, we propose that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare administer both Headstart and the early years program in close coordination with other educational programs—and provided with a stronger component of health, nutritional, and social services, as well.

We have proposed a method for accomplishing this transfer that would not result in losing the benefits of parental involvement or participation of community action agencies and private organizations. On the contrary, our proposal would continue this valuable non-public-school involvement while assuring far closer statewide coordination with preschool programs conducted under the complete management of the schools.

We propose to establish State commissions broadly representative of community action agencies, public and private education, and other health and social welfare agencies and organizations—analogous to the State commissions which smoothly administer the Higher Education Facilities Act and related programs—which would plan and administer Headstart and early years programs in the States and approve projects to be funded by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Local projects might be conducted by the public schools with the approval of local CAP agencies, or by private schools, or by special Headstart agencies. In any event, they would be coordinated with other preschool programs, keyed to the overall needs of the State, and assured a high degree of professionalism in their conduct.

There have been many suggestions that the early years program be placed completely under the U.S. Office of Education and run through the public school system. This is the intent of an amend-



ment adopted in the Senate. While we are sympathetic to a change in administration at the Federal level we see great benefit in tying these projects closely to Headstart and retaining a high degree of community and private agency participation. Moreover, the early years projects should also contain as a major element health, nutritional, and social services which could best be assured through administration at the departmental level, bringing to the programs the combined expertise of education, public health, and Children's Bureau programs.

Our proposal has taken into consideration the possibility that some States might be slow to establish a suitable commission, or that State plans might not be operative for a period of time, or that they might not comply with the requirements of the act, and we have provided a "bypass"—similar to that in school lunch and title II of ESEA—to enable the Secretary to fund programs directly in any of these circumstances.

#### UPWARD BOUND

The Upward Bound program of OEO is designed to assist able, but needy and educationally deprived high school students to prepare for college. It, therefore, fits precisely the objective of the educational opportunity grant program authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, and should be administered as a part of that program so as to complement and augment it.

#### PHASING JOB CORPS INTO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Job Corps has been as tragic a failure as anything attempted under the Economic Opportunity Act. It has fundamental weakness in concept which have been painfully magnified by weak and often unqualified administration. The real tragedy is that, properly handled, a program of residential vocational education could be a vital element in a national vocational program for disadvantaged young people.

This history of this provision is instructive. In 1963 the Congress, and this committee, did some of its finest work in reshaping the National Vocational Education Act. The new act directed federally supported vocational programs toward training for employment; it authorized area and regional vocational-technical programs; it freed the administration of the program from the inflexible and traditional categories of training; it modernized the legislative definition of vocational agriculture; and it authorized sufficient funding to revitalize vocational education.

Had section 14 been implemented we could now have a splendid residential vocational program in most, perhaps all, States. But the Johnson administration, in typical fashion, wanted a huge and dramatic effort as a part of its war on poverty. The result was the Job Corps—a hasty revival of the CCC program of the 1930's—and instructions that it was to have maximum impact prior to the 1964 elections. The effect has not been without drama; it has been a dramatic flop with overtones of classical tragedy.

We propose now to implement section 14. We would transfer the Job Corps to

the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with instructions to proceed to implement it through or in close conjunction with the 1963 Vocational Education Act. This would require a period of transition in order to permit continued operation of existing Job Corps facilities until they could be phased out or phased into State vocational systems. In this way, there would be no disruption of training programs for current trainees, arrangements would be made to accommodate trainees who would not have access to a residential facility in their State, and the substantial investment in Job Corps facilities would not be thrown away.

It is imperative that this transition be started immediately. Our first concern is for the young men and women who are not receiving either adequate training or adequate placement help from the existing Job Corps operation. Our second concern is for the long-range future of vocational education, which in every State should include residential components for area vocational-technical schools in order to meet the educational needs of all young men and women; ultimately this will result in a far greater training capacity than could otherwise be realized, and with a consequent strengthening of the entire vocational system. Finally, we are deeply concerned that the entire concept of residential training may be lost in a public revulsion against enormously high costs and pitifully low performance in terms of results. In our considered judgment, the Job Corps has no future at all in its existing structure.

Amendments adopted by the committee give additional urgency to the proposed transfer. S. 2388, as amended, authorizes the Director to provide for both residential and nonresidential training in the facilities, and for their utilization in programs for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It also authorizes an expanded program of educational research. Thus, the Job Corps is being converted into a structure that would parallel the regular vocational educational system and duplicate existing educational research and demonstration programs. If the residential character of the Job Corps is to be thus eroded and this was the primary rationale for its creation, then there is all the more reason to have it administered under vocational education.

An additional strength of administration through State vocational systems is that the program should not be exclusively residential, but according to all the expert advice we have received on the matter, could most profitably be conducted in connection with area vocational and vocational-technical schools. In this manner, the residential trainees would not be isolated from the general educational structure—or socially isolated, for that matter—but would be a part of an educational complex combining all the strengths of residential and nonresidential training, with greatly increased administrative flexibility in meeting individual needs and far greater cost effectiveness.

The only way all of these objectives can be met is by phasing the Jobs Corps

program into the State systems of vocational education to be operated as residential vocational education centers in conjunction with area vocational schools.

We would leave open the question of whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare might continue the operation of a limited number of conservation camps under delegation to the Departments of Agriculture or the Interior. He would have to assess the needs for such training and the employment prospects for graduates, as well as the possibility of State operation.

#### TRANSFER OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is supposed to be a combination of in-school work-study programs—similar or identical to the 1963 Vocational Education Act work-study program and out-of-school work-training programs. On the whole, only the in-school portion of the program has had any success, and this due to management by school authorities.

The out-of-school program, typically, has consisted of make-work projects having absolutely no value as training. Both of these programs were plagued initially by considerable scandal, including payroll padding and flagrant political abuse. Mere delegation of authority to the Department of Labor to run the program, with OEO calling the tune, has not proved a satisfactory solution to the problem.

We propose to transfer the in-school part of NYC to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be conducted as a work-study program in the schools and closely tied to the administration of the Vocational Education Act, among others. It simply does not make good sense—even if OEO could provide competent administration—to scatter education programs among agencies having no responsibility for education. Indeed, one could well argue that if this were a proper responsibility of OEO large parts of existing education programs, such as title I of ESEA and the education opportunity grants, should be transferred to that agency. We might end up with one federally financed school system for poor children and another locally controlled system for more fortunate children. We regard movements in this direction as tragically and absurdly wrong.

At the same time, we believe with equal conviction that the place for a national manpower program is the Department of Labor. Accordingly, we would transfer the out-of-school portion of NYC to that Department, to be administered in close conjunction with the Manpower Development and Training Act. Young men and women who are out of school and out of work desperately need solid training to fit them for useful and remunerative employment in the private economy; they do not need a make-work program euphemistically described as "work experience."

Fortunately, the entire Neighborhood Youth Corps program fits perfectly into the programs and responsibilities of these two departments, and there is neither a defensible rationale nor a



public purpose for leaving it under the auspices of OEO.

#### A REVIEW ON THE WAR ON POVERTY

##### A. JOB CORPS

When the Job Corps began 3 years ago, apparently Mr. Shriver felt it so necessary to get off to a crash beginning that OEO officials failed, or did not have the time, to make the necessary preparations for a successful program. No provision was made for program evaluation, placement of graduates in jobs, or followup studies, to mention just a few neglected areas. Ever since this hasty beginning, both performance and reputation of the Job Corps have suffered greatly.

Two years too late an evaluation system has finally been placed in operation by which the Job Corps can evaluate the accomplishments of corpsmen and effectiveness of centers and the programs in general. As noted in a report published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, this comes "after more than \$486 million has been spent on 60,000 enrollees who have already left the Job Corps and who, for the purposes of evaluation, are lost."

Because of Job Corps complete inability to evaluate their program in mid-1966 private polling firms were contracted to survey terminated corpsmen for followup information. Through these surveys and other private surveys and analyses, we are fortunate to have available data on which to base some judgment of the effectiveness of the Job Corps program in fulfilling the purposes of title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act. A few of the major conclusions which concern us greatly include:

##### DROPOUTS

It is clearly indicated that the degree of success of a corpsman is closely related to the length of stay in the Job Corps program. Studies indicate and Job Corps officials themselves estimate that a minimum of 6 months' educational and skill training within the center is required to make any significant impact upon a youth's employability. With this in mind, we are alarmed to note that in fiscal 1967, more than 40 percent of enrollees terminated in less than 3 months and another 24 percent terminated in less than 6 months, for a total of 67 percent of the enrollees who in the Job Corps own words do not stay long enough to make a significant impact on their status.

##### TRAINING

Only a small percent of corpsmen are working in the job for which they were trained. One study concludes 23 percent of all enrollees are in any way using their Job Corps training in their employment. One of the reasons for this appears to be inadequate training. According to Louis Harris & Associates, while 65 percent of all corpsmen—43 percent of graduates—felt their training was helpful, only one-quarter thought they had received enough training to get a job in that field. It is interesting to note that several "graduates" responded to one survey they had not "completed their course" and another survey noted that only 60 percent of urban graduates and

only 31 percent of conservation center graduates cite "course completion" as a reason for leaving.

##### PLACEMENT

The Job Corps has made little attempt to place its enrollees. Approximately one out of 10 enrollees receives any placement assistance and these tend to be the most employable youths. Few dropouts receive any assistance. Our concern in this area is for the many youths who are either unemployed or not utilizing their training which could be properly placed with organized Job Corps assistance. At a cost of \$8,046 per enrollee, we feel the Job Corps should make a concerted effort to place all enrollees in employment in which they can utilize and further the training they have received.

##### MEANINGFUL GAINS

Job Corps officials proclaim success with 53 percent of enrollees employed. However, since 58 percent were working when they enrolled this does not represent to us any meaningful gain. We are further concerned because most enrollees do not remain with their jobs for any length of time and reasons for leaving employment indicate that not enough emphasis is given in their training to attitudinal or character development and many cases reflect inadequate skill training.

Based on a thorough review of all studies available we can only come to the conclusion that the Job Corps has not been meeting the needs of these youths who so desperately need a second chance.

##### COSTS

From the very beginning a major criticism of the Job Corps has been the extremely high cost, commonly referred to in a cost-per-enrollee figure. In past years, Job Corps officials have repeatedly denied the \$11,000 and \$15,000 per enrollee figures which have been estimated. Now they are admitting to these high cost figures in the past but are saying the "new Job Corps" operating costs are very low. We tend to believe the costs have been reduced but still feel the OEO figures do not present a true picture of costs.

In their congressional presentation this past June, Job Corps officials claim centers are operating under the \$7,500-cost-per-enrollee limit placed on direct operating costs by Congress in 1966 amendments to the act. In reviewing OEO's statistics furnished, we find however, they have interpreted this limitation not as a limit for each center, but collectively, and in actuality only one men's urban center and one women's center are operating below the \$7,500 limitation in fiscal 1967. The 88 conservation centers are, according to OEO, operating at \$6,122 per enrollee level. This, however, as revealed in a study by Sar A. Levitan for a Senate subcommittee, does not include the \$854 per enrollee cost for materials used in training in conservation work. Neither do any of the figures provided for fiscal 1967—conservation, \$6,122; women's \$8,642; men's urban, \$7,630—include \$600 per enrollee cost for amortization of capital investment or \$603 per enrollee cost for recruitment, screening, placement and Job

Corps headquarters and regional expenses. An accurate picture should include these items and would produce an average per enrollee figure of \$8,076 per enrollee, broken down as \$8,664 for enrollees in men's urban centers; \$9,735 for enrollees in women's centers; and \$7,315 for those enrollees in conservation centers. It should be noted here that these figures are for those centers which have been in operation 9 months or more and do not represent startup expenses.

The Job Corps Division justifies this high cost per enrollee figure by saying these youths would all be on welfare and make no contribution to society but for their Job Corps' experience. This argument does not hold up in view of the high dropout rates, short length of stay in camps, and meager training these youths are receiving. In addition, a survey of those youths who applied for Job Corps but did not show for various reasons indicates that 60 percent of these youths are working and 14 percent have returned to school. The survey concludes the status of the "no-shows" is about the same as the status of the dropouts and discharges who account for two-thirds of all enrollees. Then we are to understand that two-thirds of all Job Corps enrollees, at \$8,076 per enrollee, are no better off than those who did not go to the Job Corps.

##### SUCCESSSES

The receipt of the following letter from the father of a Job Corps "success" with 28 months of Job Corps' training at an estimated total expenditure of \$25,000, however, can only cause us to ask "How many Job Corps successes are really successes?"

DEAR SIRS: Request your consideration for a waiver of time and allow my son, Gary James Thompson to enter the manpower program in Oklahoma City, Okla.

According to your statistics, and verbally authenticated by Mr. Daniel Lagunas and Mr. Wayne Wallace—Gary has graduated from the Job Corps. In fact, I am informed that he graduated from both basic and advanced electronics.

Attached is a certificate of participation attesting to the fact that he did attend classes in electronics for 5 months.

I must admit and compliment those that have contributed to my son's development as a young man. The corps has contributed measurably and without hesitation I admit that I am very proud of him.

I do take exception however to the end result in training and education. Gary had achieved a very low education level and certainly was not equipped to pursue a course in electronics. Further, the exigencies of the Job Corps in his being moved from one place to another. This did nothing to help his advancement.

First let us eliminate the moving around. He signed into Poplar Bluff, Mo., on January 30, 1965 (no electronics were offered there, this may be the place he should have stayed). He was transferred to Tongue Point, Oreg., on February 20, 1966, and on closing of that center, transferred to San Marcos, Tex., January 20, 1967. He was released May 29, 1967.

Gary is still ill-equipped to take his place in society. Uneducated and untrained. We waited for the school year to start, only to find that not one credit can be obtained for his 23 months in the corps.

A 19-year-old boy cannot fit into a freshman class in high school, and education is the greatest desire of his heart.



Through this thorough evaluation I have learned one important thing. The boy has a good ability and if I can find the right approach, he will progress rapidly. In taking the Air Force entrance exams he scored 65 on electronics, 55 on mechanical, 45 on administration, and 60 in the general area. However, with a 56 on the Armed Forces qualifying exam he cannot enlist in the Air Force as he is not a high school graduate. (As a category 4, non-high-school graduate he must score less than 30 on the Armed Forces exam.)

At the moment, Gary is going to the adult study center high school. However, it will take at least 3 years to obtain a high school diploma in this way. He will undoubtedly be drafted before completion.

To reiterate, I believe that Gary could qualify for a high school diploma with his current night school studies and the manpower program in less than a year. Respectfully request a waiver to enter him into his retraining program at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

CARL T. THOMPSON.

Perhaps the explanation for this situation is that centers which this youth attended provided a training program similar to the one at the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Women's Job Corps Center. "Job Corps Girls Are Angry—And Not Busy." This newspaper headline appeared during the controversy at the Albuquerque center in February 1967, when four counselors resigned their positions with the center charging, among other things, that the educational program at the center was badly organized, and the girls were not learning anything that would be of practical help to them. They also complained that class schedules for enrollees called for only one, two, three, or four classes a day involving from 45 minutes to less than 4 hours a day.

One counselor said:

Too many girls stay in bed all morning and loll around all afternoon. By night, they're raring to go.

Records of the center substantiate that there were only from 1 to 4 classes scheduled each day, with classes beginning late in the morning and only running through early afternoon. No classes were held on Saturday or Sunday and only driver's education classes were scheduled in the evenings. Average class time reflected on the schedules was approximately 9 to 12 hours a week, with some as low as 6 hours a week. A few interesting schedules are noted:

#### Enrollee A

Date of entry: May 19, 1966; vocation: Not indicated.

Schedule	Per week
Creative writing	2'15"
Photography	4'30"
Driver's education	8'
Total	14'45"

#### Enrollee B

Date of entry: Sept. 13, 1966; vocation: Not indicated.

Schedule:	Per week
Language arts	1'30"
Science	1'30"
Math	1'30"
Physical improvement	1'30"
Total	6'

#### Enrollee C

Date of entry: Aug. 9, 1966; vocation: NA (nurses aid), LPN (licensed practical nurse). (It is noted there is no LPN program at the center.)

Schedule:	Per week
First aid	2'15"
Citizenship	2'15"
English	2'15"
Math	3'45"
Total	10'30"

#### Enrollee D

Date of entry: Dec. 27, 1966; vocation: Not indicated.

Schedule:	Per week
Reading	2'15"
Basic science	1'30"
Citizenship	1'30"
Study skills	1'30"
Total	6'45"

(Note: Cost per enrollee: \$12,658.)

Job Corps officials in a review of the center's program at this time noted the following regarding the vocational program:

The vocational program needs to be strengthened and reevaluated. It needs to be upgraded \* \* \*.

There is little evidence of any evaluative analyses of the Corpswomen's individual program and progress in a vocational skill. She should be kept informed of her progress and of her ability. She should know at what level she is at a given time. Corpswomen apparently do not know. There is a great need for vocational guidance at the center. At this moment there is none.

These girls have enrolled in Job Corps because they had a very weak educational background and felt this was a second chance to obtain the educational and vocational training they badly needed. With flimsy curriculum and weak educational programing such as that exhibited at the Albuquerque center, the Job Corps is letting these girls down.

#### FAKE CURRICULUM

In November, the OEO sent out a survey and review team to the center for an investigation, after which the survey and review team reported that Albuquerque was one of the best Job Corps centers for women in the country. This led us to believe that, at a cost to the Federal Government of \$12,658 per girl per year, an intensified training program was being provided which would enable these girls to go on to meaningful remunerative employment.

Yet in February, less than 3 months after the "excellent" rating of the survey and review team, fraudulently prepared schedules were brought to light, girls were found to be in classes only 6 hours of the total week, and OEO saw to it that the director and assistant director at the Albuquerque center were allowed to "resign."

From what we can learn, the programs of most Job Corps centers are similar to the one at the Pleasanton, Calif., Camp Parks Center, as to which a study of the General Accounting Office noted:

The effectiveness of the program appears to be adversely influenced by a training day that provides only 5 hours of classroom and laboratory work. The balance of the day is free for counseling and avocational activities.

The effectiveness of the program is also adversely influenced by an absentee rate which in some sections has reached 20 percent.

No standards have been applied to govern entrance into various programs, and an individual's lack of aptitude, as indicated by test scores, is not a controlling factor for entry into the more difficult programs. No studies had been made to show what factors were involved or necessary to successfully complete a program.

#### CAMP PARKS—ONE OF THE BEST

Job Corps officials have long praised Camp Parks as "one of the best" centers in operation. Thanks to a study conducted by the General Accounting Office on the entire operation at Parks, we are fortunate to have an insight into the actual operations of one of the Job Corps' "best" camps. The following quoted conclusions from this study we think are most revealing:

While the contractor has reported that a number (enrollees) have been successfully trained and placed, an even larger number have left without completing a training program. Information has not been prepared to show the gains made by individuals during their stay at the center.

The contractor's initial estimated program costs have been far exceeded in operations, and while positive results have been obtained with some enrollees, we are of the opinion that some costs have been unnecessarily incurred, that disciplinary matters have been laxly and inconsistently handled, and that managerial control of the center's operations can be significantly improved while simultaneously reducing costs.

Although the center had been in operation for over 18 months at Pleasanton, Calif., the contractor has yet to establish adequate records to provide systematic and centralized information and evaluations showing the progress of enrollees and the effectiveness of the various courses.

By its very nature, an experimental program to develop new and unique methods to train persons who had previously failed, requires continuous review of each individual's activity to evaluate the effectiveness of existing methods and to ascertain whether different teaching and control techniques are needed. However, this has not been done by the contractor and we found no evidence that OEO has done such work. Development of information on successful techniques and procedures and dissemination to all centers significantly reduce the number of times the same problem is solved at Government expense.

The contractor has permitted some individuals with recognized behavior problems to remain in the program \* \* \* the continued presence of such persons has been extremely disrupting to other enrollees. The potential benefits of rehabilitating a few problem individuals may be far outweighed by the loss of many enrollees who have left the center citing disciplinary problems as their reason. \* \* \* Application of various aspects of employer-employee relationships, including a system for giving or withholding monetary allowances, including the readjustment allowance, could be of particular value.

We also believe that some of the techniques employed by the Army in their training program have merit and should be considered for use at the center. \* \* \* Army officials advised that their schedule minimizes behavior problems since there is little idle time. Again, the center permits enrollees to enter any vocation they desire, while the Army permits the trainee to enter only those courses in which he can reasonably be expected to succeed.



We recommend that the Job Corps act to assure the contractor continue, and expand his efforts to improve enrollee records and program evaluations, and that this data be used by management to effect program improvements. We also recommend that in order to improve control of enrollee behavior that the Job Corps require the center to establish and publish rules of conduct which will provide appropriate procedures to engender conformance.

We recommend that the Job Corps require the center to make a detailed analysis of the instructional television installation and other special equipment, texts, and group tutorials. This analysis should compare the costs involved with the benefits attainable. If the center cannot adequately justify use of these items, they should be made available to other Government activities and the Litton material should be returned for full credit.

#### ROSY PICTURE

This past June, Job Corps officials provided members of the Education and Labor Committee with two large volumes filled with testimony relating glowing reports and statistics which paint a rosy picture of the Job Corps. They say problems of community relations and discipline which have plagued them in the past, are no longer. If we are to believe the Job Corps' version then we must discount as false and nonexistent the following problems which we know to plague the Job Corps:

#### DISCIPLINE

Even though the officials may be able to discount the 150-student disturbance just short of a riot occurring inside the Poland Springs, Maine, women's center in April or later disturbances in Tomah, Wis., and Evansville, Ind., which resulted in enrollees from nearby centers being temporarily barred from those cities, as insignificant, they cannot overlook the 2-hour disturbance in New Bedford, Mass., on July 3, 1967, when approximately 200 angry corpsmen were attempting to batter down the gate of the Rodman Center and throwing rocks at police cars and policemen. Before this activity ceased, women and children were evacuated from neighboring residences, for fear of their safety. Again on October 6, 1967, approximately 100 corpsmen and six policemen were involved in a "scuffle of near-riot proportions" which resulted in the New Bedford City Council passing the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW BEDFORD, MASS., CITY COUNCIL, OCTOBER 9, 1967 (ADOPTED BY A 9 TO 0 VOTE)

Resolved, that a communication be sent to Mr. Theodore Nelson, Fort Rodman Job Corps Center requesting he discontinue the policy of the Job Corps Center allowing Job Corps students to leave the confines of the Rodman Center without responsible supervision until such time as a Federal police force, provided and paid for by the Federal Government, is made available to exercise the necessary control over Job Corps students while in the city and also at Fort Rodman for the balance of the time the Job Corps is located in New Bedford. . . .

An August disturbance with distinct racial overtones at Camp McCook in Nebraska resulted in 12 corpsmen being fired and 51 more quitting. The Omaha, Nebr., Evening World Herald account of August 3 follows:

#### SIXTY-THREE CORPSMEN AGREE TO LEAVE MCCOOK CAMP

#### ACTION IS PROMISED AGAINST THE "GUILTY" IN VIOLENCE

McCook, NEBR.—Officials of the Job Corps Conservation Camp here announced Thursday that 63 corpsmen will leave the camp as a result of a disturbance which had racial overtones Sunday night.

Twenty-nine are Negroes and 34 are white youths. Twelve of the Negroes were discharged. And the other 51 corpsmen agreed to leave voluntarily, officials said.

Camp Director Clem Griffin promised that action would be taken against "all who are guilty."

The camp had an enrollment of 158 before the disturbances began. Center officials said up to 55 percent of the trainees were Negro.

The incident brought three Job Corps officials from Washington to investigate the camp. One of the three was Bernie Diamond, Job Corps Community Relations Director.

Mr. Diamond said he was directed to visit the camp to "see what the problem areas are." He said he learned after arrival that the problem was not "as great as indicated."

#### THE SECOND

Mr. Griffin said the trouble occurred Sunday night when "about a dozen Negro and white boys became involved in a fight in front of the camp's administration building."

Mr. Griffin first said the incident was "just a little misunderstanding." He later said the disturbance was "most definitely motivated by rioting in cities around the country."

After the incident, Red Willow County Attorney Dallas Wood, Jr., said several white corpsmen told him they were "afraid to remain at the camp."

The incident was the second flareup at the camp within 16 months.

In March 1966 eight trainees were arrested and subsequently expelled after a fight in the messhall.

Mr. Griffin said at that time that the fracas was apparently triggered by racial prejudice.

In July 1966 about 50 of the camp's Negro trainees were transferred.

Job Corps officials said the transfers were a move to break up cliques, boost morale, improve racial balance and bring about an enrollment more representative of McCook's population.

#### AT OLD BASE

"With no Negro families in McCook, the lack of social outlets frustrates the corpsmen," officials said then.

The camp, sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation, opened in December 1965. It is one of two Federal Job Corps conservation camps in Nebraska. The other is near Chadron.

Located at the old McCook bomber base, the camp trains 16-to-21-years-olds who are out of work, out of school, and from poor families.

Trainees work on access roads, recreational facilities, tree planting, and other projects near the four major dam reservoirs in southwest Nebraska. Basic education is also provided.

#### WHITE JOB CORPSMEN "AFRAID TO GO BACK" (By Bill Billotte)

McCook, NEBR.—In the living room of the home of a McCook taxicab driver, four former members of the Jobs Corps Conservation Camp 10 miles northwest of here described a night of terror they experienced.

Two said they were beaten Sunday night when the camp erupted in violence after bitter words had been exchanged at an afternoon swimming party at Butler Lake in Frontier County.

Two, who were with the swimming party, said that the argument continued between Negro and white corpsmen on a bus returning them to camp.

They said the violence occurred at about

9:30 p.m. with some of the corps officials attempting to break it up.

One youth said he was beaten unconscious. Another showed a cut in his hand, inflicted, he said, by a razor blade.

One said that he saw a white corpsman beaten to the floor with mopsticks and pool cues and dragged into the hall outside the honor dormitory.

The fourth youth said he was saved from a beating by friendly Negro corpsmen.

But he said he could not escape during the night because "they were sitting on all the steps with broomsticks and razor blades when I tried to figure a way to sneak out."

The corpsmen interviewed and their time of service:

Robert Queen, 17, Akron, Ohio, 10 months; Tommy Edward James, 16, Axson, Ga., 3 months; George Russell, 17, Omaha, 7 months, and Bruce Dobson, 17, Cold Springs, Tex., 9 months.

One of the youths said, and the others agreed, that they had not been treated unfairly by Job Corps authorities at the camp—that "the authorities are doing the best job they can with the problems they have."

The corpsmen also said that the tensions had been building up since "about Christmas" and that the chief resentment among Negroes seemed to be that the Negroes did not have girls of their own race to date.

The four youths said that the disturbance almost got out of control and that others were beaten more severely than they.

A young Job Corps instructor interviewed at the Red Willow County Fair said a reporter could depend on anything that Bruce Dobson could tell him about the corps.

#### OUTSTANDING

The instructor said that Bruce had been outstanding, having been chosen "corpsman of the month" for his performance in education, work, group living, and leadership.

The instructor said that it was also his opinion that the lack of female companionship for Negro corpsmen was one of the major causes of unrest.

"I don't believe it had anything to do with the rioting in the cities," he said, "although I am sure all are fully informed on what is going on."

Young James said he was talking with a girl by telephone in an outdoor booth Sunday evening when the swimmers' bus arrived. He said a Negro banged on the door of the booth and said to "open the door before I kill you."

He said the Negro ripped open the door and "beat me down."

"Several staff members," he said, "pulled him off me and in a daze, I staggered over to a picnic table."

He said he then had his back to the crowd as he sat on the bench.

"That's the last thing I remembered," he said.

Young James was placed in the camp dispensary until Monday afternoon. Then, with two others, he was taken to a McCook clinic.

After two hours of examination and treatment he was taken to the police station where he told authorities he didn't want to return to the camp.

#### GET OUT

Young Russell, the Omaha youth, said that he had just returned from a 72-hour pass and was packing his clothes to go to Enders Lake where corpsmen do reclamation work during the week. He said he had finished and went to watch television when a friend yelled: "George, get out, there's going to be a riot."

Young Russell said he ran for the door but it was blocked by Negroes. He said he was punched in the temple and told: "We're going to get you after bed check."

He said he ran through the door, getting his hands cut by a razor in the process, and got away from the base, spending the night under a tractor a quarter mile from the camp.



He said that he and another corpsman walked into the police station the next morning and said they were afraid to return.

Young Dodson, the honor corpsman, said the violence started as he returned to his dormitory after being gone on a 72-hour pass.

"A bunch started after me but some of my Negro friends stepped in and stopped them," he said.

He said that as the night wore on it became evident that his friends would not be able to protect him again. He tried to sneak out.

"But I couldn't make it. They were on all the steps with broom handles, mops, and razor blades," he said.

Young Dodson said he went to town the next afternoon.

#### GRADUATE

He said that because of the incident he has been permitted to leave the camp as a "graduate" although he is still short several subjects.

The youth said one of the officials told several corpsmen: "If anyone wants to leave, I won't try stop you."

Young Queen said he witnessed another corpsman being beaten and dragged into the hall in the honor-dorm by about 30 Negroes.

He said he was not hurt during the night but heard discussions about beating him up if he stayed. He said he had requested permission to leave the camp but was told that he would be considered absent without leave and it would go against his record.

Young Queen said he told authorities he was worried more about his physical welfare.

Recently, officials at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center for Women at Astoria, Oreg., declared that center off limits to the Fort Simcoe Job Corps Center of Yakima, Wash., as a result of a recent disturbance.

The following letters and comments from ex-corpsmen and employees reveal more of the problems existing within these centers:

Christopher Weeks, former Job Corps Administrator:

The kid is told when he joins that this is a last ditch attempt to salvage him. So in his first day at camp, he's beaten up; his stuff is swiped the second day; after 10 days he goes home. The Corps has reinforced a failure.

Remarks placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 1967, by Congressman GUBSER:

MR. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said regarding the inadequate supervision of Job Corps trainees, and many serious cases of violence, crime, and wrongdoing have been exposed. I have not drawn a conclusion which condemns the Job Corps on the basis of these reports. However, they have become so numerous and appear so authentic that I believe the time has come for a candid investigation and report from the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have recently received a letter from a mother of a Job Corps trainee at Camp Park in California who informs me that her son observed dope addiction and thievery, and lived in constant fear of harm from hoodlums enrolled at the camp. She has authorized me to place her letter in the Congressional Record but has asked that her name be withheld. I now submit her communication, with my request that the Office of Economic Opportunity thoroughly investigate the situation. The letter follows:

"MR. CONGRESSMEN GUBSER: I am writing this letter in regards of the horrible situation at Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton, Calif.

"My son joined the Job Corps and was sent to Parks \* \* \* looking forward to taking a

2-year electronics course, but under some terrifying circumstances he was forced to come back home the following Monday morning, early, determined never to return to this place until it is thoroughly free of dope addicts, thieves, and hoodlums.

"He said the last 2 nights he spent there, he was in constant fear, as there is not enough adult supervision for protection to help the few decent boys who are there. A place like this that is supported and run by our Government, and a place like this that is so highly recommended on TV, should be a decent place for the boys who are interested in the education and training they would and could get if it wasn't for the dope addicts and hoodlums who somehow manage to go there.

"As a mother of a boy who has experienced the situation at Parks Job Corps and as a taxpayer, I would like you to arrange a Government investigation and make Parks a nice, clean, and safe place for our boys to go and take advantage of this, as it is a very good thing for young people to advance themselves for the future. I would be the last person to ask that it be discontinued, but it should definitely be investigated and made a more proper place for decent boys.

"I am aware of the fact that some boys have made it through this training with very little trouble, but I am also aware of the fact that some of our boys get back from Vietnam and others are not so lucky. I know I should not compare the two situations, but if my son is killed by another boy or man, I would rather know he was fighting for his country and not killed by some boy who would do this to him for a pack of cigarettes or what little money he had on him.

"Please take this into consideration and have the Government investigation as I am sure my son would like to return and so would many more who were forced to leave because of the lack of adult supervision and protection.

"I could tell you much more about this place, but I can't seem to have the right words to put it on paper.

"I'm sure my son would be more than happy to tell you all he knows if you are interested, so feel free to call any time after 4 p.m. as I work.

"Thank you,

"\_\_\_\_\_."

The disciplinary problems which exist at various centers may be in part due to the degree of discipline demanded by the center authorities. One conclusion arrived at in the Government agency report on Parks was:

A significant number of the Parks' enrollees have cited these (violence and discipline) reasons for leaving the program. Absenteeism also has been identified as a discipline problem at Parks . . . no centerwide standards of conduct and penalties have been established and enrollees may not be aware of what is expected of them or the consequences of improper behavior.

Furthermore, to accustom the enrollee to the employee-employer relationship that he will eventually encounter, failure of individuals to comply with reasonable standards of attendance and behavior should result in appropriate reduction of pay and allowances. This is an especially critical area since a basic objective of the Job Corps program is to prepare enrollees for employment and since a number of former enrollees have been fired for poor attendance or other disciplinary reasons.

#### ALBUQUERQUE JOB CORPS CENTER

The Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women was placed in the national spotlight last February when four counselors resigned their positions leveling charges of poor discipline, employment of a nar-

cotics "pusher" at the center who was responsible for a number of girls becoming pregnant, and poor staff morale and conflicts. These charges resulted in Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Congressman THOMAS G. MORRIS, and Senator CLINTON ANDERSON demanding an investigation of the Albuquerque Center.

Although OEO public information people promptly "kissed-off" reports of trouble by saying:

The charges were a lot of loose talk \* \* \* 99 percent of these things never happened.

OEO dispatched an investigative team to the Albuquerque Center which did in its report establish that the majority of the charges were true. Job Corps officials admitted to lax discipline, the employment of a narcotics "pusher" who was believed to be responsible for the pregnancy of one girl, and a serious problem of dissention and conflict among the staff which was considered detrimental to the corpswomen.

#### COEXISTENCE

Poor judgment in location of numerous Job Corps centers, particularly those conservation centers in remote areas, has created many of the problems realized in discipline and community relations. One comment of corpsmen during the McCook disturbance was the "chief resentment among Negroes seemed to be that the Negroes did not have girls of their own race to date," or in the word of another McCook corpsman, "The biggest flaw in the camp routine from the standpoint of the Negro corpsman stems from its location." Regarding the Price Job Corps Center in Price, Utah, which has reached 60-percent Negro enrollment at times, Price Mayor Murray Mathis commented: "We must be realistic, the town has no Negro population." The plea of Job Corps officials in April 1967 for 80 white girls to attend the Saturday night dances at McCoy Job Corps Center, suggests that the remote location of these centers create problems for all enrollees. This problem of isolation affects the operation of approximately 80 percent of all Job Corps centers.

#### HURTING BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Job Corps went to the opposite extreme and located several women's centers in the downtown business districts of a number of large cities. Complaints are being voiced by businessmen that the location of these centers is hurting the business community. One businessman in Albuquerque, N. Mex., commented:

The Job Corps is a noble dream but in operation it has certainly hurt Albuquerque downtown business.

Business leaders in Omaha, Nebr., have similar sentiments regarding their two Job Corps establishments in the downtown Regis and Paxton Hotels, as noted in the following article which appeared in the Omaha Morning World-Herald on October 12, 1967:

OMAHA BUSINESS LEADERS DECIDE JOB CORPS IS HURTING DOWNTOWN

(By Arnold Garson)

Two Omaha business leaders called Wednesday for the transfer of the Women's Job Corps Center from the city's downtown area.

George T. Wruck, general manager of the Associated Retailers of Omaha, said the Fed-



eral Job training program has hurt the city's image and economy.

Alfred C. Kennedy, chairman of the Central Omaha Committee, said the Job Corps has been "harmful to downtown."

Their comments came in separate interviews after Mayor Sorenson said it "probably was a mistake" to locate the center downtown. The mayor voiced that opinion Tuesday in response to question raised at a Junior League of Omaha luncheon.

#### CORPS SILENT

Job Corps officials declined to comment on the situation until after a meeting with "community leaders," possibly next week.

Mr. Wruck said it was a mistake to have "this much of a concentration of Job Corps girls" downtown.

"I think Omaha has made a great sacrifice. It has caused problems and we're uncomfortable about it," Mr. Wruck said.

He said many callers have complained that they have had to walk through large groups of Job Corps girls and the boys they attract.

There are about 800 Job Corps girls living at the former Paxton and Regis Hotels. Sixty percent of the enrollees are Negro; 24 percent are white, and 16 percent are Spanish-American, Indian, or oriental, corps officials said.

Some downtown businessmen reportedly have complained that Negro enrollees on the streets and young men congregating around the hotels have discouraged shoppers from coming downtown.

#### MAY OR MAY NOT

Mr. Wruck said businessmen who must work late now try to park as close to their offices as possible because "there are dangers in coming into the area."

He said businessmen have "sensed these dangers within the last year, and that they may or may not be directly related to the Job Corps."

In addition, the loss of two hotels has "handicapped the city in accommodating visitors," he said.

"We're getting a disturbing reputation as a city, nationally," as a result of the Job Corps' downtown location, he said.

Mr. Wruck said he would like the program moved to a location outside the downtown area. "If we could solve some of these discomforts, it would be a better program," he said.

Mr. Kennedy said the Job Corps has "very definitely been harmful to business conditions downtown."

#### NOT DESIRABLE

"The type of girl who enrolls in the Job Corps and the type of person she attracts are not desirable for a downtown district," Mr. Kennedy said.

He added that he would be "indifferent as to whether the center remained in Omaha."

The Job Corps program is for unemployed, out-of-school 16 to 21-year-olds. The Omaha Center is operated under Federal contract by the Burroughs Corp.

Mayor Sorenson said he suggested last week that Center Director Robert W. Anderson set up a meeting to discuss the problem caused by having the Job Corps downtown.

Leo Armatis, Job Corps public relations official, said there has been talk of such a meeting for the last week or 10 days, and that he understands the meeting will be early next week, although Job Corps officials did not set it up.

Mr. Wruck said his association "sees no reason to hold a meeting on the subject at this time."

#### TRY FOR SOLUTION

Mr. Armatis said: "We have known for some time that realtors are upset about groups of youths on the street and we are trying to work out a solution."

In an interview Tuesday, Mayor Sorenson said enrollees "need more open areas where they can enjoy the out of doors. If they go

out of doors now, they are on a main business street."

Mr. Sorenson said he would not start or support any effort to have the Job Corps moved out of the downtown hotels.

"Foot traffic has increased tremendously in the downtown area and businessmen are very concerned about it," the mayor said.

Mr. Sorenson said he asked Mr. Anderson to reduce the foot traffic. The mayor said he suggested staggering free time given enrollees and "encouraging the girls to use recreation facilities in the hotels."

Prior to his meeting with Mr. Anderson, the mayor said, the Job Corps had begun providing buses for enrollees going about three blocks between the hotels and had hired more police officers.

"The Job Corps has been very cooperative," Mr. Sorenson added.

#### LOCATION—"USUAL"

The Omaha Center is one of six urban centers located in a downtown business district, according to Richard C. Gilliland, of Kansas City, Mo., acting regional Job Corps administrator.

Mr. Gilliland, in a telephone interview, said women's Job Corps centers need to be "near libraries and the urban social atmosphere."

In a survey of former corpsmen contracted by the Job Corps, it is noted only 56 percent of the corpsmen felt their chances to meet people in the community were good. Although in some instances there has been a wholehearted acceptance and welcoming of the corpsmen into the community, we feel for the most part, it is merely a matter of coexistence.

While we listen to the Job Corps officials paint their pretty picture during their testimony before the committee, we are very irritated because, as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] so aptly said it:

As one member of the committee I get a little bit leery when I get a snow job that everything is great \* \* \* if we are going to have successful hearings and if we are going to do anything constructive as far as our time is concerned it seems to me that we ought to know the weaknesses as well as the strengths of the program and then see how we could tighten it up to do the best job possible.

#### CREDIBILITY GAP

The credibility gap created by the two widely varying versions of the Job Corps story is further widened by the charges of Mr. James Tice, former manager of student information services for the Guthrie, Okla., Job Corps Center, who advised that early in June this year, regional OEO officials, Austin, Tex., instructed the Guthrie Job Corps Center officials to falsify daily reports reflecting the "on-board strength" of corpswomen. He explained that, as corpswomen resigned or were given disciplinary discharges from the center, they were not reported to OEO until the end of fiscal 1967—June 30, 1967.

A review of the situation reveals Mr. Tice said the center director requested the site representative—OEO—to have these instructions put in writing by regional OEO; however, OEO refused to put the instructions in writing and reportedly told the center director, if they—Philco-Ford—wanted to retain the contract, they had better comply. Mr. Tice said he was not formerly told why the records had to be falsified, but it was the impression of center officials that OEO

wanted to build the total of Job Corps enrollees to 41,000 in time for the OEO congressional presentation in order to justify retention of all Job Corps Centers at current funding levels.

Among the material Mr. Tice furnished were copies of "termination requests" from the center reflecting that 22 enrollees who were terminated in June were not reported until July 3, 1967.

The following observations were set out in an investigative report of the Guthrie matter and were later established in ad hoc subcommittee hearings:

It is the observation of the investigator that the procedure of placing dropouts and discharges in an administrative leave status after they had departed the center and for the remainder of the month of June resulted in the following:

First. Since the on-board strength for the days in June after the dropouts had left the center included those in an administrative leave status, the final computations of corpswomen days, 13,148, and corpswomen months, 438, were inflated and this resulted in a lower operating cost per corpswoman for the month of June.

Second. Carrying the corpswomen in an administrative leave status after they had returned to their homes resulted in the delay of severance pay being forwarded to the girls. This may have caused some hardships. It is noted that several of the youths had to wait 2 months or 9 weeks for their separation pay.

When additional letters are received, such as this sent to Congressman SMITH from Oklahoma, questions are presented regarding the statistics furnished by OEO:

MOUNTAIN PARK, OKLA.,  
October 4, 1967.

HON. JAMES V. SMITH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I wish to congratulate you on your recent announcement of a discovery of irregularities in enrollment records at Guthrie Job Corps Center for Women.

As a resident of your district, I wish to encourage you to further investigate the Jobs Corps. I resigned on June 1, 1967, after spending 2 years as principal and teacher with the Job Corps at Ouachita Job Corps Center, Royal, Ark. I assure you that what was discovered at Guthrie is not limited to that center, but has been done at all centers by direction of OEO. Enrollment records have long been manipulated by OEO officials. Several times during my tenure with the Job Corps, orders were received from OEO, directing centers not to release names of corpsmen who would be leaving the center until a certain date. At times orders were sent to centers directing center officials not to send any corpsmen home until after a certain date.

A method used to cover up dropout rates is that of considering all corpsmen as enrollees for the first 30 days. If corpsmen drop out during that time, no dropout is recorded.

One important facet of Job Corps' statistics is the number of graduates reported. Only a very small percentage of Job Corps graduates have actually completed the program and truly bettered themselves. Corpsmen leaving after a stay of only 5, 6, or 8 weeks are generally considered graduates for record purposes. Many times corpsmen go AWOL and are recorded as graduates.

During the 2 years I spent at Ouachita Job Corps Center, out of over 500 enrollees, only 1 percent could actually be considered graduates of the program. The others merely spent time there.



I feel I can speak with some authority when I say that the Job Corps is a program of much deceit and waste. Unless the program is radically changed, I feel that it should be abolished.

I will be happy to provide you with any help you might desire should you decide to continue your inquest into the Job Corps.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. DEEDS.

B. NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The long-range answer to the employment problems of the disadvantaged cannot reside in a program to be simply an "aging vat," providing youths with some income and work during their early years in the labor force. It must reside in a well-developed program based on providing participants with a thorough knowledge and skill in a particular field that will provide permanence.

We oppose the indefinite funding of Neighborhood Youth Corps—NYC—and urge that steps be taken toward a permanent training program for youth—a program that will lead to more than "make work," a program that will lead to a better standard of living for the participants.

Last year one of our major criticisms of the NYC was the small percentage of enrollees who were receiving any form of remedial education or vocational training. The Office of Education testified at the 1966 House hearings that only 20 percent of all enrollees and only 10 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving any such education or training assistance. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz confirmed this and admitted he was not satisfied. Since the intent of the Congress in legislating the out-of-school program was to enable high school dropouts to return to school or to provide them with meaningful vocational training on which to build a career, we are, like Mr. Wirtz, totally dissatisfied. It was felt much of the problem was created by the Economic Opportunity Act itself, which barred the participation of private, profitmaking firms, leaving the enrollees to be placed in make work jobs with local governments or nonprofit agencies. For this reason, Congress last year amended NYC legislation to permit private, profitmaking employers to participate in the NYC.

ONE YEAR LATER

We returned to the 1967 House hearings eager to see how this amendment and employment with private firms had improved the status of high school dropouts and the NYC's figures, but were told that only four projects involving private employers had been approved, which included a mere 164 enrollees out of 25,000 total enrollment. So we again asked, "How many enrollees were receiving any remedial education or vocational training during fiscal 1967?" Mr. Jack Howard, Administrator of the Bureau of Works program, responded that now 30 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving remedial or vocational education training. A closer look at this statement reveals to us that 70 percent of all out-of-school NYC enrollees, at \$2,930 apiece, are still in "make-work" jobs and receiving no remedial education or vocational training.

#### MEASUREMENT OF SUCCESS

A reduction in the high school dropout rates and the placement of former enrollees in jobs are the final measures of success of the NYC. So we looked to the Labor Department for the followup records of past enrollees by which we could evaluate the program—but found no such regular system of information is maintained. A few samples of program results have been conducted by Labor Department and projected as being typical of what is happening nationally. These projections would indicate the in-school program has resulted in a noticeable decline in high school dropout rates and possibly a reduction in juvenile delinquency rates.

Like Job Corps, NYC officials, to fill the gap, have contracted with a few private firms to make studies of the NYC program. These and other private studies which are available to us indicate that approximately one-third of the enrollees are known to have returned to school, received additional training or obtained employment upon leaving the program. The studies also indicate that, while in training, nearly five of every six enrollees thought that they would need additional education or training to meet their occupational goals. Also, when seeking employment, nearly two of every five who found jobs did not use the NYC as a reference.

In view of the above type of results, we consider it vital that more detailed information be developed by the NYC about the program so that an informed evaluation can be made.

#### C. COMMUNITY ACTION

Community Action, under the misdirection of OEO administrators, has done more to impede the war on poverty than any other component. From the beginning it was obvious that OEO read things into the Economic Opportunity Act that were never intended by the Congress. The concept of social reform by force and development of abrasive relations between community action agencies on the one hand and public officials and established agencies on the other was developed and propounded by the OEO in Washington and by regional OEO representatives.

Community action agency personnel have organized and directed confrontations and demonstrations against public officials to a degree where tensions have mounted and complete community disruption has resulted. Too frequently these displays of hostility have been coincident with racial unrest and have polarized the Negro and white communities.

The lack of coordination and cooperation between community action agencies on one hand and school officials, welfare agencies, housing authorities, and representatives of private enterprise on the other, have brought about total alienation of these community leaders from antipoverty programs. Until these malfunctions are corrected, it is unlikely that community action will be able to bring about changes to improve conditions which contribute to poverty.

Community action agencies have be-

come so deeply involved in voter registration drives and subsequent elections that the role of paid antipoverty workers in "politics" has been clearly identified and established. Elected officials and candidates, especially in urban areas consider community action agencies as a most powerful base in local political arenas.

Community reaction to the excessive political and organizational aspects of community action has developed an atmosphere of conflict and bitterness.

Irresponsible handling of large sums of money and lack of fiscal accountability continue to plague community action programs.

There is little indication that community action is reaching a significant number of poor or that the poverty stricken are being assisted in tangible or visible ways. It is likely that the heavy emphasis on organization and political and demonstration activity have detracted from the performance of community action agencies in these regards.

#### COMMUNITY DISRUPTION

Investigation by this committee in 1965 and 1967 revealed that community action in Newark, N.J., has developed bitterness and conflict between the poor and public officials of that city.

Community action personnel during early summer 1967, organized and participated in demonstrations of protest against the mayor and the Newark School Board. At public meetings antipoverty personnel made numerous inflammatory public speeches advocating violence. On July 13, 1967, antipoverty workers distributed announcements of a police brutality rally to be held at a Newark police station. Later that evening antipoverty workers organized the demonstration which was attended by several hundred demonstrators. The Newark riots started at this rally.

Although public officials are reluctant to express their views publicly concerning community action there has been ample evidence that hostility and conflict has existed between antipoverty agencies on one hand and elected officials and community agencies on the other in Syracuse, N.Y.; Rochester, N.Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Houston, Tex.; Elgin, Ill.; Durham, N.C.; and many other cities.

Community action leaders seem to have overlooked their responsibility to "mobilize and utilize" resources, public or private, of a community in an attack on poverty. Rather, the contrary appears to be true, the resources of the community action agency—80 or 90 percent Federal funds—have been literally utilized in attacks on mayors, police departments, welfare and housing agencies, school authorities, and at times private individuals and firms. The abrasive relations existing between CAA's and other community agencies can only lead to failure of programs and eventual collapse of the community action agency involved.

We feel the responsibility for much of the disruptive and destructive activities of community action programs lies with the Office of Economic Opportunity. The concept that public officials and tra-



ditional services agencies are to be considered adversaries of the poor is popular among community action officials. It is shared and at times propounded by OEO administrators. This is illustrated in an exchange of letters between the mayor of Houston, Tex., and the Office of Economic Opportunity in May and July 1967:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
City of Houston, Tex.

The attached constitutes a series of questions that this office feels it can no longer delay in raising. The questions are of both a conceptual and specific nature concerning the poverty program on the national level and on the local level.

It seems particularly imperative for this information to be given careful scrutiny at this time and for answers to be obtained to the questions raised. As the OEO in both Washington and Austin knows, there has been deep concern about the poverty program in the Houston area for some time but it has only been in the last few weeks that the problem has reached a point where this office must bring the sort of information and questions contained in the attached to the attention of those in authority on a national level.

LOUIE WELCH, Mayor.

#### A. CONCEPTUAL 1. National level

(a) According to the Community Action Program Guide, volume 1, October 1965, the purpose of "Federal assistance to community action programs is to help urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty \* \* \* A vital feature of every Community Action program is the involvement of the poor themselves—the residents of the areas and members of the groups to be served—in planning, policymaking, and operation of the program \* \* \* The long-range objective of every Community Action program is to effect a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted by poverty to deal effectively with their own problems so that they need no further assistance" (p. 7).

(b) According to President Lyndon B. Johnson's state of the Union message, 1965, " \* \* \* the central problem is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

Question. What is the Washington OEO's position as to whether the above purposes can be accomplished and the problems alleviated by local CAP agencies working with and taking advantage of the resources of local government?

Question. What is the Washington OEO's position on whether local CAP employees should encourage and promote conflict with local government when remedies through mediation and negotiation have not been exhausted?

#### 2. Local level

(a) In the attempts between the Houston-Harris County Economic Opportunity Organization to merge with the Houston Action for Youth, the following statements were contained in HHCEO material outlining their philosophy and approach.

(1) In contrasting the EEO approach with HAY's approach, this position was taken by EEO: "Their (HAY) approach is directed toward leadership development, direct services, and cultural enrichment. They are not, however, intent on rapid social change and do not employ the concept of power in their social theory. Given the political structures of our day, their approach is of little significance in forming a large power base of the poor" (p. 4, "Operation Discovery," spring 1967).

Question. The most rapid social change is revolution. Is revolution the goal of EEO?

Question. Does the EEO consider the "political structures of our day" so inflexible that the voices of the poor cannot be heard and the poor cannot obtain programs they initiate without confrontation and conflict with "the establishment?"

(2) " \* \* \* It is only in this manner that Houston's largest concentrations of inner city poor can be organized into the large power organization which would force its way into the center of the decisionmaking processes which control the city" (p. 5, Operation Discovery).

Question. What is meant by "force?" Is it felt that the "decisionmaking processes" have no interest in including the poor, who are constituents in a community just as much as people with greater means? Does the EEO mean that "force" is the only way the poor can be included or does the EEO really mean this is the EEO's opinion?

(3) In "action phase I" of the EEO's approach in the community, this description is given of the organizer's job: "It is up to the organizer to determine which of the problems should be selected to act upon first. Once this is done the community organizer seeks out a situation which will dramatize the problem. This situation becomes the "gut issue" around which the community organizer rallies the people (HHCEO community organization component proposal).

Question. What does it mean to "seek out" a dramatic situation? In Houston, EEO used a case in which county deputy constables were involved in Settegast to bring two busloads to city hall to protest "police brutality." What elaboration can be given on the "gut issue" approach—is it one designed to stir people up to the point that their emotions can be used by EEO workers to "force" the poor into "decisionmaking processes?"

Question. Since it appears that the EEO program is based, at least in part, on that used by the Woodlawn Organization initiated by Saul Alinsky, is it the opinion of the EEO that confrontation and conflict are the only means by which the poor can be heard by "the power structure" and mediation of problems is a method not open to the impoverished?

#### B. SPECIFIC

1. Activities of employees of Houston-Harris County Economic Opportunity Organization (now part of the Harris County Community Action Association).

(a) What is—and was—the role of EEO employees in the following type situations?

(1) At Texas Southern University:

(a) On the night of Tuesday, May 16, and early morning of Wednesday, May 17, when a gun battle occurred between dormitory students at TSU and police, an EEO employee named Roosevelt "Rudy" Huffpower stated that he had been in the dormitory where students had guns and were firing them. Was he there to dissuade them from firing or to encourage them? What was his function?

Earl Allen, director of community organization for EEO, also appeared and his offer to accompany other "dissuaders" to the dormitory was accepted. Any report that has been submitted saying Allen's help was solicited by the mayor's office or police is not correct. He claims to have rapport with TSU students and thus his offer to go to the dormitory with three other Negro "leaders" was accepted. The "leaders" failed to dissuade the students from shooting. The main question in connection with Allen and TSU is that reports have been picked up that he and other EEO workers have claimed that they have "kept the situation down" at TSU and if it hadn't been for them, trouble would have come sooner. Such is not true. A second question is: What has any attempt at intervention at TSU have to do with the poverty program? Certainly, in a crisis such as Tuesday night, help from any quarter would be welcomed. But the claim has been

made since March that EEO workers have been "helping keep the situation down" at TSU and, until Tuesday night they were at the college strictly on their own initiative. (More discussion on this point will follow.)

(b) Reports have been picked up that EEO workers have stated that they knew students had 17 weapons in the dormitories and could have "disarmed" them. If EEO workers were so anxious to "keep the situation down" at TSU, why didn't they turn such information over to proper authorities. And why didn't they "disarm" the students on the night of the shooting, if they could, since Huffpower himself said he was in the dormitory where the guns were?

(c) In connection with the frequent claims that EEO workers have contributed to holding the TSU situation down, the following questions need to be answered:

On the night of Saturday, April 22, when 24 cars were damaged by bricks and rocks thrown from the TSU campus at passing motorists, injuring six of them (two seriously), where were the EEO "mediators"? The mayor's office assistant in race relations was in Dallas and didn't return until Sunday.

On the night of Sunday, April 23, when the mayor's aide was back in town, he was told by Dean of Students J. B. Jones that the situation was as explosive as ever and bricks would probably again be thrown. The mayor's aide persuaded the head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who had not been involved in the brick throwing, to go to the campus and try to dispel some 200 students who had gathered. He did so. Where were the EEO "mediators"?

On Monday night, April 24, the same situation repeated itself and the same assistance was provided by the mayor's office. None came from the EEO workers.

On Tuesday night, April 25, the mayor's office aide conferred with SNCC leaders on a "campus policing" routine to keep disorders down. SNCC agreed to take on the job. EEO was not involved.

Until Wednesday, April 26, Wheeler Street was having to be blocked off regularly and from 100 to 300 policemen stationed three blocks away for possible intervention on the campus.

(d) All these details are furnished to dispel rumors that EEO workers have helped keep order at TSU. They have not.

(e) On Monday, May 22, an EEO worker identified as Pluria Marshall, who was given a leave of absence after being at the scene of TSU street-blocking demonstrations in April, was seen passing out inflammatory material on the trouble at TSU May 16. A copy of the material has been obtained. Marshall is back on the EEO payroll.

Question. Is this a legitimate function of a war on poverty worker and, if it is, what relationship does it have to creating or executing programs helping the poor? The distribution of the material was being made in the 3000 block of Rosedale, six blocks from TSU, a section known as Riverside, where homes in the area sell for \$14,000 to \$20,000.

(2) At the Holmes Road dump—preachers in the area have led a series of street blockings to keep garbage trucks from using the dump. Arrests have followed.

(a) On Saturday, May 20, three EEO workers were at the church where Rev. O. L. Hughes was organizing a new group of people to block the street to the dump.

(b) According to Francis Williams, board chairman of the merged Harris County Community Action Association, their assignment was to keep people from "becoming wrought up" and "doing anything impulsive" since there was tension in the city from the May 17 disturbance at TSU.

(c) Paraphrased, these are the kind of statements the three EEO workers made to a mayor's office assistant in the presence of neighborhood people who gathered around for the discussion:



When is your racist mayor going to wake up to the fact that this town is going to burn if he doesn't do something?

The shooting by students at TSU was justified because the white man has been oppressing the Negro for 300 years and now it is the black man's turn.

Don't you know this town is going to burn and there are people just waiting to loot the stores?

Question. Are such statements, made outside an organizational meeting for a demonstration, designed to "keep people from getting wrought up?" The statements came from Roosevelt "Rudy" Huffpower, Bertain English, and Robert Becnel. Huffpower had been issued 3 days before, at the request of EEO Executive Director Charles Kelly, a "special representative of mayor's" card to enable him to cross police lines such as at TSU. Huffpower was the EEO worker who was loudly branding the mayor a "racist" at the Holmes Road meeting site. Kelly was asked May 23 to return all mayor's cards.

Question. Has the Washington OEO agency been receiving reports that Houston is "going to burn" and the EEO workers are the ones who are keeping things under control? Reports picked up locally are that Earl Allen has repeatedly used "the town is going to burn" theme to indicate that only himself and his people have the power to keep things under control.

### (3) In northeast Houston

(a) On the evening of Tuesday, May 16, before any shooting at TSU, EEO workers appeared at the homes in the area where there was tension over picketing and arrests at the nearby Northwood Junior High School.

Question. Why did these people intervene in an area where the Scenic Woods homes are all brick, costing from \$10,000 to \$15,000, and there is no indication of poverty?

(b) On the same evening, after the TSU shooting started, the mayor's office was informed that Francis Williams, EEO board chairman had made his staff available to keep people from going to the streets in other areas of the city or creating disorder not in the interest of community peace. EEO workers Larry Thomas, Robert Benjamin and Warren Fincke were "assigned" to the Northeast area.

(c) On the night of Thursday, May 18, Larry Thomas signed a letter, which was delivered by Fincke, for four to six parents in the northeast area wanting a meeting with the superintendent at noon the next day. The parents would not sign or deliver the letter themselves. The superintendent wanted to know what business the EEO had in the affair, which concerned suspensions of students who were children of the four to six parents.

(d) On the morning of Thursday, May 18, a former employer of one of the parents of a suspended student at Northwood Junior High School received a call from the parent saying that "agitators" had moved into his home and were "dangerous." He identified a "Larry Thomas" and said he feared these people might try to do "something like blow up the school."

(e) Reports have picked up locally that EEO workers are blaming Sam Price, Earl Allen's counterpart at HAY, for telling police where a suspect in the TSU trouble was staying.

Question. Has the OEO agency in Washington received this report and does it consider that a man's life may be in danger as a result?

(f) Tuesday, May 23, without intervention from either EEO or HAY workers (now both members of the Harris County Community Action Association), arrangements were made through a representative of the mayor's office for dissident parents in Northeast Houston to meet with the school superintendent, with the result that all but two students

were reinstated in Northwood Junior High School. This was accomplished through mediation, without use of the confrontation-conflict technique advocated in such situations by the local EEO and without need of further picketing or demonstrations by the suspended students, their parents or outside "help" from TSU students.

Such reinstatement should not be interpreted to mean there will not be any more trouble in the Northeast Houston area or at the Northwood Junior High School. It simply means that any reports the Washington OEO agency may have received about the critical nature of the situation has been negated, as far as problems from dissident parents are concerned.

(b) Questions on Charles Kelly, EEO executive director, and sources of "city in crisis" rumors:

(b) In December 1966, Kelly told a mayor's office aide of a report that there would be "a burning" in the third ward during the Christmas holiday and that "the CIA was working on it."

(2) In March 1967, Kelly said that the controversy in Settegast between residents and EEO workers was being handled right by EEO and was a "gut issue."

(3) Repeated reports have come from EEO workers in the past week that Houston is "about to burn" and only they can save the situation.

2. Activities of James M. Simons, whose "card of introduction" identifies him as with the Office of Economic Opportunity, 314 West 11th Street, Austin, Tex.

(a) What is his role and function?

(1) Sam Price, head of neighborhood organization for Houston Action for Youth, said Simons originally identified himself as assigned to OEO Office of Inspector, under Ed Terrones, but working for the U.S. Department of Justice.

(2) Price said Simons first came to Houston approximately 1 month ago to investigate the participation of EEO workers in civil rights demonstrations.

(3) To this date, Simons has never paid a visit to the mayor's office to obtain information it might have on any EEO worker leaving his assigned area to work with the poor and appearing at TSU and other areas to encourage or participate in demonstrations. On Thursday, May 18, a mayor's assistant, who happened to be at Houston Action for Youth for a meeting of the merged group, was introduced to Simons, who also was at HAY. After visiting TSU, Simons came back and had approximately 5 minutes of conversation with the mayor's assistant and asked for some "off the record" opinions.

(b) What is the nature of the reports Simons has been sending in?

(1) From reports in Houston, Simons has gained a reputation as a completely naive, inexperienced young man who has been taken in by the Earl Allen group in EEO on the need for militant participation by EEO in "civil rights" activities.

(2) As Simons was leaving HAY headquarters, he was told by a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee who had been with him to read a certain book the SNCC member had recommended. The SNCC member said it would indoctrinate Simons. Simons said he was already indoctrinated.

(3) It is believed that Simons also obtained information, mostly from the EEO faction, on the situation in northeast Houston and has reported that it is explosive. It is doubtful he made any mention of the arrangements, made through the mayor's office, that resulted Tuesday in reinstatement of all but two students.

Question. If Simons is meant to investigate the participation of EEO in Houston in demonstrations and TSU disturbances, has he given any indication of covering "both sides," and interviewing people who are not in favor

of the EEO activities as well as those who are?

3. Acceptance of the poor of the antipov-erty program in Houston:

(a) Since July 1966, a survey team of Negro interviewers has conducted interviews in all Negro neighborhoods of Houston, asking opinions on various problems and issues, including attitudes toward the "War on Poverty."

(b) These interviews were conducted among low-income Negroes, those included in the poverty bracket. Neighborhoods covered included those from Sunnyside to Settegast.

(c) Low-income Negroes themselves have not been found to have positive opinions toward the war on poverty. The results to date are:

51 percent say the war on poverty had done a fair job in terms of results.

31 percent say it has done a bad job.

12 percent say it has done a good job.

6 percent say they have never heard of the program.

(d) In addition to asking low-income Negroes their opinion about the poverty program in Houston, the interview subjects also were asked such open-ended questions as: "What are the causes of racial tension in Houston?"

(Random comments have included negative comments about the poverty program. An example, from the last survey: "People are bitter because the so-called poverty program hasn't done no good.")

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
SOUTHWEST REGION,  
Austin, Tex., July 21, 1967.

HON. LOUIE WELCH,  
Mayor of Houston,  
Houston, Tex.

DEAR MAYOR WELCH: Sargent Shriver has asked me to answer your communication to him of May 25, 1967, concerning the poverty program nationally and in Houston.

First, allow me to deal generally with the conceptual questions you have raised. I do not find the same implication in the use of the word "force" which your questionnaire quoted from an HHCEO document called "Operation Discovery," nor do I find that revolution in its popular sense is implied in the document. This document was prepared by the community organization staff of the former HHCEO organization's community development component which our office funded in June. The program will be discussed later in this letter.

I am convinced that OEO and the legislation which provides its mandate have already "forced" new types of decisionmaking structures all over this Nation. In countless communities, the people to be served are sitting for the first time in governing bodies which are deciding their destinies. It is most essential that these new voices join with the traditional governmental, agency based, and general community representatives to frame programs and strategies which will eliminate the obstacles to their fullest economic and cultural opportunities. Without the most extensive participation of the major local governments, these plans will be doomed from the beginning.

The record of interest and concern of both the metropolitan governments and the county government of Harris County in all phases of the attack on poverty has proved the willingness of the political leaders there to use their resources to the maximum extent. This is in the best tradition of OEO which is revolutionary only in the sense that existing structures are mobilized in new ways to do the job of providing new economic opportunities through making it possible for the poor to help themselves. I feel certain that the restructured Community Action Agency in Harris County, even though it is no mere extension of governmental agencies, will in-



volve all public officials in an integral way in the anti-poverty decisions which only Harris County's citizens can make.

On the other hand, we have discovered that because the poor have been so long a voiceless segment of our communities, they may view the traditional public and private policymaking bodies as obstacles to their full development. Anyone can expect, during the poverty war's infancy, a measure of conflict between the traditional responsible elements of a community and those who, in many cases, are being introduced to civic responsibility for the first time. The community action agencies are placed in the dilemma of being the advocate for the poor, their chief reason for being, and the mobilizers of support from groups which the poor may at times criticize. In view of this, OEO must support the necessity for all CAA's to enable the poor to express their grievances at all times in an orderly manner using first the traditional tools of petition and hearing and only then, that failing, their constitutional right to assemble peacefully to demonstrate publicly the wrongs they seek to redress.

The CAA and its staff should not promote conflict in any instance, yet it should never discourage the use of orderly methods in effecting necessary change. It is, in fact, remiss when it is not actively involved in helping to order these expressions but it is also remiss when it or its staff seeks to participate actively in these efforts to the extent that the initiative and participation of the poor would be replaced. The CAA must always enable the poor to speak effectively and forcefully, but it must not become a substitute for their voice. Also, I do not believe it is accurate to impute to the poverty program those frustrations and aggressions which find their impetus in the uneven struggles of racial minorities for community recognition of age-old grievances.

Violence of any type is not an acceptable means of developing community organizations. On the contrary, it has been our official and well-publicized position that such activity will not be countenanced under the poverty program. Those few individuals who have been unable to operate within the program under this constraint have been asked to leave. Others were fired upon the presentation of proof that they were engaged in encouraging or fomenting violent acts. Far from encouraging violence, the poverty program has provided the poor, including minority poor, with a legitimate framework, encompassing community resources, for expressing grievances through nonviolent means. In my opinion, this endeavor in almost every instance has been singularly successful.

This regional office has recently approved applications from the newly merged community action agency in Harris County which include a community development component. The methodology described in this program includes the organization of poverty residents around the central issues of their concern. These are called gut issues, and they refer to needs for normal community services and facilities.

There is no hint in this proposal that issues and solutions will be emotionally based; rather, it is planned that the development staff will conduct extensive surveys and profiles of the community and that they will follow this discovery of immediate needs with a carefully planned strategy to seek the satisfaction of these needs. This strategy is to be determined by the residents themselves. Conflict is not inherent in this plan; however, confrontation is, in the sense that the fullest expression of these needs should enable the policymaking community organizations to become more directly sensitive and responsive to the problems of daily life in the poverty areas.

The poor do not need to be forced into the decisionmaking process in Harris County.

They are already there, through their own duly elected representatives and through those sympathetic representatives of the governmental bodies and the community at large. The goals of community development are to enable poverty residents to speak with clarity and with strength to the problems they know best, thus increasing the effectiveness of all of their advocates on the CAA board and on other policy bodies in Harris County.

It must be added that, in my opinion, the degree of success in building effective neighborhood voice through such community development projects will determine the degree of Harris County's success in arresting the tensions that occur when that voice is not able to be heard. This is not to say that, in Harris County, public officials have not been ready to listen; rather it is to say that the expressions of concern from the poor have been fragmented, disjointed, and scattered and therefore ineffective. It is the role of the CAA to reform these expressions and aid all local decisionmakers to meet the problems head on. This is what I mean by confrontation.

The role of the neighborhood organization staffs in the two former Harris County Community Action Agencies has been spotty and uneven. We are apprised of incidents in which staff members have exceeded the roles they serve. This must not continue to occur. I believe that under the leadership of a newly united board, neighborhood organizers will be able to become much more aware of their assignments and goals as well as their limitations. We have been encouraged by the initiative shown by the new board chairman, Mr. Francis Williams, in supervising the utilization of staff members during the recent tensions in Harris County.

Mr. Williams has offered to you the HCAA staff insofar as it can be helpful in resolving the conflicts that have occurred. It has been charged to effect the role of observer in these tensions. Some effective work has been done, and when either of the two neighborhood staffs (HAY and HHCEO) worked at cross-purposes or exceeded their assignments. Mr. Williams dealt with each issue, and conflict with authority and fairness. He has seen fit to make difficult decisions regarding staff assignments in the midst of disputes over methods of approach. We believe that his actions signify a more positively directed neighborhood staff and that the newly-united operation in Harris County will enable the CAA to implement and evaluate better the goals and direction toward those goals of neighborhood organization.

The local CAA will always have to decide case by case whether or not neighborhood conflict is related to the conditions of poverty in the community and whether or not the conflict has a direct bearing on ongoing CAA efforts. However, when the CAA can clearly show that it has a stake in the issue at hand, I am prepared to support its involvement within the limitations I have stated.

OEO both regionally and nationally is constantly evaluating the role of CAAs and their staff in neighborhood affairs especially when tensions flare. It is under this necessity to discover and interpret the facts that it recently sent to Houston both Mr. Ray Reusche and Mr. Jim Simons from its Office of Inspection. Both of these men have presented us with full and unbiased reports regarding staff involvement. Mr. Reusche worked primarily with public officials and CAA staff, and Mr. Simons worked primarily with the officials and staffs of both HAY and HHCEO plus city, county, and university officials and neighborhood residents.

Mr. Simons, has worked especially close with our office's field representatives, and they have commented favorably on the thoroughness of his work as well as Mrs. Reusche's. Based on Mr. Reusche's and Mr. Simons' reports, in no instance have we dis-

covered any intent or act designed to stir up violence or conflict on the part of CAA staff members, even though many have become closely involved in the areas to which they have been assigned and with those people who would use grievances as a source for inflammatory action.

Our investigations are not at an end, and we will continue to seek to discover the facts behind the problems and the issues that involve CAA members.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. RICHTER,  
Director, Southwest Region.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
SOUTHWEST REGION,  
Austin, Tex., July 21, 1967.

HON. LOUIE WELCH,  
Mayor of Houston.

DEAR MAYOR WELCH: I appreciate very much having had the opportunity to meet with you briefly yesterday, and I hope to make an effort to keep in touch with you more closely in the future.

Enclosed is my official written response to your letter of May 25, something I drafted and forwarded to the central office shortly after being informed of your inquiry. At a meeting in Washington in late June, I learned that this information had not been forwarded to you and was assured that something would be done. About 10 days ago I had one of my staff people check on it and received further assurances.

Before I left Houston yesterday I called my man in our Austin office to tell him to get some action, and he informed me that yesterday morning he had had a call from Washington advising that the copy of the letter had been mailed. It arrived with a letter of transmittal from Bert Harding dated June 22 with a handwritten note signed by Don Baker, an OEO attorney, which read: "It's all my fault—I had wanted to edit it—but each day was exhausted by crises and some time passed. So here it is! As was!"

I dislike elaborating on excuses when the whole thing is inexcusable, but I wanted you to understand that the ball dropping was essentially the fault of one guy and certainly does not reflect the manner in which Mr. Shriver or Mr. Harding normally handle their important correspondence.

Regarding the absence of direct comment on a number of questions which you posed about activities of the local OEO-funded operations. I have first a statement and then a suggestion.

My statement has, admittedly, dealt with your conceptual questions, because in almost every specific instance cited the official OEO stance is explained by this statement of policy and philosophy. To have tried to establish an objective, documented investigation of each happening and situation referred to would have been a mammoth and almost impossible undertaking.

This probably relates to your comment about not having been consulted in an "investigation" since there was none based on the specifics in your inquiry. The inquiries I referred to were extensive inspection and factfinding efforts, mainly by several teams from the central office and supported in some instances by our own staff. These certainly should have included considerable contacts with you and other city officials.

Because I want in no way to shirk our responsibility in responding to specific circumstances and situations referred to in your letter, I should like to make the following suggestion. If possible on August 3 and 4, since these are the first days available for our staff people concerned, I would like for Frank Moffitt and Fred Holt of our staff to meet with Dr. Justice, Mr. Fairchild, and possibly others of your staff and Francis Williams for the purpose of reviewing item by item the questions you have raised in the



light of the OEO position as reflected in my response to you. Also, I would want the review procedure to cover a person-by-person review of instances in which your office feels that prior criminal involvements constitute cause for dismissal.

As I mentioned yesterday, the area of responsibility of the Southwest region (representing the Federal Government) for involvement in local problem areas is a delicate and sensitive matter, but I would hope that the individuals assembled could reach agreement on most of the situations and problems under review.

My suggestion further is that in those instances when there is not a clear understanding of the OEO position at our level I be brought into the picture, preferably in a conference with you, so that I could make a final policy judgment.

I hope you will agree with this suggestion and that I may hear from you either approving the August 3 or 4 dates for the preliminary meeting or suggesting an alternate date.

I just talked to Bert Harding on the telephone a few minutes ago. He asked me to give you his personal regards and to express his deep regret over the woefully inadequate manner in which your inquiry was handled.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. RICHTER,  
Director, Southwest Region.

Urban rioting and "rotten politics" have seriously undermined congressional support for poverty war legislation, Congressman PHIL M. LANDRUM said in August:

I have about reached the conclusion that the Community Action programs are hopeless. So much local responsibility is required for them, and there is so little judgment in what they do. \* \* \* One group of extremists has wanted to use Community Action for Civil rights, another for politics—

#### POLITICS AND POWER—THE NAME OF THE GAME

Despite a 1966 amendment which the Congress hoped would take politics out of the war on poverty, the OEO continues to allow the most obvious political abuses to flourish in antipoverty programs.

In Durham, N.C., this year, Operation Breakthrough—the community action agency—with the advice and consent of OEO officials, developed a highly professional vote delivering apparatus.

For 3 months, January to March, antipoverty workers pored over voter registration books, copying registration lists and other political data.

In April, using poverty-financed vehicles, Operation Breakthrough employees transported hundreds of Durham residents to polling places for registration.

In May, antipoverty workers, serving as checkers at the polls and using personally owned cars, delivered citizens to the polls during the Durham municipal general election.

All of this, according to the Director of OEO did not violate any laws. Whether or not laws were broken, it was apparent to all that the Durham antipoverty agency was in the political arena in a very big way.

#### PARTISAN POLITICS?

An investigation of the General Accounting Office revealed that in Palm Beach County, Fla., in the fall of 1966, two antipoverty workers, serving as voting registrars and conducting "on the

spot" registration of migrant workers, signed up 686 voters, 680 of whom registered Democrat.

#### HAVEN FOR POLITICIANS

In Newark, N.J., according to the city's mayor, Hugh Addonizio, the \$6 million antipoverty agency, United Community Corporation, is a haven for defeated political candidates and aspirants to public office.

#### POWER PLAY

In Syracuse, N.Y., 3 years of community action has seen two community action agencies fold up after prolonged power struggles with that city's administration.

#### VOTER REGISTRATION—A POWERFUL POLITICAL WEAPON

In September 1967, U.S. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, protesting voter registration drives in Gary, Ind., warned that voter-registration drives by poverty-war workers, viewed on a national scale, could become a potent political weapon in the hands of the administration.

#### THEY MADE THEIR QUOTAS

Early this year in Houston, Tex., antipoverty workers signed up thousands of Harris County residents in a voter-registration drive. When four of the poverty warriors failed to meet their quotas, they resorted to apartment house lists, trailer camp directories, and nameplates on mailboxes, filled out registration forms, and within days had more than met their quotas.

A subsequent \$25,000 investigation of voter registration in Houston revealed that an estimated 8,000 were phony.

#### earmarking of programs

During debate on the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 we warned that earmarking of funds under title II-A would impair the effectiveness of community action programs. Despite our pleas a bill was passed which provided that 60 percent of the funds—\$486.5 million—be allocated to specific, pre-packaged programs. As we predicted, this formula resulted in priorities of programs at local levels which contrasted with the needs of respective communities.

The following statements of community action directors, 6 months after the bill was passed, reflect the feeling of knowledgeable antipoverty administrators:

Too often we are told by the OEO what to plan, in fact, given the plan and told to "sign here."

The long arm of Washington is reaching in with funds and telling us what to do.

Community Action programs have reached the turning point in whether they will live or die. There are those who say Community Action programs will not work and that local authority is being usurped by the earmarking of funds.

The key to the success of such programs is that they be geared to specific needs and that we maintain the local concept.

Mr. Clark said he would like to remind regional officials that St. Paul is not Chicago, not Detroit, or Omaha, but has its own unique problems and cannot be fitted into a mold.

"But we must also maintain the grass-roots level. We have shown that it works and must continue our efforts to keep local autonomy," said Carlson.

We should be free within broad policy lines to determine our own needs and perhaps even make our own mistakes.

The OEO seems to have overlooked the fact that many communities—including St. Paul—have interwoven networks of agencies, many of which have pioneered efforts to abolish poverty.

#### TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, JULY 12, 1967

Shirley Tannenbaum, Director, Frederick County, Md., CAP, stated:

"Shortly after assuming the role of CAP Director (1966) the national picture began to change. Not only did Congress begin to cut appropriations, but it also began deciding what the funds should be used for (i.e., Headstart, Upward Bound, Legal Aid, etc.).

"This seems to me to be a direct contradiction to the philosophy put forth by OEO and the original law which required maximum feasible participation of the poor and local determination of priorities.

"It is conceivable that none including Headstart of the so-called canned programs may be applicable or seen as necessary by the poor themselves in some localities. \* \* \*

"We were told that homemakers programs were low priority. Low priority to whom? In Frederick County it was high priority.

"It seems to me that if the legislators want to earmark funds and decide on a national level what programs will get funds they should also eliminate the hypocrisy of getting representation of the poor. Why bother to ask them what they need and then say you can't have it because there are no funds allocated for that?

"If this alternative is chosen, then OEO will become another dispenser of programs and services. Another bureaucratic empire will be built. But it will not eliminate poverty."

Mr. Chairman, again this year we find the Senate bill, S. 2388, earmarks 50 percent of the funds authorized for community action programs. We intend to oppose this provision of the Senate's bill and leave the funds free for local communities to establish their own priorities.

#### HEADSTART

Although Sargent Shriver has described Headstart as "OEO's greatest, single, measurable success," it has experienced continuous turmoil created by last-minute funding, constantly changing policies, and dual funding through the OEO and Office of Education.

We have, in the past, criticized the circumstance of funding by two separate agencies, which is in part responsible for much of the confusion and delay in funding. Numerous applications are shuttled from agency to agency while each claims the other should fund them. A chamber of commerce study on Headstart programs also criticizes the coordination between the two agencies, stating:

OEO does not consider the role of the Office of Education when making projections of future Headstart program needs. They do not even maintain information on how many projects they are funding jointly with the Office of Education.

Hundreds of administrators of Headstart programs complain about funding problems. As an example, here is the lament of the director of the Detroit program in the summer of 1966:

We were funded on Friday and had to open 400 classes for 6,210 children on the following Monday. This made innumerable problems concerning personnel, recruiting, and equipment. We could not officially hire



aids, doctors, and so forth, until we were sure that the funds were available.

#### THE TOO-LATE HEADSTART

The administrative OEO machinery is largely responsible for these problems. An evaluation of summer, 1966, Headstart projects of Lake County, Ind., by Drs. Harold A. Gram and Leon J. Tolle of Valparaiso University, clearly illustrates the problems experienced by that program:

Briefly, the evaluators found plans and proposals were submitted to the regional office about March 18; however, the regional office did not respond until June 7, the date the program was to have begun. On that day, OEO regional personnel began making corrections and revision of contracts with the delegate agencies. According to the evaluators, these revisions were "communicated to the delegate agencies on June 14, 1966, and were apparently made without any communication or coordination with Lake County OEO or the delegate agencies. Furthermore, they were neither consistent or logical." First funds were not made available until June 27, 1966.

The effect of this timing and lack of coordination in the planning stages had two general results:

First, it created an atmosphere of confusion, frustration, and uncertainty which was not really overcome in some districts until the program was underway if at all. This atmosphere lowered morale in the Headstart program which obviously depends heavily on enthusiasm and commitment of its participating people. The damage caused by this poor administration of planning was diminished fortunately by the presence of dedicated and experienced personnel who were able to tolerate and to some extent overcome the confusion.

Second, the delays and intransigence in early planning phases caused delays and ineffectiveness in subordinate plans, notably in recruiting and orientation of personnel, in purchasing and procurement of supplies, and in the establishment of effective policies and control procedures at the county and district levels.

The study attributes the poor planning to three conditions: "ineffective and inexperienced personnel in regional OEO; a lack of clear, comprehensive directives and guidelines at any level; and understaffing and personnel turnover at the county OEO office."

The evaluators were likewise critical of the lack of policy formulation and commented that "after 1 year's experience, a greater maturity and stability than was found should be expected." They commented specifically that "policy was lacking on personnel qualifications and records; on child-family eligibility; on type, limits and tolerance on budget expenditures; on required program content; on closed-downed and on followup policies."

They go on to say "perhaps more important, however, was the lack of clarity and conciseness which burdens most of the OEO literature. Important directives and guidelines are buried in masses of fancy rhetoric and vocabulary. The result is frequent oversight and misunderstanding of what is to be done."

Regarding assistance from the regional offices, the report indicates that—

The Lake County OEO Office relied materially on five area coordinators to coordinate its several programs. It was beyond the scope of our study to determine the overall effectiveness of this group, but it was clearly apparent that they did relatively little for Headstart. Several of them were barely aware of the program and had not visited it while it was in progress.

#### Regarding controls—

A major complaint about the previous year's program (1965) was the large amount of reporting which had to be done. The 1966 session of Headstart apparently was swung to the opposite extreme.

Among Dr. Gram's and Dr. Tolle's conclusions were the points that—

Formulation with OEO policy must achieve greater consistency and stability. This is especially true with regional OEO levels where ex post facto policy formulation must be avoided.

#### MORE REDTAPE

These problems continued to exist last fall as illustrated by the complaints of officials at the Hayward United School District of Hayward, Calif., who said their program "may be dumped because of a Federal redtape snarl." Their application for a year-round program was submitted in April 1966, and 5 months later, one-half week before the program was to have begun, officials received word that the regional OEO had reviewed the application and made changes. Superintendent William Cuninghame blamed officials at San Francisco regional office for not keeping them informed of changes in guidelines and said:

Frankly, I am getting completely disenchanted with the redtape we've been fighting for the past few months with that office.

In late May 1967, at a time when all plans, funds, and programs should be ready to begin, officials were again complaining over last-minute changes in guidelines and no funds. The last week in May, the Christian County school system, Kentucky, announced it would "pull out of the Headstart program this summer unless Federal funds are approved by tomorrow."

Although the program did finally take place, Dr. Guy S. Potts of the Fayette County school system announced on May 20 their school system had dropped the 1967 summer Headstart program, citing funding problems, late notification by the Federal Government, and "bureaucratic bungling" as reasons. The target date for the Government's approval of this Headstart grant was February 28, but a copy of the approved budget did not reach Dr. Potts until the last week in May. In light of "confused" directions from Washington transmitted by "memoranda, letters, guidelines, telephone calls, various verbal information, and training sessions," Dr. Potts said he felt it was impossible to clearly understand conditions.

Officials in Atlanta, Cleveland, and other cities and counties throughout the country have suffered through the same experience this summer and will continue to each year until they finally decide to forget about the Federal grant and develop their own programs, using whatever local funds they can find, as

East Cleveland decided to do this summer.

#### OEO—THE GREAT BUREAUCRACY

Placing OEO in the Executive Office of the President was to have provided the leverage OEO needed to coordinate the efforts of Cabinet-level departments. Unfortunately, due to a lack of interest and backing on the part of the President and antagonism between the OEO Director and other department heads, this has failed to have any effect. As James L. Sundquist notes in his study of OEO coordinative efforts for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty:

The other agencies of Government do not look upon OEO staff members as Presidential agents speaking for the President and exercising his authority, like staff members of the White House, the Budget Bureau, or the Council of Economic Advisers. OEO is looked upon, and acts as, another operating agency on a par with the Cabinet departments—not on an organizational level above them. Its staff role is ancillary to its operating role in much the same sense as are the Presidential staff roles of the Secretaries of HUD, Labor, and the other departments.

#### COORDINATOR OF ITS OWN PROGRAMS

We would at least expect that OEO, in its administration of Job Corps, community action, and VISTA, would attempt to coordinate with other agencies who are administering like programs or with other levels of Government which are attempting to coordinate programs within their States. We are sorry to see very little evidence of such coordination by OEO.

One example of this lack of coordination is in the area of Indian programs. "A Comprehensive Evaluation of OEO Community Action Programs on Six Selected American Indian Reservations" by Human Science Research, Inc., concluded:

As indicated in the descriptions of a number of problems, coordination between such Federal agencies as OEO, EDI, BIA, PHS, and PHA, not to mention State and local agencies, school boards, law enforcement agencies and the like \* \* \* would be of inestimable value in launching programs which could strike at the roots of Indian poverty. The economic development, housing and other construction provisions of CAP component space and of any other aspects of the War on Poverty would be facilitated were such cooperation the rule rather than the exception.

A number of instances have been reported of surveys being conducted under OEO auspices to gather information already collected by local BIA agencies. Considerable expense and time would have been saved had there been any mechanization in existence to acquaint either or both of these agencies with the other's activities.

#### STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

OEO professes to maintain a satisfactory degree of coordination with the States through their grants to State agencies for technical assistance programs. In actual operation, however, the expertise and valuable knowledge of most States offices are wasted except for the small role they play in providing technical assistance to community action agencies.

Directors of State technical assistance agencies—STA's—held a conference in Washington this summer at which a position paper was drawn up and signed by



all but two of the directors present. Some suggestions in this position paper were:

1. That the State agencies should be permitted to submit an annual State plan for expenditure of funds in concert with the Federal, regional, and local OEO, and consultation between State and regional or national OEO should take place before funds are granted or approved in any State; and

2. STA's should be included in OEO's checkpoint procedures relating to all OEO programs and that the STA's be involved with the OEO, regional and community action agencies in developing evaluation procedures.

Voluminous testimony at the hearings and numerous letters and comments from STA directors indicate the present State role is not great enough, that State agencies presently have no say in the allocation of funds within a State. The regional offices of OEO make such allocations taking no effort either to provide an equitable distribution of the money to the poor over the State or to concentrate it in the areas where most needed.

#### VIEWS FROM THE STATE

One State director commented on the problem of coordination of various programs within the State:

The linkage between community action programs and work programs is tenuous at best, especially in the rural areas. The Office of Economic Opportunity has to be given muscle to effectively coordinate these programs with its own. Likewise, the State officials should be a critical point for this function, and it should be spelled out in the law.

Former Connecticut OEO Director Joseph P. Dyer stated before our committee this summer:

Under the terms of the present Economic Opportunity Act, a STA director has little muscle to impose regulations, has no responsibility for evaluating results, and is considered as an afterthought by most OEO Washington and regional office personnel.

He also notes:

Sole strength we have to control local poverty spending is a Governor's veto—which can be overridden by the national director—and the public information media.

E. R. Rankin, Jr., director, North Carolina Department of Administration, likewise complained that:

Federal antipoverty programs are usually prepared without any knowledge of the Governor and are submitted for the approval or disapproval of the Governor after public announcement in Washington that the OEO has approved the grant, or other Federal assistance.

Further concerned with the lack of coordination, Mr. Rankin states:

The well-known OEO policy of ignoring and bypassing existing State and local governmental agencies has certainly not assisted in North Carolina's efforts to improve poverty and poverty conditions. Any long-term improvement in local community conditions must involve the existing agencies and local leadership in these agencies.

Another State director notes the nearly complete exclusion of the State from proposal review, and the lack of program evaluation by OEO:

Presently, a proposal, when submitted by the CAA to the regional office, is reviewed by a regional analyst, who has the authority to add or delete from the component. This practice in almost all cases goes on without

consultation with the State TA. The local community, thus sensing that the ultimate responsibility for the success of their proposal rests with a regional analyst, turns to the regional office for assistance. In all too many instances, the analyst encourages the local community to obviate the STA. This dual service leads inevitably to confusion and mistrust.

At present, the evaluation of funded programs is not required. Thus, proposals are refunded without a knowledge on the part of the reviewer if the program was effective and meaningful to the lives of the disadvantaged. It is conceivable that good money is supporting ineffective program.

The following letter to Congressman QUIE from Governor LeVander of Minnesota not only provides an excellent statement of the plight of the States under present policies of OEO, but also furnishes realistic alternatives that we think would immeasurably strengthen community action and other poverty programs:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
St. Paul, Minn., April 18, 1967.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I am most grateful for your letter of April 13 and the copy of the news release outlining your proposed "Republican Opportunity Crusade" to inject new life into the faltering poverty program.

Public reaction to your proposed changes is generally quite favorable, and even enthusiastic in some quarters. However, there are many who are confused—and have been led to believe that your plan for new direction and new vitality in the program is really an effort to discontinue Federal programs for the poor. This is unfortunate, and you might consider another release stressing your concern for redirection and realistic administration of antipoverty programs in order to restore confidence and respect of the American public and those who should be benefiting from these expenditures.

Of particular importance is the development of sound administration, new direction, and new vitality for the poverty programs and the establishment of sound management and direction so desperately needed by the local CAP councils.

Actually, here in Minnesota, the Governor's office of economic opportunity is the "Governor's" in name only. The State OEO office "dangles" haplessly, between the local CAP councils and the regional office, doing house-keeping chores, providing routine assistance to CAP councils, with no real authority to act. Only out-State (rural) OEO programs in Minnesota are under the Governor's OEO office. As you know, metropolitan programs in the Twin Cities, Indian programs on reservations, and special service programs funded with earmarked moneys require my approval (waiver). As Governor, I have neither control nor authority over the programs once they are operational. Similarly, programs of local community action councils require executive approval (waiver), but regulations provide no real basis for authority by the State over the council actions once the funds and the projects have had approval from the regional office.

As part of your proposal for reestablishment and rejuvenation of these programs for the poor through the opportunity crusade concept, there is great need to strengthen the State's position in administration of the programs and in allocation of funds. Ideally, allocation and utilization of funds should be handled by a designated State office responsible to the Governor. This office, operating with a combination of State and Federal funds, and working with local communities and community action councils would make

determination of programs and projects based on local needs, with specific goals and purpose.

There is, as your proposal indicates, need to lift the philosophy and attitudes of the program and the people involved to a "positive" rather than negative approach.

There is need for more imaginative programs keyed to local needs. With funding approval centered in a regional office by people who have no familiarity with an area or its problems, it becomes almost impossible to get acceptance of a special, imaginative program that is different than the standard. This, in itself, defeats the purpose of the community action concept and results in the sameness of programs throughout the State.

Under present administrative procedures, the regional office in Chicago now handles the function of funding and approving programs, completely bypassing the State office. It certainly would be desirable to amend the act and/or regulations to allow funds for administration and programs to be granted directly to the State. With the funds, there should also be requirement that local CAP councils meet minimum standards in administrative procedures, bookkeeping, management and other criteria to insure proper utilization of funds in keeping with the intent of the law. States desiring to administer the programs should be required to meet certain criteria such as:

(1) A demonstrated knowledge of the goals and philosophy of the act based on past performance;

(2) Full compliance with civil rights legislation;

(3) Adequate staff to give technical assistance to CAP councils;

(4) A demonstrated ability to write, suggest, and evaluate programs to meet specific needs;

(5) A continuous evidence of interest in helping low-income people improve their position;

(6) A demonstrated understanding and willingness to have liaison with the programs of other State and Federal agencies, so as to avoid costly overlapping, duplicating effort;

(7) A willingness to communicate and furnish public information to the community, the State, and Federal agencies pursuant to the operation of the Technical Assistance Office and/or any CAP council under its jurisdiction.

It is to the best interests of the Governors of all States that the community action programs which go on in their States be more responsive to the needs within the State. It is unfair to ask a Governor to agree to participation in a program, to whatever limits, without his having any authority in the matter. The various State technical assistance offices at present, along with the various Governors' offices, are in the middle and with the planning outlined above, this could all be changed for the good of the program in the State involved.

Similarly, antipoverty programs on Indian reservations are inadequately supervised and potentially explosive. The programs on Indian reservations are funded directly from the Indian Desk in Washington, but I hold the responsibility of approval or disapproval—not really knowing precisely what is being approved. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity both stand on the sidelines with no actual authority over the programs or administration of the CAP councils on Indian reservations \* \* \*. Modifications in the act or regulations to provide each Governor greater jurisdiction over the anti-poverty programs on Indian reservations in his State is imperative toward accomplishing the goals outlined in your "Opportunity Crusade" proposal.

As of mid-March, Minnesota had received \$40,497,212 in antipoverty funds since the initial grants were made to Hennepin and Ramsey Counties in December 1964. The sev-



en Indian reservations in Minnesota have received \$5,908,130 since the start of these OEO programs for Indians.

There is great need for guidance in the development of meaningful programs on the reservations which will result in better utilization of these funds, and to provide programs of a more lasting effect than most of the projects now being funded.

Please accept my good wishes that your proposals for a new "Opportunity Crusade" will result in new and vigorous programs that are both meaningful and effective.

Kindest personal regards,

Cordially,

HAROLD LEVANDER, Governor.

#### RECORD OF ADMINISTRATION

By now, due to the tireless efforts of those in charge to obfuscate, confuse, and delay, OEO must have gained the reputation of being the "black sheep" of all departments and agencies in Washington, D.C. This is certainly true with most Members of Congress. Numerous Members have complained on the floor of the House and otherwise that any dealings with OEO are a drawout, frustrating experience. Congressman JAMES M. HANLEY, of New York, gained the sympathy of every Member of Congress when he read into the record:

#### BUCKPASSING BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(Mr. HANLEY (at the request of Mr. CABELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the great privilege of representing Onondaga County in the House of Representatives. It is a thriving area, full of the bustle traditional to any American community on the move. It is also full of the anxieties and pressures which confront an American community trying to adjust to the temperament of the 1960's.

The city of Syracuse is located in Onondaga County, and it is to this fact and its ramifications that I wish to address the attention of my colleagues this afternoon.

In 1964, the city of Syracuse established as a grantee agency the mayor's commission for youth designed as a vehicle for distribution of funds under the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency. As you will recall, Congress in the summer of 1964, enacted the Economic Opportunity Act whose purposes were, first to provide an umbrella operation for then existing programs such as the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency; and second, to expand economic and social opportunities to those to whom these words had been empty and meaningless.

The Economic Opportunity Act represented a brandnew conceptual approach to the problems of cyclical poverty. Its preamble held that more than welfare and the dole were necessary to root out the social malaise which had afflicted the lower economic classes of our Nation for generations. It held that a massive program of self-help was not only possible but absolutely necessary.

While not a Member of this body at the time EOA was enacted, I did do my part as an interested citizen to engender support for its enactment and proper implementation.

Fortunately, despite a few initial, temporary setbacks and despite constant sniper attacks, the Office of Economic Opportunity did get off the ground. Equally as fortunate was the fact that my own hometown of Syracuse became one of the initial participants in the war on poverty.

I suspect that no other agency of the Federal Government had more significant hurdles to overcome than OEO, if for no other reason than the herculean nature of the task

handed to it. Any agency dealing with the emotional fabric of our society, with the stridency of deep rooted passions and with the societal barnacles of myth, has its work cut out for it. But there were those of us in whose breast beliefs and confidence ran high—belief that cyclical poverty could be licked and confidence that our society had lost neither its taste nor its capacity for adjustment.

Since no new program can be expected to attain perfection in a short period of time, if in fact, considering the elements of human frailty, it ever can, we were well counseled to accept the reality of slow progress toward our professed goals in the poverty war.

To be certain, no one, not even the most optimistic, believed that we could win the war only with injections of good faith and money. Hard decisions both at the local level and at the national administrative level had to be made. This item, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the main thrust of my remarks this afternoon.

The poverty program in Syracuse, N.Y., is in the throes of desperation. I will not attempt to recount the bitterness which has rooted its way into the foundations of the Syracuse agency. Suffice it to say, without any blameful attributions, that a Mexican standoff has been effected between opposing elements intimately involved with the program in Syracuse. I said I would make no blameful attributions because the air is rife with charges and countercharges each of which has been brought bluntly and forcefully to the attention of the highest echelon of the Office of Economic Opportunity during the last month.

Mr. Speaker, the funds for the war on poverty in Syracuse are due to expire tomorrow evening at midnight and no decision on the part of OEO has as yet been forthcoming on the future of that program. The decision is beyond the pale of local resolution. It is now even beyond the reach of the OEO regional office in New York City. It is squarely, as it has been for a week, in the hands of OEO headquarters in downtown Washington.

I have supported the aims of the war on poverty and in all likelihood I will continue to support them. But I can guarantee that the authorization of new funds will provide one of the hottest debates this Chamber has ever had.

In my 3 years in Congress, I have witnessed mountains of bureaucratic indecision and gobbledygook. I have seen bureaucratic vacillation that would have shaken less stable governments; I have been the recipient of conflicting reports which might drive some men onto a diet of sasparilla and strychnine, but never in my congressional tenure, Mr. Speaker, have I seen a more blundering mish-mash of indecision than that served up to me by OEO during the last month.

I used to think in my greener days, that the semicomical portrayal of bureaucratic operations was something one only read about in the columns of crusading journalists—but now I have become a believer. During the last month either I or a member of my staff has talked with just about every warm body in the OEO establishment. I have pled, cajoled, begged, demanded, and otherwise sought some decision out of that administrative monstrosity only to have my pleading, cajolery, begging, and demands fall on deaf ears. I have been plugged into more telephone connections at OEO than any operator on their switchboard. It seems to me that the only decision anyone down there is capable of making is that someone else is making the decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Congress order a carload of medals for buckpassing struck and then direct that the carload be delivered en masse to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE has experienced such delay and confusion since OEO's inception. This spring, when OEO

attempted to outdo its previous record of delay in answering letters, the following chain of correspondence ensued:

#### AN ANSWER FROM MR. SHRIVER

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. STANTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, for over 18 months I have been attempting, without much success, to get certain vital information from the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Director, Mr. R. Sargent Shriver. I am today inserting in the Congressional Record a series of letters and one telegram to illustrate how difficult it is to elicit even a reply from Mr. Shriver.

The opening letter is dated January 12, 1967, to which no reply was received. On March 2, 1967, I again wrote to Mr. Shriver. A third letter was sent on April 6, 1967. I waited until April 13, 1967, at which time I sent a telegram to Mr. Shriver which contained this phrase:

"Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators, House Education and Labor Committee, will be at your office, nine a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence four-week investigation at OEO headquarters."

The telegram, at last, galvanized Mr. Shriver into an answer, which is also included, dated April 14, 1967. I am also including my reply to Mr. Shriver of April 17, 1967.

I believe a careful reading of the letters and telegram illustrates a serious administrative defect in the operations of OEO. As I wrote in my letter of April 17, 1967:

"A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12, (1967), concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to reasonable inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency."

Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that OEO already has enough problems without compounding them by refusing to answer a reasonable request from a Member of Congress.

As Members of Congress know, I am not out to eliminate the poverty programs. With my colleague, Mr. Goodell, I have worked hard to prepare a substitute for the administration's war on poverty, called the opportunity crusade. The opportunity crusade would transfer the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act from OEO to existing agencies and would provide for the involvement of States and private industry in an effort to make meaningful studies toward eliminating poverty.

The purpose of many contacts with OEO is to make the faltering war on poverty a successful opportunity crusade.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my colleagues will take note of this exchange of letters, and Mr. Shriver's belated reply. To vote intelligently we must have more facts. I hope Mr. Shriver and his associates will in the future be more cooperative when a Member of Congress makes a reasonable request for information.

The letters and telegram follow:

JANUARY 12, 1967.

MR. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The December 20, 1966, issue of the Omaha, Nebraska, *World Herald* carried an article captioned "GOCA Given Bonus Offer—Job Corps Prospects Worth \$25 Each." The Director of the Greater Omaha Community Action agency reported he had been asked to participate in a "bonus" program to attract more male youths into the



Job Corps. He said the Community Action agency would receive \$25 for each youth it recruited and sent to the State Employment Service where screening and testing is done. GOCA reportedly would be paid whether or not the youth entered the Corps.

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Kenneth E. Shearer, Director, Greater Omaha Community Action, confirmed the above and stated this bonus program had been set up in many states because of "some difficulties in recruiting youngsters."

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Don Thomasson, Regional Director of OEO, Kansas City, Missouri, advised a staff investigator of the House Education and Labor Committee that the above program was conceived early in December and all Regional Offices of OEO had been encouraged to participate.

Perhaps you will recall that during the Senate debate of the 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, there was some criticism of OEO for paying amounts up to \$80 to the United States Employment Service and private organizations for recruiting Job Corps prospects. The 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, Section 103(e) provided "that the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the corps."

It seems to me that a plan to reimburse another anti-poverty agency for recruiting or referring Job Corps prospects is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended. Further, I would expect that the recruitment and counseling of prospects for Job Corps would receive high priority in community action programs and that these activities are provided for in funds granted community action agencies for conduct and administration.

I would appreciate your comments regarding the above matter.

With every best wish, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
Member of Congress.

MARCH 2, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The Sunday, December 11, 1966, issue of the *San Francisco* (California) *Examiner* carried a front-page story exposing fiscal irregularities in the operation of the Economic Opportunity Council (EOC), San Francisco's Community Action Agency. The Examiner's story was based on an Office of Economic Opportunity audit report released by the Western Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Concerning the release of the OEO audit report, the Regional OEO Director said it was a public document open to inspection by anyone.

I was somewhat surprised to learn that OEO considers audit reports public documents. During the past eighteen months, there has been considerable publicity resulting from alleged improper expenditures of War on Poverty funds. To my knowledge, neither the Congress nor the public have been given the results of audits of programs where scandals have occurred and in most instances have not learned of the ultimate disposition of these matters.

I know you are aware of my deep interest in anti-poverty legislation and the development of anti-poverty programs across the country. In order that the Congress can be apprised of the results of official OEO audits of programs having alleged fiscal difficulties, please forward to me OEO audit reports regarding the following matters:

1) Interim and final audit reports concerning Haryou-Act during the 1965-1966 period.

2) Interim and final audit reports concerning EYOA, the Los Angeles Community Action Agency, audited early in 1966. (You will recall that during the 1966 War on Poverty hearings, the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee ordered that these reports be submitted for the record. The record does not include the Los Angeles audit reports.)

3) Interim and final audit reports concerning the ABCD, Boston's Community Action Agency, which was involved in difficulties late in 1965 and early 1966;

4) Interim and final audit reports regarding CDGM, Mississippi's Head Start sponsor much of which has been publicized;

5) Audit reports concerning EOC, San Francisco's Community Action Agency, which were released to the press in December, 1966;

6) Audit reports reflecting the results of an investigation in Newark, New Jersey, which culminated in the conviction of Philip Thigpen, an NYC administrator, and his assistant;

7) Inspection reports regarding the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs which received widespread publicity late in 1965;

8) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Atterbury, Indiana, Job Corps Center prior to change of sponsor in 1966;

9) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Breckenridge, Ky., Job Corps Center prior to the change of sponsor in 1966;

10) Audit reports concerning the Cleveland Action for Youth program where, prior to September, 1966, \$1,632 admittedly was paid to a fictitious employee;

11) Audit reports regarding Cleveland's (Ohio) Neighborhood Youth Corps where in September, 1966, alleged payroll padding scandals were exposed;

12) Audit reports of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) antipoverty programs. It was reported in July, 1966, that U.S. Representative Sam Gibbons had requested OEO to make a "top-to-bottom" re-examination of the Suncoast poverty war; and

13) Any audit or inspection reports of the Mingo, West Virginia, County Community Action Agency.

An early reply to the above request will be appreciated very much.

With every best wish, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
Member of Congress.

APRIL 6, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I am told that on the Easter Sunday "Meet the Press" program you stated you would welcome a long, hard look, at the antipoverty program by the Congress. I find this invitation most interesting and particularly appropriate at this time. I am hopeful that in the near future the House Education and Labor Committee will be considering anti-poverty legislation. It is my feeling that the Committee would find most useful data that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been gathering for the past year. I have noted that several million dollars have been spent by the OEO to study and evaluate a variety of its programs.

It would be appreciated if you will agree to make OEO records available to staff investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee at the OEO Headquarters during the period April 17—May 12, 1967. I would like your assurance that investigators will be permitted access to personnel and administrative records, Inspector General's reports of OEO investigations, all fiscal records including OEO audit reports, all OEO contracts and memorandum and reports concerning studies and evaluations of War on Poverty programs. It is likely that copies of selected data will be

requested for review by the Committee. Further, it would be most helpful if you would make members of your staff available, their schedules permitting, for interviews.

I would appreciate an early reply in order that the necessary arrangements can be made.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE.

R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, OEO,  
Washington, D.C.:

Reference my letter April 6, 1967. Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators. House Education and Labor Committee will be at your office, 9 a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence 4-week investigation at OEO headquarters.

Regards,

ALBERT H. QUIE,  
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
Washington, D.C.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Your telegram of April 13 and your letter of April 6 have been the subject of a discussion between myself and the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Chairman Perkins indicated that he would shortly inform me of his Committee's desires with respect to the handling of this year's poverty bill.

I assured the Chairman that I would welcome a long hard look at the anti-poverty programs by his Committee, that this agency was fully prepared to comply with any appropriate requests for information from his Committee, and that we were ready to cooperate in every possible way to facilitate the deliberations of his Committee.

I am prepared to answer any questions that you or any other Member of Congress may have with respect to this agency's operations. Members of my staff are prepared at any time, their schedules permitting, to answer any questions you or any other Member of Congress may wish to present to them.

I don't think that my attitude with respect to Congressional examination of Economic Opportunity Act programs differs significantly from those of the heads of other agencies in connection with their requests for funds and legislation. I am, therefore, somewhat surprised that what I have said on this point should give rise to the suggestion that your staff should be permitted to range at will through the files and records of this agency—a request that, so far as I know, is completely unprecedented.

The files of this agency, like those of others, contain a variety of material that bears on internal decision-making processes, upon the private affairs of many thousands of individuals, and upon possible or alleged but as yet undetermined violations of law or regulations on the part of specific individuals and organizations. I am certain you will recognize that much of this material is traditionally protected and not of the nature that any agency head could be expected to make available on the terms you suggest.

Apart from questions of law or basic propriety, I would also point out that what you suggest would most certainly interfere with operations of this agency at the busiest time of the year. It would also most certainly interfere with the grant process and inhibit our own efforts to prepare and assemble our justification materials for the Congress in an orderly and efficient manner.

The evaluation reports of OEO programs, as we have previously indicated, are available at any time. They are voluminous and we



have them in a special library that is open to the public and certainly would be available to any of your staff who would like to review them. They may contact Dr. Levine (Government Code 128-6021) and they will be permitted access to the reports.

In response to your letter of March 2 with respect to certain audit reports, neither this agency nor any other in the Federal Government considers such reports automatically public documents. The fact that one report was issued prematurely is not a justification for considering all such reports public information.

The report of the auditors is but one step in an over-all auditing process that may involve a good many internal staff communications of the kind that are not normally available even in litigation with an agency. An audit report, moreover, may well lead to or become a part of an administrative or court proceeding. It is clear that premature release of this kind of document can be wholly subversive of the purpose for which those documents are prepared. Obviously the Federal interest could not be protected by the disclosure of every potential claim, charge, or action while it is under discussion. Public disclosure would, in fact, jeopardize in many instances the Federal case if the matter eventually results in a formal proceeding or a criminal prosecution.

Most of the audits on which you requested reports have not as yet been brought to final resolution. The audit report of the 1965 summer program of Haryou, for instance, was completed early this year. It was followed by a response on the part of the grantee which resolved some of the problems. That response has been reviewed by lawyers, accountants, and program people who have made recommendations to the regional director. He is now consulting further with Haryou on the basis of the recommendations made by the reviewing staff. Should his determinations be accepted by Haryou, a final order bringing the matter to a conclusion will be prepared. If not, Haryou will be entitled to an administrative or judicial hearing.

There follows a status report on the other matters on which you requested information.

1. EYOA (The Los Angeles Community Action Agency)—The audit report has been completed and a response has been made by the grantee. This response is being evaluated and no final determinations have been made.

2. ABCD (Boston's Community Action Agency)—A series of audits have been completed. The grantee has responded and the process is moving forward. One or two elements are being evaluated by the Justice Department.

3. CDGM—1965 Summer Head Start Program—Audit process has been completed. A substantial amount of money was recovered. A report on this matter will be provided to you shortly. An interim audit by Ernst and Ernst of the 1966 CDGM Head Start Program is being evaluated as a basis for final audit by OEO staff.

4. EOC (San Francisco's Community Action Agency)—The report was completed. The response of the grantee is now being evaluated.

5. Your requests relating to the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs of ABCD in Boston, and Newark, New Jersey, the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland Action for Youth, and the Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps, I have referred to Jack Howard who will respond to your inquiry.

6. The audits of Camp Atterbury and Camp Breckenridge Job Corps Centers are now in process. When they are completed, the Contracting Officer will make his decisions and a close-out voucher will be submitted.

7. The audits of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) are being wound up. Information disclosed by the auditors has already resulted

in the conviction of one individual for the misappropriation of funds.

8. Mingo County (West Virginia)—An audit is underway.

I stand ready, of course, to answer any specific question you may have with respect to any grant or contract made by this agency. I am also prepared to provide you with the final determination of the audit process as each is completed.

The General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has automatic access to the reports of our audits and continuously scrutinizes our auditing process. If you have genuine doubts as to how this agency is handling the audits of its programs, you might want to request GAO for an evaluation of our efforts either generally or with respect to particular matters. People at the GAO are experienced and competent to carry out such work. Their experience and objectivity would preclude the misinterpretation and confusion that might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally. As for the reports of our Office of Inspection, they are not and never have been public information. These reports are prepared for investigatory purposes and for law enforcement. They are internal communications directed to me as Director of this agency, most frequently at my specific request, giving advisory interpretations of specific fact situations. They almost invariably contain information given in confidence and material which if publicly disclosed would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. By their very nature, they must be protected for public disclosure if they are to serve the purpose for which they are intended.

Your vigilant concern for the problems local anti-poverty programs have met in the past is well known to all of us. I believe that most of these problems, now more than a year behind us, have been resolved. I sincerely trust that as our new legislation goes forward you will be as vigilant in maintaining the OEO programs which have proven so vital to the continued progress of America's poor.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director.

APRIL 17, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SHRIVER: Thank you for your letter of April 14, 1967. I was pleased to note the communication did not reflect the hostility which was conveyed by Saturday morning's *Washington Post's* account of it. I read the *Post's* article first.

As the time for the House Education and Labor Committee's hearings on the anti-poverty program rapidly approaches, I am most anxious to see that valid, objective data bearing upon the progress, or lack of it, of War on Poverty programs is presented properly to the Committee. Perhaps you will recall that a substantial part of the testimony at last year's hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act was provided by representatives of Federal agencies. My efforts to have sixty-seven witnesses called were ignored. It was my feeling that these individuals, a cross section of proponents and dissidents and all knowledgeable regarding specific aspects of the War on Poverty, could have furnished information of value for the legislative deliberations of the Committee.

Misappropriation and diversion of anti-poverty funds are of vital concern to the Congress and the taxpayers. We in the Congress have been rather patient, I think, waiting for reliable reports of fiscal scandals that broke in the news media eighteen months ago. If disposition of the audits I requested on March 2nd isn't available for this year's hearings, when will it be? Why is it that the

Comptroller of the City of New York can release his report on the Haryou situation and the Congress must remain in the dark concerning OEO's findings in this matter?

At last year's hearings you will recall a discussion of the Los Angeles Community Action Agency's audit by the OEO. At that time the Chairman ordered this report be placed in the record and it was not done. Now, one year later, you tell me no final determinations have been made. Are there no administrative devices to expedite these important matters?

Your reasons for denying Congressional examinations of OEO audit reports and reports of your Office of Inspection appear to be substantial; however, I'm not convinced the reasons take precedence over the need for the Congress to know their contents.

Why was OEO's audit report of San Francisco's Community Action Agency released to the press in December, 1966, and what basis did your Regional Director have for stating the audit report was a public document open to inspection by anyone? It seems to me there may have been a compelling reason to release the San Francisco report, if your attitude regarding audit reports was the same then as it is now.

You suggest I might want to request the General Accounting Office to evaluate the handling of OEO audits. I reject this suggestion since it would constitute duplication of the process that your auditors have performed. At this point I have no quarrel with your auditing procedures. It is the findings of the audits that would be of interest to the Congress, the House Education and Labor Committee, and the general public.

I would take exception to your feeling that "misinterpretation and confusion might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally" by Congressional staff investigators. I can assure you that the minority investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee are experienced, competent and thorough and would be capable of a completely objective review of your agency's records.

What did you mean when you said on the March 26th, nationally televised, "Meet the Press" program when you stated, "We would welcome, as I've said many times, a close scrutiny of all parts of the War against Poverty?" It is my view that any close scrutiny of the War on Poverty must include an examination of the OEO Headquarters' operations, the very heart of the problems that plague anti-poverty efforts.

Naturally, I would prefer that any investigation of OEO Headquarters or examination of OEO records be scheduled with your approval and cooperation. If at some future date I still feel the need of Congress to be apprised of the results of OEO audits and inspection reports, I intend to explore the possibilities of examining OEO records under the provisions of legislation enacted by the Congress last year (Public Law 89-487, Public Information, Availability).

A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12, concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to responsible inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency. When irate taxpayers and responsible representatives of the news media request information from me concerning anti-poverty programs, I do not expect they should be kept waiting for periods of months for answers to their inquiries. Any steps you can take to expedite responses will be greatly appreciated. I might add this view is shared by a large number of my colleagues.



Your invitation to my staff to review evaluation reports of OEO programs at your library is appreciated. I would appreciate it if you will forward the following reports to me so that I might look them over in my office prior to this year's anti-poverty hearings:

Two reports prepared by the Louis Harris Associates concerning surveys of Job Corps graduates and dropouts.

The evaluation report of neighborhood centers prepared by Kirschner Associates of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Report of the study made by Dr. Max Wolff, Senior Research Sociologist for the Center of Urban Education at the University of New York City, on the Head Start program.

410-page report prepared by the Human Sciences Research, Inc., McLean, Virginia, resulting from a study of six Indian reservations.

310-page report on the jobs for the poor in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and Rochester, prepared by the National Committee on Employment of Youth under contract to OEO.

Report on Camp Atterbury prepared by Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., in late 1965.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUITE,

Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, many proponents of the OEO and its programs feel about the programs as Representative PHIL M. LANDBUM, one responsible for the initial legislation, when he said:

I still feel strongly that the so-called poverty program is sound in concept and designed to go after these problems on a long-range basis of education and training. But I am saddened that the administration of the program has been so poorly carried out and that so many bad judgements have been made.

#### REGIONAL OFFICES

Since the decentralization of OEO most of the decisions and policies affecting individual programs are established within the six regional offices. A study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., in April 1967, entitled "Strengthening the Organization and Process of the CAP Regional Offices," thoroughly reviewed the operation of the regional offices and contained the following major conclusions:

Headquarters imposes an excessive number of information demands on the regional offices \* \* \*. We identified several examples of inquiries from two or more headquarters offices about the same problem on the same day. While we have not conducted a detailed \* \* \* (one) underlying cause: A lack of understanding on the part of headquarters personnel of the role headquarters is to play in the management process, and an unwillingness to function within the boundaries of that role.

The regional offices frequently receive detailed direction from a multitude of headquarters personnel. \* \* \* This problem grows out of a lack of understanding at headquarters of line authority and of the functional and advisory authorities of the various staff units.

Personnel at each level must develop and instill in subordinates a greater degree of discipline than has heretofore existed in CAP. By "organizational discipline," we mean the frame of mind with which individuals carry out their assigned responsibilities without dissipating time in nonessential meetings or veering off into areas of responsibility outside their own.

The lack of adequate headquarters discipline is a problem to the regional offices because of the excessive information requests that have been imposed, the management

improvement projects that have been launched but have not been completed, and the needed actions that were delayed when decisions were not properly coordinated or when unauthorized persons intervened.

CAP critically needs to be able to apportion work and assign responsibilities in a logical manner so that each person fulfills his responsibilities without drifting into another's area of responsibility.

However, CAP has been hampered by an excessively high turnover in personnel that has undermined efforts to develop a fully experienced and effective staff. The magnitude of this problem is indicated by the following findings:

a. The rate of turnover among regional analysts has been 52 percent per year. The average length of service for analysts is only 10.6 months.

b. Every top-level position at CAP headquarters and at OEO, with the exception of the Director of OEO, has had at least two occupants during the past 2½ years, some positions have had three or four occupants.

\* \* \* Some of the reasons for this situation were identified through interviews and through questionnaires completed by regional analysts. Low morale and general dissatisfaction were mentioned frequently in five of the seven regional offices.

Regional analysts are frustrated by the confusion, time demands, and lack of support under which they must work. \* \* \* indicated substantial frustration due to the "confused paperwork maze" in which they must function. \* \* \* The average analyst spends only 2.2 days per month in the field, and some have never visited their grantees.

A review of programs in the northeastern and southeastern regions conducted for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty this year contained several criticisms and suggestions, some of which were:

#### NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL OFFICE

Yet we are convinced that the Federal regional role needs adjustment. OEO/New York needs more emissaries in the field and fewer "desk man" in the regional office. More personal and continuous contact is needed between the communities and OEO, and the point of contact should be the field staff of the OEO regional office. Preferably, the New Jersey, upstate New York, and New England field teams should be physically located in the communities they serve. And should operate as articulate spokesmen of the Federal stake in community action programs. Without these local contacts, there is little advantage in locating a regional office on Madison Avenue rather than in Washington where the field services for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands remain.

The field staff and, on occasion, the regional director and his deputies could help communities to resolve interagency or interpersonal squabbles. Indeed, they have played this role but one suspects not as often as needed.

#### SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL OFFICE

The Southeastern regional office has served more in the role of control and review than in leadership in program development and evaluation. Apparently the resources of the regional office have been limited to the extent that its efforts have had to be directed more toward the review of applications and the determination of compliance than to helpful guidance and direction. All agencies expressed regret that regional representatives could not spend more time in their communities to understand their programs and to help them in program evaluation.

\* \* \* It would appear that stronger coordination at the State and Federal level of all related programs is mandatory. The State agency should be given more clearly defined responsibility to effect such coordination at

the local level, particularly where State-controlled programs are operating in the local community.

One State technical assistant director has commented "probably the most important difficulty results from exasperating and seemingly arbitrary actions by national and regional OEO in the realm of policies and procedures."

#### PROGRAM EVALUATION

Another complaint of various State technical assistant directors is that OEO policies do not include as one of the criteria for renewing funds for any program any proof of effectiveness through the form of evaluation to determine the extent to which the program has contributed to the alleviation of poverty or its causes. This is a very serious deficiency and can result in millions of dollars of antipoverty funds being spent on ineffective and wasteful programs.

Mrs. Shirley Tannebaum, director of the Frederick County, Md., Community Action program, testified during hearings before our committee to her frustrating experiences with regional OEO:

Upon presenting this program package to OEO, we began a long series of negotiations which if it were not so serious could be called a comedy of errors. The day after presenting our proposals to regional office, the program analyst for my county resigned.

Since then I have had six program analysts. Every time I have had to go through these programs again, explaining and describing once again. This particular process went on for about a year.

Never was I told that the program was bad. The proposals were not rejected. They simply never were funded.

#### ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

Probably the most effective and efficient administrative effort in the entire OEO is in the area of public relations. A budget of \$2.4 million is utilized in a furious churning out of beautiful brochures and tons of press releases which tell what a grand and glorious job OEO is doing to lift the poverty stricken up by the boot straps. OEO pays great attention to the press, and whenever articles are written which are favorable to OEO they are reproduced and sent to Members of Congress as well as countless others.

Many problems facing OEO today have been created from overselling a program which has in no way been able to fulfill the promises made.

OEO public relations efforts include the technique of swiftly issuing press releases rebutting any and all criticisms of the program, regardless of the facts. Such "rebuttals" in the past have ranged from casting aspersions on a congressional report—as in the press release criticizing the minority views of this committee on the 1966 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act—to a complete denial of facts previously established. Consider the case of the Liberation Hate School in Nashville, Tenn., brought to light in the testimony of Capt. John A. Sorace of the Nashville Police Department before the Senate Judiciary Committee in early August of this year. Captain Sorace testified that OEO funds had been issued to support a liberation school connected with the North Nashville summer project at St. Anselm's



Episcopal Church in Nashville at which, under the direction of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee affiliated employments, children were being taught to "hate whitey." After a denial of such support by Rev. Dr. Paschell Davis the following day before the committee, Dr. Davis sent a telegram to the committee in which he restated the case and admitted that some expenses of the school had been or would be borne by the metropolitan action commission, the antipov-erty agency funded under the OEO ap-propriation.

The following letter published in sev-eral southeastern newspapers on and around August 25, 3 weeks after use of OEO funds for the liberation hate school was firmly established, contains a denial in one form or another in every para-graph, and leaves one with the impres-sion that OEO funds were not in any way involved. Although the release is care-fully worded and numerous denials as stated are correct, the general denial that "not one dime of Federal funds has been used in the controversial liberation school" is contrary to the established and true facts:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Aug. 25, 1967]

PULSE OF THE PUBLIC—FREEDOM SCHOOL NOT OEO'S

ATLANTA.—A wire service story out of Nash-ville August 17 reported on some controver-sial classes at the liberation school, connected with the North Nashville summer project of St. Anselm's Episcopal Church. Unfortu-nately, the news report identified these ac-tivities, skits acting out the slaughter of white plantation owners in the Nat Turner slave rebellion of over a century ago, as being paid from Federal funds provided by OEO. This is definitely not the case, and we regret that some newsmen have failed to note the repeated and emphatic denials of any par-ticipation by our agency in that project.

Not one dime of Federal funds has been used in the controversial liberation school, and that fact has been thoroughly docu-mented and publicly presented on several conspicuous occasions during the past 2 weeks. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, stated flatly that none of our funds have ever been used in that project.

The Reverend Dr. Paschall Davis, chairman of the metropolitan action commission, our community-action agency in Nashville, testi-fied before the Senate Judiciary Committee that no Federal expenditures have ever been made in that project.

Several others connected with our agency, and with the various relationships it has in Nashville, Tenn., have all stated publicly that absolutely no OEO funds have ever been used by the liberation school.

In spite of the latest erroneous reports, sensationalizing the unfortunate events in Nashville, we trust that your readers under-stand that the school in question is definitely not supported by the funds from OEO.

Thank you for your kindness in making this clarification for us.

DUPREE JORDAN,  
Director of Public Affairs, Southeast  
Regional Office, Office of Economic  
Opportunity.

We would suggest to OEO that if its high-powered public relations staff were put to work straightening out the admin-istrative confusions in the poverty pro-grams, the time, money, and energy would be better spent.

#### LOBBYING

A serious matter of congressional lob-bying was brought to the attention of Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD by Mayor Wallace Johnson of Berkeley, Calif., and later substantiated by other mayors. Following is Mayor Johnson's letter:

CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
October 3, 1967.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORD: Today, long distance collect from Washington, an assist-ant of Sargent Shriver, Lewis Ritter, tele-phoned me to secure my commendation of the OEO program. He went on to explain that, with the approval of Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell, of Honolulu, he was calling the Republican mayors of this country to solicit their sup-port of OEO. If I were favorably disposed to append my name to a petition or statement in support of OEO, Mr. Ritter explained, he would send me a copy of the text of such a statement.

I asked him what was the general content of the statement. He responded that it in-cluded the thought that the OEO program in the local communities was working well and effectively, and that furthermore I, as a Republican mayor, endorsed it. I promptly advised this man that I was not enthusiastic about the OEO program, and could see no evidence that it was attaining its objectives.

My purpose in writing to you is to tell you that as a citizen, a public servant, and a fel-low Republican, I resent Sargent Shriver and his aides using public funds and facilities to, in effect, lobby among local Republican of-ficials in an effort to put pressure on Gerald Ford and Everett Dirksen. Mr. Ritter quite candidly stated that the purpose of his en-deavor was to prepare a message endorsed by a large number of Republican mayors, and then to confront you with it.

I have written a book on politics, "Respon-sible Individualism," which will be published later this month by Devin-Adair. A chapter of this book, "Bureaucracy—the 4th Arm of Government," describes the growing power of nonelected officials and the importance of keeping the power and prerogatives of admin-istrative staff in their proper subordinate role. Here is a flagrant example of staff lobby-ing against legislators. You can count on my full cooperation to help correct this abuse.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE JOHNSON, Mayor.

The efforts of Mr. Ritter did result in a telegram signed by 22 Republican mayors being sent to Minority Leaders EVERETT DIRKSEN and GERALD FORD urg-ing the minority leaders "to encourage Members of Congress to support the OEO budget so that these dynamic and imagi-native programs may be carried on in a successful manner."

Congressman GOODELL responded with the following release reminding OEO of the criminal lobbying law:

Congressman Charles E. Goodell, a ranking Republican on the House committee writing poverty legislation and a member of the House Republican leadership, today charged OEO with violation of Federal criminal law prohibiting Government employees from lobbying Congress at the taxpayers' expense. The charge leveled by Congressman Goodell involved solicitation by OEO employees of favorable comments from Republican mayors with reference to the war on poverty.

"Information has come to me from several Republican mayors that they resented pres-sure from OEO officials to whom they must apply for funds," Congressman Goodell as-

serted "All mayors of major cities in this country face fiscal problems and they want as much Federal money to come to their cities as is possible, however poorly written and poorly administered the Federal laws may be. They acknowledge that they do not have information about suggested improve-ments or redirection of the war on poverty. When they are called or contacted by mail, the context inevitably is: 'You want us to make money available to your community, now you do something for us. Urge congres-sional leadership to expand the war on pov-erty and to carry it on in its present form.'"

"This is a very serious matter. Letters are going out from OEO every day and wires are burning with OEO employees urging public officials, labor unions, business groups, and other organizations to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress. Unfortunately, these people being solicited are getting only one side of the story. They are told: 'Mem-bers of Congress are trying to kill the poverty war. If you want to save it and keep getting some money in your community, go to work on your Congressman.' They are not told about the Opportunity Crusade or other pro-posals to improve and redirect the program."

Congressman GOODELL cited title 18 of the United States Code, section 913, which provides as follows:

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legisla-tion or appropriation by Congress.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to vio-late this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Exceptions are provided in the law for di-rect communications between Federal agen-cies and Members of Congress. Those excep-tions are not involved in the cases in ques-tion, Congressman Goodell stated.

Congress provided this safeguard to protect the people and the representatives of the people from the overwhelming lobbying power of Federal employees using the tax-payers' money to perpetuate and promote the programs understandably supported by the people who administer those programs. This is a particularly dangerous practice when organizations or public officials solicited re-ceive large amounts of Federal money from the very administrators who are soliciting them. OEO employees have been flagrant in their abuse of the intent of these criminal provisions. These abuses must cease immedi-ately.

It is quite possible that some officials favor continuation of the present war on poverty without change. If so, they don't need to be influenced or pressured by OEO to make their opinions felt in Congress. Congressmen welcome unpressured opinions from all citi-zens with reference to the legislative prob-lems we face.

I am referring the clear violations that have come to my attention in this instance to the Department of Justice and the Gen-eral Accounting Office for investigation and appropriate prosecution.

OEO in conjunction with other de-partments initiated a concentrated em-ployment program in 19 of the larger cities and two rural areas throughout the country early in June, but in their usual fashion—with all the administrative bungling, fast approval of programs



without thought, without planning, or the waste involved. This crash effort was considered by many merely as an attempt to keep the cities "cool" this summer and was criticized widely:

James Banks, former UPO director here in Washington, said:

The Government's whole method of approaching summer is a crazy, illogical, emotional response to a problem which deserves more serious consideration. There is something rather immoral about it. The Government's response is "Let us keep down riots and violence" rather than let us eliminate the causes of riots and violence.

Mitchell Sviridoff, former director of the New York City Human Resources Administration, likewise commented:

In my opinion, the concentrated employment program is one of the most promising manpower efforts ever initiated by the Department of Labor. I enthusiastically support it. I also support summer programs. It's just that I do not believe that, in themselves, summer programs are enough.

After the mad rush in May and June to get the program underway, the EYOA in Los Angeles received a 1-year allocation to fund a concentrated employment program, effective July 1. It is unbelievable that as of September 14 not one person had been employed. As noted in a letter Supervisor Kenneth Hahn sent to Mr. Shriver criticizing the concentrated employment program and the antipoverty administration in Washington:

Although the effective date of this program was July 1, 1967, when 2,100 persons were to go on the payroll, as of this date not one person has been actually employed.

Mr. Hahn has further commented the concentrated employment program is "so snarled in redtape that it's hurting—not helping—existing work and training programs in county government."

Even Zane Meckler, San Francisco acting regional manager of community action programs, indicated his disapproval of this type of administration when he said:

The crash program approach to several recent Federal projects has caught my office on the wrong foot, too. We are exceedingly embarrassed by last-minute release of funds, which we know will cause nothing but havoc. Programs which allow local agencies only a few weeks or days to organize local projects and apply for funds have obvious drawbacks.

#### URBAN BIAS

Studies and hearings have been conducted during the past year into the problem of poverty in rural America, regarding what is being done to check it and what needs to be done. Two facts have been established that are of concern to us: One-half of the Nation's poor live in rural America, but only 31 percent of antipoverty community action funds are going to agencies serving the rural poor.

Because the cities were able to organize, apply, get funded and move quickly, it is understandable that a greater percentage of the funds went to urban programs in the beginning. Such is not the situation now as there are more than 1,050 community action programs in operation and, according to OEO officials, with the planned creation of 40 new agencies, all rural counties which fall

into the "concentrated poverty" bracket will be covered by a community action agency. These agencies are ready, willing and asking for funds needed to assist the rural poor, but OEO plans for fiscal 1968 will continue to give a disproportionately large share of funds to urban communities.

Dr. James Bonnen, an economist at Michigan State University, who recently spent 2 years on the President's Council of Economic Advisers, bluntly explains the oversight:

An administrator of national programs is under the gun to get the biggest bang for the buck. So he doesn't operate in areas where he encounters the highest cost per unit of program output. In other words, there is a concentration of poor in the cities while the rural poor are dotted here and there over thousands of square miles. It takes more money and effort to even reach them, much less help them.

State OEO directors, community action agency directors, and many groups concerned with the rural poor strongly oppose this inequity in funding and so testified before our committee this summer. Mrs. Shirley Tannenbaum, director of the Frederick, Md., community action agency, said:

In the mid-Atlantic region the rural areas with smaller and less skilled staffs must compete with such cities as Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Washington. The result is that there is not much left to be distributed to rural community action programs.

#### HOW YOU GOING TO KEEP THEM DOWN ON THE FARM?

Although the President is urging an increase in Federal aid programs which will help the poor stay in rural America, top thinkers at OEO disagree. According to Nick Kotz, correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, Robert A. Levine, Assistant Director of OEO, "has actively opposed programs to establish housing, job training and economic development designed to help the hard-core rural poor stay where they are. He believes these programs are doomed to failure and that migration to the city is inevitable." Mr. Kotz claims the Minneapolis Tribune has obtained a series of confidential government memorandums which reveal a fundamental disagreement in the Government over what to do about rural poverty.

Thomas Karter, who resigned as Director of OEO's migrant and seasonal farmworkers program, has protested:

Rural programs are not being properly funded. It's not fair to expect people to stay in rural areas when money is not forthcoming to help them toward a better life there. The philosophy Levine is expressing represents the actual policy and programs not only of OEO but of several other Federal agencies.

#### RESEARCH

Under OEO's authority to conduct or contract for research into the problems of poverty and evaluation of its programs, a total of \$70 million has been spent. Of course, research into all aspects of poverty is necessary, but so is proper administration of research efforts, including coordination with other agencies and organizations, whether Federal, State, or local, to avoid duplication, and to obtain subsequent full utili-

zation of the findings of such studies. Otherwise, such funds spent on research are "poured down the drain."

Unfortunately, OEO has in the past approached research into poverty as if no effort had ever been made in this field. We are told that prior to 1964, when OEO was legislated, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had contracted for or conducted approximately 300 studies into the problems of poverty. In response to an inquiry from the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs of the Government Operations Committee, in connection with their study on "The Use of Social Research in Federal Domestic Programs," Mr. Joseph A. Kershaw, former Director of OEO Research, commented regarding coordination:

There was never any organized system for doing this and perhaps the agencies ought to have some kind of regularized exchange developed between them.

During "markup" of the poverty bill last week, Congressman John Dent made reference to an OEO contract with Princeton University for an evaluation of technical and training schools in six States. He also noted that he had been advised by a representative of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Information that this information is available and "they can get it for a 5 cent stamp if they wrote for it."

A large percentage of research funds are spent evaluating the anti-poverty programs' administration by OEO or other agencies under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Since OEO is able to provide realistic evaluation of its own programs, such contracting with private scholars is desirable; however, those knowledgeable with the administration in the Research Division of OEO are highly critical of the effect these evaluations and other research studies have on policies and decisionmaking. Dr. Oscar A. Ornati of New York University contends:

Too few of the senior administrators are familiar with them; there is little systematic analysis of the reports and no routinized way for the findings to be distributed either to the Community Action agencies that administer the programs or to the regional offices of OEO that increasingly pass on fund applications.

#### SECRECY AS A POLICY

Also of concern to us is the policy of OEO to write into some research contracts language which forbids the contractor to "publish, permit to be published, or distribute for public consumption, any information concerning the objectives, results, or conclusions without the prior written consent of the contracting officer." This restriction has applied to 88 OEO grants totaling over \$12 million during fiscal 1965 and 1966.

Dr. Sar A. Levitan, George Washington University, also concerned over this practice, has said:

An increasingly dangerous practice is Government contracting with private consulting firms and academic institutions for survey and evaluation of public programs. The products of the outside experts become the property of the contracting agency and are not frequently published.

Thus far, the product of the OEO research staff remains largely in the files of the "Pov-



erty House". \* \* \* All that we know about this significant work is based on sketchy newspaper reports or the result of some "leaks," inadvertent or perhaps contrived. It is very doubtful that the product of OEO research and conclusions will ever become public property, unless the recommendations are adopted as official Government policy—an unlikely event. Neither Congress nor the public, therefore, may ever have an opportunity to assess knowledgeably the merits of the proposed multibillion-dollar programs.

There is, however, an urgent need in a free society for the public and Congress to be better informed than they are about the operations of publicly funded programs. At the very minimum, the public is entitled to frank discussion and interpretations of program operations prepared by detached experts without vested interests.

The product of the research must be freely available, and the researcher must be independent of thought controls.

Congressmen QUIE and GOODELL, as well as countless others interested in the war on poverty, have experienced great difficulty in the past in obtaining copies of research and evaluation reports. Congressman HENRY REUSS, chairman of the subcommittee making the above study, urged the OEO to change their "secrecy policies" after which he was assured new policies would be forthcoming soon. Following a couple of months of silence and no change in policies by OEO officials, Congressman REUSS made a public release criticizing OEO's release of information policies:

Unless the Office of Economic Opportunity changes its information policy, the public will believe that OEO permits its contractors to release only those facts it wants the public to know.

My subcommittee was told that the OEO policy of restricting the release of contract research findings would be changed in the middle of November, but it is the third week of January and nothing has yet been done. Until these restrictions are lifted, Congress will believe that OEO is playing politics with its research funds, rather than conducting a dispassionate research for the truth, letting the facts fall as they may.

The war on poverty has enough trouble from its enemies. It should not get into trouble with its friends over this issue.

OEO policy of prohibiting the release of certain research results came to my attention in an inquiry into federally financed social research conducted by the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, \* \* \*

#### F. UNPOPULARITY POLLS

The responses to surveys conducted by Members of the Congress reflect the unpopularity of the war on poverty and overwhelming dissatisfaction with anti-poverty programs. The following release sets out the results of 19 congressional polls:

#### QUIE SAYS DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN POLLS REVEAL WIDESPREAD DISSATISFACTION WITH WAR ON POVERTY PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Minnesota Congressman Albert H. Quie said today (Friday) 19

recent polls by Members of Congress reflect widespread dissatisfaction with the administration's war on poverty program. Representative Quie, Republican of Minnesota, pointed out that the four Democratic polls were as negative as the 15 Republican polls.

He said the polls, placed in the Congressional Record between January 10 and July 10, included every poll that contained a question about the war on poverty. "This, I believe, is a fair sample of what the American people think," he said.

Quie cited the question from Representative O. C. Fisher, Democrat of Texas: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" The "Yes" answers totaled only 6 percent while 87.5 percent answered "No." The poll of another Democrat, Representative Charles E. Bennett, of Florida, gave the war on poverty program only a 12-percent affirmative vote and an 85-percent negative rating.

Representative Quie said Representative Jerome L. Waldie, Democrat of California, asked: "Should we transfer proven programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to regular Federal agencies; e.g., Operation Headstart to HEW, not thereby reducing expenditures, but perhaps increasing efficiency?" The answers were 79 percent "Yes" and only 9 percent "No."

Quie said this only confirms what sponsors of the Opportunity Crusade have been saying all along, that to be truly effective, programs such as Headstart should be transferred to HEW.

He also said the poll results illustrate that the antipoverty program must be revamped and redirected along the lines proposed in the Republican alternative, the Opportunity Crusade. The Opportunity Crusade, he said, is gaining more and more support from Democrats.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM THE 19 POLLS

Representative Charlotte T. Reid, Republican of Illinois: "Do you think that the majority of the war on poverty programs have been effective?" Yes, 10 percent; no, 84 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

Representative Delbert L. Latta, Republican of Ohio: "Do you believe the administration's poverty program is making progress toward the elimination of poverty?" Yes, 11 percent; no, 89 percent.

Representative Edward Hutchinson, Republican of Michigan: "The various war on poverty programs have been in effect for nearly 2 years. Thus far, do you think they have been successful in moving toward the ultimate goal of improving the lot of the poor?" Yes, 11.73 percent; no, 82.40 percent; no answer, 5.87 percent.

Representative Henry P. Smith, Republican of New York: "On balance, do you believe the administration's war on poverty has been successful?" Yes, 12.4 percent; no, 79.9 percent; no opinion, 7.7 percent.

Representative Railsback, Republican of Illinois: "Do you think the war on poverty has been (a) very successful, 2 percent; (b) slightly successful, 31.5 percent; (c) unsuccessful, 64.5 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

Representative Dave Martin, Republican of Nebraska: "We are spending this year \$1,500 million on the war on poverty. Do you feel

this program has been successful?" Yes, 4.8 percent; no, 84 percent; undecided, 11.2 percent.

Representative John M. Ashbrook, Republican of Ohio: "Do you believe the \$2 billion war on poverty has been successful?" Yes, 7 percent; no, 89 percent.

Representative O. C. Fisher, Democrat of Texas: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" Yes, 6 percent; no, 87.5 percent.

Representative John J. Duncan, Republican of Tennessee: "Do you think we should continue our spending on the war on poverty?" Yes, 25 percent; no, 69 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

Representative Dan Kuykendall, Republican of Tennessee: "Do you think the war on poverty has been worth the cost?" Yes, 5.7 percent; no, 94.3 percent.

Representative William L. Scott, Republican of Virginia: "Should Government spending be cut? If so, what areas? Poverty programs?" Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

Representative Charles E. Bennett, Democrat of Florida: "Should your Congressman vote to continue the poverty program under present circumstances?" Yes, 12 percent; no, 85 percent.

Representative William L. Hungate, Democrat of Missouri: "Do you think the poverty program is worthy of being continued?" Yes, 20 percent; no, 75 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Representative Samuel L. Devine, Republican of Ohio: "Do you favor continuation of Great Society war on poverty?" Yes, 18 percent; no, 80 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

Representative Charles E. Chamberlain, Republican of Michigan: "How do you rate the war on poverty as a whole?" Good, 5 percent; fair, 19 percent; poor, 63 percent; blank, 13 percent.

Representative Jerome L. Waldie, Democrat of California: "This year's budget proposes to spend \$1.9 billion on this program (poverty), about the cost of 3 weeks of the Vietnam war. Do you believe (a) We should abolish the entire war on poverty" yes, 36 percent; no, 56 percent; undecided, 8 percent; (b) "We should transfer proven programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to regular Federal agencies, e.g., Operation Headstart to HEW, not thereby reducing expenditures, but perhaps increasing efficiency?" Yes, 79 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 12 percent; (c) "Do you believe we should materially reduce the War on Poverty program?" Yes, 49 percent; no, 41 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

Representative Tim Carter, Republican of Kentucky: (Should we) "Continue the war on poverty, especially the 'Happy Pappy' program?" Yes, 36.8 percent; no, 53.7 percent; undecided, 9.3 percent; "Keep VISTA and Appalachian volunteers?" Yes, 30.6 percent; no, 52.4 percent; undecided, 16.9 percent.

Representative Donald Rumsfeld, Republican of Illinois: "Do you favor an expansion of the Headstart program?" Yes, 50 percent; no, 38 percent; no answer, 12 percent.

Representative George Bush, Republican of Texas: "What should we do about the war on poverty?" (a) Increase expenditures, 3 percent; (b) Reorganize program to make it more responsive to local needs, 52 percent; (c) Eliminate program, 45 percent.



## A SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS, AUTHORIZATIONS, AND PROJECTIONS OF TOTAL FUNDS GENERATED FROM ALL SOURCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REVISED PROPOSALS OF THE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

[In thousands of dollars]

Proposals	Total funds	Opportunity crusade authorization	Description
1. Council of Economic Opportunity advisers to the President (new initiative).	2.50	2.5	Create in the Executive Office of the President, a council to assist the President in overall coordination of Federal antipoverty programs. The council would gather information, appraise various antipoverty programs, develop policies of coordination, make reports and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.
2. Residential vocational training program (new initiative)-----	190.00	190.0	Assist the States to plan, develop, and conduct, at residential centers, a program of basic education, vocational training, job experience, counseling, and placement for jobs, for disadvantaged youth who require a substantial change of environment as a precondition to meaningful training experience.
3. Military career training program (new initiative)-----	(1)	(1)	Provide training and education in residential military career centers administered by the Secretary of Defense for needy youth who would not otherwise qualify for military service.
4. Secondary school work-study program (revamped Neighborhood Youth Corps).	133.30	100.0	Provide work opportunities with public or private nonprofit agencies for students who need extra income to stay in school. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will administer in conjunction with other educationally oriented programs. The Federal share of the wages paid would be 75 percent; the employer's share is 25 percent. The Federal expenditure (\$100,000,000) would result in 1 additional dollar for every 3 Federal dollars spent, for a total of \$33,333,333 in funds generated under the program.
5. In-school counselor program (new initiative)-----	1,165.00	20.0	Provide work opportunities with private, profitmaking employers through efforts of counselors located in schools or school systems who interview, assess the skills of and place needy high school youth with willing employers. Federal funds will pay for no more than 1/2 the salary of such counselors; non-Federal funds supply the balance. Private employers pay the full amount of wages to such student employees. \$40,000,000 will pay the salaries of 5,000 counselors earning an average of \$8,000 per year. If we may assume that each counselor can place an average of 200 students in part-time jobs locally, 1,000,000 needy youth will be assisted. To compute the earning power of such youth is, of course, a matter for speculation. However, it is not unreasonable to assume that such students will work approximately 15 hours weekly for a period of at least a year, and be paid a wage of \$1.50 per hour. If so, each student would earn, on the average, \$1,125 per year. The total impact of private dollars then becomes \$1,125,000,000 in addition to the \$20,000,000 paid to match the Federal dollars to hire such counselors. The Secretary of HEW will administer the program.
6. Work-training program (continuation of the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps).	40.00	30.0	Provide work opportunities with public or private nonprofit employers for needy youth who have terminated their formal education. The Secretary of Labor will continue to administer the program because of its manpower thrust. The Federal share of the wages paid would be 75 percent; the employer's share is 25 percent. The Federal expenditure (\$30,000,000) would result in 1 additional dollar for every 3 Federal dollars spent, for a total of \$10,000,000 in non-Federal funds generated under this program.
7. Industry Youth Corps program (new initiative)-----	280.00	70.0	Provide on-the-job training and job opportunities with private, profitmaking enterprises willing to train needy youth who have terminated their formal education by reimbursing the employers for the cash value of the productivity gap between such youth and other employees performing similar work. (Not to exceed the equivalent of 25 percent of the wages paid such youth.) Each Federal dollar should generate 3 private dollars, for a total of \$210,000,000 in private funds resulting from a \$70,000,000 expenditure.
8. Urban and rural community action programs (revamped)-----	466.25	380.0	Stimulate the creation of new and imaginative programs to fight poverty through assistance to local community action boards without earmarking of funds. Continue the involvement of the poor in the design and operation of such programs, and enlarge the role and responsibility of the States for review of programs, determination of statewide needs and priorities, and assistance to local agencies. Versatile funds may be used for planning, conduct and administration of local programs. (Separate allotments will be made within each State for urban and rural programs, based upon the respective numbers of urban and rural poor in each.) Technical assistance funds will be provided for setting up community action programs and training personnel. An estimated 10 percent of the versatile funds (\$38,000,000) would be used for technical assistance, without any requirement of matching funds. The balance of the versatile funds (\$342,000,000) would be provided on an 80-20 matching basis, generating \$85,500,000 in non-Federal funds. Community action would continue to be administered nationally by the Office of Economic Opportunity, but with stringent prohibitions against engaging in or assisting political activities, whether partisan or nonpartisan.
9. State bonus program in community action (new initiative)-----	40.00	20.0	Enable the States to work in partnership with the Federal Government to develop community action programs locally. Federal dollars must be matched by State contribution, and may be used for State studies, or to supplement funding of local agencies as appropriate.
10. Vista (revamped)-----	26.00	26.0	Encourage and train volunteers to work in combating poverty. Federal funds may be used to recruit, select, train, refer, and maintain volunteers. Initiate a new "Hometown" program for local assignments.
11. Headstart and Early Years programs (revamped)-----	462.50	375.0	Provide educational and supportive services for needy children with poor social/educational backgrounds, both at preschool and early elementary stages of development. Funds will be provided on an 80-20 matching basis for planning, development, and conduct of such programs, under the administration of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare nationally, and community action agencies locally. States will be required to designate a Headstart agency to prepare plans and programs for Early Years as well as Headstart programs. Children who did not participate in Headstart but whose families satisfy eligibility criteria will be allowed to participate in Early Years programs. \$92,500,000 in non-Federal funds will be generated under these programs.
12. State bonus grants program (new initiative)-----	70.00	35.0	Provide assistance to States willing to make an extra effort in Headstart and Early Years. \$35,000,000 in Federal assistance for the States under this program must be matched by State contributions, for a total of \$70,000,000 in additional Headstart and Early Years funding.
13. Rural loan program (continuation)-----	16.00	16.0	Appropriation will be added to the revolving fund established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for loans to low-income rural families and local cooperative associations.
14. Migrant and seasonal workers program (continuation)-----	27.00	27.0	Provide special assistance for migrant and other seasonally employed agricultural workers.
15. Special small business loans and incentives (continuation)-----			Strengthen small business concerns owned by individuals who qualify under poverty standards for loans and guidance and counseling. Costs are paid by the Small Business Administration from a revolving fund administered by it. It is anticipated that \$60,000,000 will be committed to this program during fiscal year 1968.
16. Automation of job opportunity data (new initiative)-----	25.00	25.0	The Secretary of Labor is directed to use automated, high-speed data and communication systems, in order to (a) compile, and make available information regarding job opportunities, skill requirements, labor supply and other data, and (b) establish a nationwide program in the U.S. Employment Service to match job opportunities with available and qualified workers and enable the referral of individuals to places with job openings.
17. Work experience program (continuation)-----	70.00	70.0	Provide work experience for adults as presently authorized under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.
Total-----	3,013.50	1,386.5	

<sup>1</sup> To be funded by the Secretary of Defense from DOD appropriations.

Note: The foregoing summary excludes estimated administrative cost of \$5,500,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity.



## CONCLUSION

Despite the foregoing history of 3 years of frustrations under the Economic Opportunity Act, we are convinced that these programs could be shaped to accomplish their objectives. All of our efforts have been to this end: the development of programs which offer a real hope of success in eliminating the causes of poverty.

It is a matter of deep regret that these efforts have been turned aside by the majority at a time when the entire anti-poverty program faces the distinct possibility of defeat in the House of Representatives. We made every effort to produce a bill which, with bipartisan support, would have an excellent chance to pass the House. The committee bill represents a total rejection of that opportunity. It is worse than present law.

If this entire program dies, it will be because those who profess to be the champions of a "war on poverty"—confronted with the failings of an act that was hastily and sloppily put together and then mutilated by the most inept administration in the history of American Government—would not give an inch to correct past mistakes.

For our part, we would rather see the beginning of a successful attack on poverty in America than the end to the hopes that were kindled by this legislation. It was in this spirit that we did our best to improve the act during the long committee sessions on this bill. The effort was not productive; the committee bill is unacceptable.

There is still time to redirect the "war on poverty" in a manner that would save it from extinction. The time is very short, but we shall keep trying. The American people will be the final judges in this matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, standing in the well of the House to be an advocate, to persuade, to debate the issue, is usually an uplifting experience. Today it is my well of despair.

Mr. Chairman, I rise not to urge but to plead for your compassion for the poor; yet I know that they would not want only your compassion for they stoop not at the corner with a tin cup but stand firm in the belief that America means more than just charity.

Some talk as though poverty were just a thing or a nomenclature—I am here to remind you that poverty are the conditions under which people live in America—that the poor are people, entitled to your first and paramount attention, that in your constituency programs have been in operation to help them nurture and incubate their hopes and dreams and aspirations for a brighter future.

Last night I received a phone call from a young constituent of mine working in Baltimore as a VISTA volunteer. He challenged to me to stand in this well today and by sheer force of logic persuade this House to see that we as a

nation cannot turn our backs now on the poor.

Sometimes the obvious is not discernible—and neither is logic persuasive—and so it is engulfed by superficial antagonisms, beleaguered from its infancy with loud and petty attacks which hampered its great potential for growth and development, crippled by lack of funds, demoralized by lack of support, but despite all this the record will indelibly show that millions of our young children and our unemployed citizens have been shown that they can breathe a little deeper and that hope can become their American creeds.

Millions of Americans are watching and waiting to see whether this Congress will falter or continue in its efforts against the strangulation and despair of the slums and ghettos. It is a little bewildering to me how so many who profess to be for the poor to make it in this world, are not so eager to help provide the means by which this can be accomplished.

Given the necessity to save the taxpayer's dollars and to balance the budget without excessive deficits, it seems to me that the last place we should search for cuts is in a domestic program for the neediest of our fellow citizens who face this world without any promises except hope, and if this program is cut will be left shattered and without faith. Let us not tear asunder that which is not perfect, for no institution can claim that degree of immunity from human error.

Your mail may be misdelivered upon occasions; but none would suggest that this gravamen warrants a dismantling of the post office system. A spaceship burns on the launching pad and three of our most gallant astronauts are killed; yet none out of this catastrophe has suggested that the space program should be overhauled and disjointed at the seams. Faulty controls in defense procurement costing the Government untold dollars; yet no one has suggested that the Defense Department be decentralized and all purchasing ordered by General Services Administration.

Yet with the poverty program, only 3 years old, we are told we must do better, more efficiently, for more people, at less cost and the way to do this is by completely decapitating and dismembering this fledgling creature whose survival will then be only as a statutory funnel for block grants to the State Houses.

Tarred and feathered, badly maligned, humiliated by exclusion from the recent pay raise bill, crippled by lack of funds, the Office of Economic Opportunity continues today its dedicated mission for the poor. As my closing, today I want to pay special commendation to all those OEO workers, volunteers, enrollees who have continued about their business without any diminished effort or zeal throughout all the recent oratory, confident that this Congress will keep up the momentum which has been begun in this truly remarkable program of conscience and compassion to alleviate the suffering of our fellow citizens, and to enlarge this vision of hope for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon. [Mrs. GREEN].

(Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, without crippling amendments so that we may move ahead with the tremendous effort to get our impoverished citizens into a self-respecting productive role in society. Despite the carping criticism and condemnation of the war on poverty, it is evident that real progress has been made and great success lies ahead. Despite some failures and shortcomings, the poverty war has given unprecedented opportunity and hope to our Nation's poor. We dare not retreat nor give ground in this war for, as President Kennedy said:

If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

The legislation before the House will help us to meet this national challenge.

The accomplishments of the Office of Economic Opportunity and cooperating private and public groups across the country are indeed impressive. The Headstart program has already provided educational and other benefits to more than 1.3 million children. Nearly 70,000 men and women have graduated from Job Corps centers and most have embarked upon worthwhile and constructive careers. At least a quarter of a million poor persons have received guidance in civil affairs through the legal services program. Thirty thousand talented high school students are now participating in the Upward Bound project which will help to give them the incentive to complete high school and continue on to college. Almost 1 million boys and girls have obtained useful employment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware that there have been problems or soft spots in each of these programs. Overall, however, they have been successful and offer much potential for even greater success in the future.

The Education and Labor Committee has performed its assigned task with admirable dedication and thoroughness. The members have made an exhaustive review of the operations of the entire



program in an effort to produce a bill which will move the antipoverty effort forward to even greater victories. I would ask my colleagues in the House to follow this example. Patience is the foremost requirement. We cannot expect to correct all of our social and economic ills overnight. We must learn from and build upon the mistakes of the past—not scuttle or destroy a basically sound and hopeful program because of relatively minor problems. It is inevitable that such a complex measure could not wholly satisfy any of us who believe in a meaningful and effective antipoverty program. Each of us is no doubt critical of some aspect or another of the measure before us, but, in my opinion, the whole is worthy of our full support.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation has made a commitment to break the vicious cycle leading from lack of opportunity to poverty to deprivation and to despair. This is a difficult task, but surely is not beyond the capacity of the richest, strongest nation on earth. Let us fulfill this commitment to the poor and disadvantaged in the spirit of justice and compassion that has marked the American character.

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party has earned its name as the party of action. The Economic Opportunity Act, which the party conceived and initiated, is further evidence that the party continues to deserve its name. It is now time for the party to unite in support of this important legislation designed to create for all Americans a life of dignity and prosperity.

The Nation has approved many programs to alleviate poverty among us. From the emergency days of the 1930's to the present, we Democrats have led in the struggle to provide each American with the job each American needs. And the great benefit of the Economic Opportunity Act is that it attacks poverty at just this point. It is not welfare given by the fortunate to the unfortunate. It is not a dole, a handout by which the wealthy may soothe their consciences. It is a sound approach based on the understanding that one of our basic freedoms is the freedom one gains by reason of being productive, and thus, economically independent. The Economic Opportunity Act intends to achieve and has begun to achieve that high purpose.

I hear on the floor of the House and from other sources that this bill is in difficulty, that this bill, after many months of hearings in committee, may die for lack of votes on the floor. If these rumblings are related to reality, then the only excuse we have is that we have misunderstood the bill as amended in committee. Arguments against the committee bill center on errors and waste in its execution. But the bill before us has considered past errors and corrected them. Perhaps we would like to change the past. However, it is false logic to punish the present and the future for past error. This bill is aimed, not at our ancestors but at people alive now, people who live in conditions we all abhor, peo-

ple who need the chance we can give them through passage of this legislation. And I am convinced that the committee bill, carefully drawn and tightly reasoned, is the best instrument available to assure that the people who need opportunity the most will receive the intended benefits of OEO funds.

I am particularly pleased that the bill before us calls for a new emphasis on opportunities for older Americans, emergency food and medical services, and day care provisions. The House Education and Labor Committee has given us a bill reflecting not only the Democratic Party's commitment to action but also a realistic bill of vision, a bill that has weighed error and has set its face against it. To Chairman PERKINS and his committee this House owes its gratitude. And if this House will demonstrate its concern with error to the same degree as the committee, we will vote overwhelmingly to pass this bill.

The future is ours if we shape it. This bill is a lever on the future.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the measure that we have before us is really not an operational program that meets a clear need. Rather, it is a promise, a good faith token, an evidence of bona fide concern by this Congress with the problem of endemic, inherited, structured poverty in America. If anything, it is a marginal program in terms of resources. Scarcely 10 percent of the people living in poverty in the United States have been impacted directly by this program in over 3 years.

To talk of reduction of the administration's requested authorization of \$2 billion to me is as bizarre as it is absurd if we mean to keep faith with the American people. And the American people are looking to us today with foreboding in their hearts.

Last summer 107 American communities suffered grievous harm to their social fabric through violence, and ugly, unruly riots, civil disturbances. According to the experts on the President's anti-riot commission there was one common factor in virtually all of these 107 communities, lack of willingness or lack of capacity on the part of the political and civic leaders in the community to receive grievances from the poor, to turn on their hearing aids so to speak, to establish channels of communication with the poor, and an accompanying lack of capacity to respond to those grievances—not necessarily with the full measure of resources necessary to meet the problem of poverty and urban blight in all its enormity, but to respond with some degree of responsiveness and responsibility to the felt needs of the poor.

In many hundreds of other American communities, we did not have riots and civil disturbances. We did not have violence in the streets. I am proud to say that was true in my own city of New York.

In these communities, too, there was

one overriding factor present—namely, an unexpressed but clearly sensed feeling by the poor that the power structure of those communities did identify with their problems—that the power structure was turned on, was listening and communicating and wanted to hear them and try to solve the grievous and desperate problems of the poor with sensitivity and responsibility.

Now we have heard a great deal of talk about backlash, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday the American people gave us some evidence of a frontlash when they responded to the needs and demands of the poor in Cleveland, Ohio; Gary, Ind.; and Boston, Mass., with a magnificent display of decency and commitment. Urban Americans selected public officials of competence and dedication who were in every sense tuned in on the needs and aspirations of the poor, talented individuals who are determined to solve the problems of our cities on the basis of decency, justice, equity, and reason.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say let us get on with the job of passing this bill. Let us not indulge for days on end in an orgy of recrimination that can only be interpreted by Americans across the country as a clear signal that we are really not concerned with poverty—that we are grasping for reasons not to do the job that needs to be done.

I would point out that in the years that we have had the poverty program, from 1964 to 1967—in those 3 years we spent somewhere between \$4 billion and \$4.5 billion. We have subjected this rather modest level of expenditures to persistent and merciless scrutiny in the press and on this floor; the pitiless searchlight of publicity has flashed and glared of seemingly on each and every Job Corps trainee—on each Headstart child, on each foster grandpappy.

In the same period of time we spent \$77 billion in our public works, military construction, space and agriculture subsidy programs, all programs which inherently were more than susceptible to pruning and "stretchout" treatment. I have not noticed any overriding concern on the part of Members of this body to put the meat ax or bludgeon to these programs. I have not noticed any predilection on the part of Members of this House to engage in an orgy of incriminations or soul searching as to the cost effectiveness of every last dime spent on these programs.

Secretary McNamara recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee that:

All too often, large-scale weapon-system developments, and even production programs, have been undertaken before we had clearly defined what was wanted or whether they would work.

In the last few years in just five or six programs about \$4.5 billion worth of military hardware programs were abandoned:

Dynasoar (glide bomber from orbit) abandoned .....	\$1, 000, 000, 000
Skybolt (air to ground missile) abandoned .....	2, 000, 000, 000
Manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program, abandoned .....	1, 000, 000, 000



PM6 (jet propelled mine laying seaplane) abandoned..	\$450,000,000
Pluto project (Nuclear ram-jet missile) abandoned for "lack of a stated military requirement" .....	200,000,000
Abandoned .....	4,600,000,000

These were experimental, innovative, sophisticated programs, and I am sure not a single Member of this House would point the finger of guilt at such research and development programs or the administrators responsible for them because they had some failures among their many successes.

I only hope, Mr. Chairman, that there will be some comparable evidence of charity, concern, and conviction forthcoming in the next few days, as we face up to continuing uncrippled and undiminished, equally experimental, innovative, and sophisticated programs to end poverty in our land.

The Members of this House know in their hearts that in the cities and towns and hamlets of urban and rural America this program is performing miracles of human reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, let us validate the faith and commitment of the American people as they went to the polls yesterday. Let us pass the splendid administration program intact, and continue with unabated momentum and forward thrust, with increased experience, sensitivity, and know-how to meet and solve the appalling problem of poverty amidst plenty in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. GARDNER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, in 1966, we passed, on the floor of this House, after 4 hours of general debate and without amendment, a welfare authorization of over \$4 billion. We did it because we recognized that there are, in this Nation of affluence, some 30 million Americans who need assistance just to sustain themselves. I voted for it, and will doubtless do so again.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems ironic to me that, in the same year, we passed, after 10 hours of debate and several days of amendments, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, and authorized somewhat over \$1.5 billion. I sat through the entire debate and heard every argument conceivable against a welfare program.

But, the war on poverty is not a welfare program.

There is no section of this law that simply gives people money and asks nothing in return. This is an act that says to people: "Here is a chance to learn. Here is a chance to earn. Here is a chance to train. Here is a chance to help yourself." This is no handout. It is an investment in human renewal.

And, yet, it is an act which has had more abuse heaped on it—has had more criticism than any I have seen since I have been in Congress. Why?

First, let me say that not all the criticism was undeserved. This program is not perfect. There have been mistakes, and there will be more. But, therein lies one of the great problems. The friends of this program expect too much. The critics expect too little.

To expect this program to cure all the accumulated social ills overnight is to expect too much. Yet, to expect that improvement can be made in the lives of the poor without reforms that sometimes shake the establishment is to expect too little.

But, whether we expect too much or too little, it seems to me that it is a tribute to Congress and to this Nation that, in our affluence we have directed our efforts to a concerted attack on poverty, and that is precisely what it is, a concerted attack.

True, the old-line agencies have been combating the causes for poverty one at a time for years. Each one has done a relatively good job. But, the great strength of this program comes from a final recognition that there is not just one reason or two reasons for poverty, but many reasons. Under this act, we are attacking, for the first time, all of them.

To do this, it is necessary to involve the persons afflicted with the multiple causes of poverty. It is necessary to have community action programs where the local residents undertake an entire effort against what they believe to be problems in their communities.

#### JOB CORPS

It is necessary to have a Job Corps where young people receive not only basic education but also vocational training, medical services, counseling, discipline, and a chance to build self-esteem. I never cease to be amazed at the number of well-meaning people who feel you can take the type of young person we have in Job Corps today and just find him a job, or just improve his education, or just provide discipline and all will be well with him. You can do this, they say, at half the cost.

Just doing any one of these things will help, but it will not do the job of reclaiming and redirecting that young person. And, that must be done if he or she is to completely break out of the cocoon which is poverty.

#### HEADSTART

Headstart is a perfect example of the total approach which must be made. At the outset, many of us conceived it to be an educational program. It is that. But, it is also many other things. It is involvement of parents, medical and dental care, a trip to the zoo, sharing experiences, meeting other youngsters, eating a wholesome lunch, involvement

of brothers and sisters, and many other things.

Basically, the effect of the program is to involve people in solutions to their own and their communities' problems.

#### MIGRANT WORKERS

Let me cite for you the efforts of some interested citizens in one of my own counties. Skagit County, Wash., has the second largest migrant population in the State. Yet, prior to this act, there had been no significant effort to alleviate the plight of the migrant workers who annually descended on the area. These citizens, with the help of an OEO-sponsored migrant programs, have set up a center and are operating it themselves. It provides medical and dental care, and education for children who, without it, would be locked in cars or watched by older brothers and sisters. It provides adult basic education for the adult migrants.

The people of Skagit County had been concerned for years, and had long wanted to do something. This act made it possible.

Why is it so important that the plight of the migrant be relieved? Aside from the human values involved, this Nation has a stake in their well-being. Stoop labor is fast being replaced by mechanization. What are we to do with a group whose average income is less than \$2,000 per family, whose children have less than 8 weeks of formal schooling per year, whose medical and dental needs are not being met? We can play ostrich, stick our heads in the sand and forget it. But if we do, we will regret it.

Alternatively, we can do as we are doing under OEO-sponsored migrant programs all over this Nation; we can face up to the problem and do something about it.

#### THE COST, THE PROFIT

"At what cost," we are asked.

In Oregon, the Valley Migrant League sponsored welding classes under title III-B of this act. The total cost of operating the class was \$1,015. Of the 10 graduates from the class, six went to work in Portland earning \$3.79 per hour. Within 7 weeks, these six men alone paid a total of \$1,130 in withholding tax payments.

In Arizona in 1966, 121 adult migrants passed high school equivalency tests after completing adult education classes sponsored under this act. Latest studies indicate a high school diploma is estimated at \$60,000 in lifetime income. This represents about \$9,000 in Federal tax alone. The course cost \$200 per person.

Who wants to play ostrich with alternatives like that?

#### INDIAN CAP PROJECTS

While the plight of the migrant is bad, the poorest Americans are the first Americans—the American Indians, 70 percent of the families living on reservations are living in poverty. 70 percent of them are living in substandard homes, and their children are dropping out of school at rates exceeding twice the national average.

There are those who say that this is a good illustration of what happens



when the Federal Government provides for people: They lose their incentive, drive, and desire to achieve for themselves. I agree. We have provided meager doles and programs with the paternalistic care of a mildly interested father who insists that only he knows what the child needs. These people are not children, and it is time we stopped treating them as such.

OEO-sponsored community action programs have broken the paternalistic concept, and are operating on Indian reservations, involving the Indians in their planning and execution.

The Indians on the reservations in my district recognize this departure from traditional paternalism, and, believe me, they appreciate it. In speaking about traditional agencies, one young Indian said: "You haven't reached us; you haven't touched us; you haven't moved us." Now that tribe is being reached, touched, and moved by their own community action program under this act.

But, to believe that the deep-rooted problems of the American Indians are going to be solved overnight and by the meager funds under this act would be a mistake. Much more must be done in housing, education, and in tribal economic development.

#### LEGAL SERVICES

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to one of the most encouraging programs under this act: The National Emphasis program of legal services. Here is a program which provides the alternative of justice in the courts to riots in the streets.

A noted journalist once referred to the law as "the bastard daughter of justice." I am afraid that this has been all too true for the poor. Too often the law to them means only garnishment of their wages, eviction from their tenement, arrest for crime, the friend of the "organization." Too often, to them the law is their enemy because they simply have not the money needed to get the law to work for them as well.

Mr. Chairman, to get equal justice, persons must have equal access to competent attorneys. That costs money. But, there is another way now.

While we have a long way to go, the legal services program is providing the alternative. It is essential that this program continue at least at the funding suggested in this act. And, it is essential that the program continue as a legal service program with the ability to provide the same legal services that people who can afford counsel can obtain.

I am not saying that legal services programs alone can prevent riots. I am suggesting that providing a legal remedy to real injustices is a giant stride in that direction. We can provide this alternative with a small fraction of the sums lost in the riot-torn cities of last summer.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken at length on some aspects of this bill. That I have spent less time on others does not mean they are less important. They are all important, because, in sum, they constitute a concerted and comprehensive attack on the multitude of causes for poverty. It is important that they be directed from a unified source and continued as total commitment to the total problem.

There are those who feel we should spin off the various functions of OEO to the traditional agencies.

To do so at this time, I feel, would be disastrous because it would fragment our commitment and leave us with little better than we had when we undertook the concerted attack that has done so much in 3 short years.

#### LOOKING AT THE BILL

On balance, Mr. Chairman, I feel this legislation constitutes a significant improvement and will better enable us to wage a successful fight. But, I cannot say I agree with all we have done.

I feel the changes we have made in the authorization of community action agencies is a backward step. When this legislation was first enacted, it was subjected to severe criticism as being susceptible to use as a tool of the establishment—a way to further entrench city hall. I feel much of this criticism was unjustified, but I must say that, in my opinion, the amendments before us today contain that potential as never before. I agree that there should be more direction and participation by States and political subdivisions. I agree that they should have more responsibility for local antipoverty efforts. But, I think in a zealous effort to do this, we have gone too far. We have placed in jeopardy the role of the private, nonprofit agencies which today compose 80 percent of the community action agencies. I feel we could have the involvement and direction of the State and local officials we desire by the change in section 211(b)—by simply requiring the one-third participation of public officials required in that section. As the legislation before us now reads, private nonprofit agencies can be community action agencies only when so designated by a State or political subdivision. I am hopeful, if adopted in this form, the provision will not cause undue disruption. But, I fear that the seed of abuse is planted therein—a seed which may later grow to haunt us.

Mr. Chairman, the main thrust of this act is toward the involvement of people in the solution of their own problems. It seems to me that an amendment adopted in committee to section 223(c) detracts substantially from this worthy purpose. Under the law as it now exists, community action agencies and special emphasis programs can make up the nonfederal share by in-kind contributions. By and large, this has meant the involvement of local citizens and the utilization of local facilities. But, in committee, we amended this section to require that at least 50 percent of the local share be made up of cash. This means that involvement of money replaces involvement of people. Additionally, the burden becomes almost insurmountable to those areas which have had the most difficulty in raising the matching money. And, those are the areas which need this program most.

With these exceptions, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill. A good bill, because it strengthens and renews the pledge this Congress made to the American people when it enacted this legislation.

Before this act was passed, we tried

to meet the problems of the poor and underprivileged with what was basically a dole. Our motivation was essentially humanitarian and to that extent our efforts were on the side of the angels. But, we were only treating the symptoms of poverty.

In passing this act, we committed ourselves to a more fundamental and effective approach. We are no longer interested in simply deadening the pain of poverty. We want to eliminate it. There is still the strong strain of humanitarian motivation behind the effort. But, we are also doing it because it makes sense. It is the reasonable, logical thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider it in that light.

#### THE NEED FOR LEGAL SERVICES: ITS DIMENSIONS AND URGENCY

Anyone who doubts that the poor have legal problems should visit one of the neighborhood legal services offices funded through the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The waiting rooms are crowded with people in need of immediate assistance.

One man's truck has been taken from his premises in the dead of the night by a reposessor of cars employed by a California bank which had a lien on it. He had some valuable tools in the pickup and the reposessor tore down part of the building while taking the truck.

Another man was being evicted from his apartment. He had reported housing code violations to the public housing authority and his landlord had then instituted eviction proceedings. The notice of the court hearing had never been delivered and the man had been evicted as the result of a default judgment.

A woman with four children has been taken off the welfare rolls without notice and without a hearing. An investigator during a midnight search found a pair of men's shoes underneath her bed. The woman explained that the shoes belonged to her 17-year-old son who was living away from home, but the authorities had refused to believe her. She had no other means of support.

These and many other kinds of problems constantly plague the poor of our Nation—some 30 million Americans. The American Bar Foundation in a preliminary study concluded that those 30 million poverty-stricken Americans experienced probably more than 5 million legal problems a year.

The American Bar Foundation minimum estimates may prove overly modest. The combined records of the neighborhood legal services program and the Washington Legal Aid Society show that they actually handled almost 28 legal aid cases per thousand of population. If this ratio were applied to the rest of the Nation, there would be more than 5½ million legal problems which would be handled by legal aid attorneys. And it should be noted, that Mr. Julian Dugas, director of the neighborhood legal services program, said that the number of cases handled by his 31 attorneys last year almost crushed his staff and he estimates that the demands will increase fivefold in the next few years. It should be further noted that some of the OEO rural



legal assistance programs have been reporting that they handle 48 to 60 cases per thousand of population. This projects to a national level of 12 million cases per year. And other estimates of the total need for legal services to the poor have ranged as high as 20 million legal problems a year—all requiring the assistance of a lawyer. During the last 6 months of 1966 the projects funded through OEO reported they handled 92,000 cases. In the first 3 months of 1967, they handled 93,000 cases. Thus they handled more cases in 3 months than they had the previous 6 months—a doubling of the annual rate. Then in the following 3 months they handled almost 120,000 cases, another 25-percent increase in just a 3-month period.

By the end of fiscal year 1967 the legal services program was handling cases at an annual rate of almost 500,000 cases per year. That is an enormous feat. But remember, at best this means that 10 percent of the need was being met. And it may be as little as 2 or 3 percent of the actual need was being met at the end of fiscal year 1967.

If the legal services program were to be sufficiently expanded to meet just one-half of the minimum estimated total need for legal assistance, the program would need over \$150 million. Last year the legal services office at OEO was allotted only \$30 million and they are included in the administrative bill for \$47 million this coming fiscal year. And yet these modest baby steps toward solution of this immense need are now threatened by the actions of this legislative body. If the OEO budget is cut as some Members of this House of Representatives have suggested the legal services program would be required to eliminate at least 320 of its 850 presently funded law offices, to eliminate 750 of its 2,000 attorneys. This budget cut would mean that 300,000 fewer cases could be handled in fiscal year 1968 than would otherwise be handled. In simple language, gentlemen, we would be denying justice to 300,000 poor families who have been caught up in some legal crisis this year.

The expansion and the continuance of this program is absolutely essential for the maintenance of our democratic society. When the problems of the poor are not uncovered and channeled into the legal system for peaceful and equitable settlement, when there have been no educational programs informing people of their legal rights and responsibilities, when there has been no visible demonstration that the legal process can solve many problems permanently and effectively, the result is the kind of deplorable violence witnessed in Watts, Harlem, Hough, and in other urban ghettos across the Nation. The legal services program is one of the most promising and successful methods which has been formulated to meet the social crises of the 1960's. We should, we must be talking about ways to expand it dramatically so that it can fulfill its purpose and its promise—its purpose of equal justice for all and its promise of peace in our streets.

### A statistical profile follows:

#### STATISTICAL PROFILE OF LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

##### I.

Total number of programs: 299.  
Annualized cost of programs: \$44,525,234.  
The average number of attorneys: 1,400.  
The average salary: \$9,530.  
The average indigency standard: \$2,240 per single person; \$3,610 per family of four.  
Average cost per case: \$48.39.

##### II.

Highlights of results from fiscal year 1967 as reported by 270 operating programs.

##### A

Total number of cases handled—290,934.  
Not accepted 51,640 making a total of 342,574 clients who sought service.

##### B. Types of cases handled

	Percent
Family problems	34
Juvenile	33
Welfare	7
Consumer	20
Housing	8

##### C. Handling of cases

	Percent
Received advice only	35
Client represented but not in court	25
Client represented in court	25
Client represented in appellate actions	1

##### D. Success of representations

Welfare assistance: 61 percent of 833 welfare cut-off cases resulted in restoration.  
Eviction actions: 88 percent of the 1,094 evictions sought were averted or stayed.

Court cases: won almost  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the trials they have participated in and won 60% of the appeals.

31,433 out of the 53,093 cases referred were referred to private attorneys. The others were referred to social agencies and other poverty programs. 62,726 cases were referred from private attorneys. 834 groups were represented.

#### CONCLUSION

The lawyers on the average handled 500 new cases per year and it is expected that this percentage will rise. In the last six months of calendar 1966 Legal Services Projects handled 92,000 families in legal difficulties. In the first three months of calendar 1967 they handled 93,000 families with legal difficulties. In other words they handled more in those last three months than in the prior six months and the volume is still climbing.

#### LEGAL SERVICES, 1967

Legal problems, by type	Accepted	Not accepted
1. Total consumer and employment problems	52,579	9,508
A. Sales contracts	11,388	2,365
B. Garnishment and attachment	8,589	1,101
C. Wage claims	3,199	517
D. Bankruptcy	6,018	2,631
E. Other	15,164	2,592
2. Total administrative problems	20,722	2,459
A. State and local welfare	7,238	453
B. Social security	3,232	181
C. Workman's compensation	1,319	708
D. Veterans' Administration	954	110
E. Unemployment insurance	749	164
F. Other	4,993	812
3. Total housing problems	23,536	3,409
A. Private landlord and tenant	12,143	1,670
B. Housing code violations	762	72
C. Public housing	1,902	145
D. Other	4,490	1,121
4. Total family problems	102,581	21,950
A. Divorce and annulment	46,671	13,468
B. Separation	4,080	1,408
C. Nonsupport	16,510	2,576
D. Custody and guardianship	7,732	1,446
E. Paternity	3,472	451
F. Adoption	2,546	599
G. Other	13,140	2,021

#### LEGAL SERVICES, 1967—Continued

Legal problems, by type	Accepted	Not accepted
5. Total miscellaneous problems	93,332	11,674
A. Torts	5,267	2,600
B. Juvenile	10,494	496
C. School cases	468	67
D. Misdemeanors	19,549	1,785
E. Other criminal	24,538	1,876
F. Commitment procedures	1,111	134
G. Other	27,262	4,531
Total problems	290,934	51,640

#### NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAM SUPPLEMENT—LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program information	Results
1. Total services rendered	236,486
A. Total receiving advice only	95,608
B. Total referred	53,093
(1) Number of lawyer referrals	31,433
(2) Number of other grantee programs	3,123
(3) Number of social agencies	9,359
(4) Number of other referrals	11,309
C. Total represented, but not in litigation	87,331
D. Total in litigation	58,603
(1) Number of court proceedings	40,566
a. Number of plaintiffs	21,694
b. Number of defendants	18,967
(2) Number of administrative proceedings	2,803
(3) Number of appeals	608
2. Evaluation of closed cases:	
A. Number of cases not litigated; client objective obtained	49,143
B. Results of court cases:	
(1) Money claims against client	111,990
a. Total amount sought against client	\$1,716,130
b. Total amount recovered	\$431,988
c. Total saved client	\$958,672
(2) Eviction actions	1,599
a. Number of evictions sought	1,904
b. Number of evictions averted/stayed	1,635
(3) Juvenile offender cases	8,164
a. Number dismissed	729
b. Number pleadings involved	1,299
c. Number found involved by court	2,055
d. Number found not involved by court	241
(4) Criminal cases	23,419
a. Number dismissed	5,408
b. Number pleading guilty to lesser charge	1,025
c. Number pleading guilty to charge	4,360
d. Number found guilty	8,175
e. Number found not guilty	2,081
(5) Divorces and annulments:	
a. Divorces and annulment sought	10,809
b. Divorces and annulment received	6,186
(6) Bankruptcies:	
a. Bankruptcies sought	1,742
b. Bankruptcies received	1,172
(7) Total litigated cases (including above)	38,608
a. Number won	21,122
b. Number lost	9,036
c. Number settled	3,429
C. Total appeals	384
(1) Number won	141
(2) Number lost	87
D. Administrative cases:	
(1) Total number of welfare cases	4,198
a. New applications sought	1,377
b. New applicants received	1,081
c. Restorations sought	833
d. Restorations received	514
e. Increases sought	548
f. Increases received	340
(2) Total other administration cases	3,203
(3) Total administration cases	4,740
a. Number won	1,635
b. Number lost	438
c. Number settled	857
3. Caseload summary:	
A. Number cases brought forward from previous period	107,191
B. Number cases reopened	6,794
C. Number new cases	267,039
D. Number cases closed	199,248
E. Number cases withdrawn	7,026
F. Number cases pending at end of period	153,423



NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAM SUPPLEMENT—LEGAL  
SERVICES PROGRAM INFORMATION—Continued

Program information	Results
4. Sources of participants:	
A. Number legal referral.....	62,726
B. Number outreached (by grantee).....	28,620
C. Number referred by another party.....	25,195
D. Number previously served.....	25,015
E. Number through publicity.....	47,104
F. Number, other.....	90,597
5. Participant characteristics:	
A. Number participants employed.....	84,969
B. Number of 1st-time attorney-participant contacts.....	81,781
C. Number of groups seeking service.....	1,488
D. Number of groups served.....	834

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. MEEDS) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, because there has been so much discussion on the Job Corps program, I think it is important today to read into the RECORD here discussions held before the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations at varying times during the early part of this year and again a little over a month ago.

On page 1046 you will find that Mr. John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, on March 14, testified as follows:

I would like to comment on our part of the Job Corps program. We are quite pleased with the overall progress to date. Our Centers are now in full swing, even though the job of getting them established turned out to be larger and to take longer than we expected. Much of the work, such as landscaping, sidewalks, roadways, and utility buildings was accomplished by the corpsmen.

Administration of the Centers is settling down into a more routine operation. Corpsmen incidents are fewer. Community acceptance appears to be on the upswing. About 113 Job Corps graduates have been employed by the Forest Service in such positions as engineer aid, fire control aid, resident worker, cook helper, and forest worker. Corpsmen graduates are consistently being placed in better jobs than those they previously held, enlisting in the military or entering school. In most cases, by the time an enrollee becomes a corpsman, he is making significant personal improvement. On January 31, 1967, there were 7,287 corpsmen in centers administered by the Forest Service.

I have asked Mr. Cliff to comment briefly on a few significant accomplishments during the past fiscal year. He and his staff will be glad to answer any questions that you may have.

## JOB CORPS

Mr. BAKER. One final word with respect to our part of the Job Corps. The program has pretty well shaken down. We are quite proud of the education and personal achievements of the enrollees, the corpsmen, and most of the camps now used have been built, they are in use, and on January 31, 1967, there were 7,287 corpsmen in the centers administered by the Forest Service. About 113 of the Job Corps graduates have qualified for full-time jobs with the Forest Service. Many others have gotten jobs for the first time in their lives in manufacturing plants and elsewhere. Others have returned to school or gone into the military services.

The number of incidents involving corpsmen is falling all the time as we get shaken down in the camp directors and other personnel—as they learn how to operate it.

In addition to Mr. Baker's statement, here is the following record from the committee that Members of this Congress should review, for unfortunately I doubt that each Member reads the hearings of an Appropriations Subcommittee.

## OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY (JOB CORPS)

## TRANSFERS TO FOREST SERVICE

	Available, 1966		Estimate, 1967		Estimate, 1968	
	Number of permanent positions	Amount (in thousands)	Number of permanent positions	Amount (in thousands)	Number of permanent positions	Amount (in thousands)
Center construction and equipment.....	-----	\$21,862	-----	\$2,075	-----	\$2,000
Center operation.....	1,763	30,191	2,123	42,967	2,123	43,000
Program direction and training.....	154	1,899	154	2,120	154	2,200
Total.....	1,917	53,952	2,277	47,162	2,277	47,200

## LOCATION AND ECONOMICS OF JOB CORPS CAMPS

Mrs. HANSEN. On page 12 of the justifications you indicate a transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity of \$47.2 million for the Job Corps program with a total of 2,277 positions.

Please place in the record at this point a listing of the locations of the Job Corps camps throughout the Nation indicating the employment, funding, and principal type of work being performed.

In addition, I think the members of the committee would be interested in knowing

what the cost is per Job Corps enrollee at each of the camps.

We would also like to know the level of their income after they leave the Corps so that we may measure the returns from our investment in the Job Corps.

I think it would also be well for you to place in the record the value of the work they did for the Forest Service, and for the United States.

Mr. CLIFF. We will be very glad to do that, Mrs. Hansen.

(The information follows:)

## "JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS ADMINISTERED BY FOREST SERVICE

"Center and location	Number of center staff <sup>1</sup>	Number of corpsmen <sup>2</sup>	Total operational cost <sup>3</sup>	Cost per man-year <sup>4</sup>	Types conservation work accomplished
Anaconda, Anaconda, Mont.....	52	180	\$537,071	\$6,713	Range improvement, road and trail construction, recreation development.
Cedar Flats, Kooskia, Idaho.....	52	203	559,515	4,132	Recreation development, phone line construction, road and trail construction.
Cottonwood, Cottonwood, Idaho.....	51	197	604,298	4,827	Road and trail construction, phone line construction, building construction.
Curlew, Curlew, Wash.....	49	181	556,966	5,542	Range and wildlife improvements, recreation development, road construction.
Dickinson, Dickinson, N. Dak.....	52	172	546,882	5,258	Range improvements and recreation development.
Trapper Creek, Darby, Mont.....	52	193	542,111	6,260	Road and trail constructions, timber stand improvement, recreation development.
Boxelder, Nemo, S. Dak.....	52	184	625,944	5,382	Range and wildlife improvements, watershed restoration, hazard reduction.
Pagosa Springs, Pagosa Springs, Colo.....	32	109	403,437	5,847	Recreation development, range improvement, timber stand improvement road and trail construction.
Pine Ridge, Chadron, Nebr.....	32	111	336,491	4,807	Range improvement, recreation development, timber stand improvement.
Alpine, Alpine, Ariz.....	32	120	412,803	5,326	Road construction, range improvement, timber stand improvement.
Grants, Grants, N. Mex.....	52	215	653,499	4,877	Range improvement, recreation development, timber stand improvement.
Heber, Heber, Ariz.....	50	212	678,872	5,190	Range and wildlife improvement, road construction, hazard reduction, recreation development.
Luna, Las Vegas, N. Mex.....	51	213	475,045	6,709	Range improvement, road and trail construction, watershed restoration.
Mountainair, Mountainair, N. Mex.....	49	191	580,780	5,969	Range improvement, recreation development, timber stand improvement, road and trail construction.
Clear Creek, Carson City, Nev.....	52	199	662,940	5,946	Range improvement, building construction, recreation development.
Alder Springs, Elk Creek, Calif.....	50	204	674,876	4,048	Trail construction, recreation development, brush eradication.
Fenner Canyon, Valyerno, Calif.....	28	119	456,884	6,078	Trail construction, recreation development, building construction.
Five Mile, Sonora, Calif.....	46	152	516,617	5,277	Timber stand improvement, recreation development, building construction.
Los Pinos, Elsinore, Calif.....	48	231	778,400	5,493	Recreation development, road construction, bridge construction.
Sly Park, Pollock Pines, Calif.....	32	122	410,847	5,181	Do.
Angell, Yachats, Oreg.....	32	129	364,949	5,471	Trail construction, recreation development, fence construction.
Cispus, Randle, Wash.....	52	217	653,355	4,634	Recreation development, wildlife improvement, sanitation improvement, timber stand improvement.

Footnotes at end of table.



## "JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS ADMINISTERED BY FOREST SERVICE—Continued

"Center and location	Number of center staff <sup>1</sup>	Number of corpsmen <sup>2</sup>	Total operational cost <sup>3</sup>	Cost per man-year <sup>4</sup>	Types conservation work accomplished
Timberlake, Estacada, Oreg.....	52	221	\$683,824	\$5,021	Road and trail construction, water system improvement, building construction.
Wolf Creek, Glide, Oreg.....	52	198	609,920	4,511	Road and trail construction, recreation development, building construction.
Arrowood, Franklin, N.C.....	32	108	410,349	6,161	Road construction, wildlife habitat, building construction, recreation development.
Cass, Ozark, Ark.....	32	110	403,230	5,810	Recreation improvement, beautification, trail construction.
Flatwoods, Coeburn, Va.....	45	113	425,634	5,903	Recreation improvement, timber stand improvement, stream improvement, roads.
Frenchburg, Frenchburg, Ky.....	32	115	355,266	4,997	Stream improvement, trail construction, wildlife improvement.
Hodgens, Hodgens, Okla.....	41	121	424,291	5,627	Recreation improvement, wildlife habitat, beautification.
Jacobs Creek, Bristol, Tenn.....	37	104	418,294	6,080	Road construction, beautification, recreation improvement.
New Waverly, New Waverly, Tex.....	52	203	410,705	4,705	Recreation improvement, wildlife habitat, land line location.
Quachita, Royal, Ark.....	32	123	429,171	5,625	Recreation improvement, wildlife habitat, building construction.
Pine Knot, Pine Knot, Ky.....	64	244	633,345	3,946	Road construction, wildlife habitat, beautification.
Schenck, Pisgah Forest, N.C.....	52	205	601,067	4,641	Road construction, recreation improvement, building improvement.
Anthony, Neola, W. Va.....	41	166	476,513	5,783	Recreation improvement, roads, land line location, beautification.
Blackwell, Laona, Wis.....	52	186	571,171	4,768	Recreation improvement, fish habitat, building improvement, beautification.
Blue Jay, Marienville, Pa.....	32	125	342,660	4,557	Recreation improvement, beautification, building improvement.
Branchville, Branchville, Ind.....	32	113	340,164	4,698	Recreation improvement and beautification.
Clam Lake, Clam Lake, Wis.....	52	197	726,530	5,762	Fish habitat, building improvement, roads.
Golconda, Golconda, Ill.....	52	223	602,735	4,591	Recreation improvement and building construction.
Hoxey, Cadillac, Mich.....	32	110	398,568	5,661	Recreation improvement, wildlife habitat, beautification.
Isabella, Finland, Minn.....	52	202	692,186	5,549	Recreation improvement, roads, beautification.
Lydick Lake, Cass Lake, Minn.....	50	218	752,289	6,096	Recreation improvement, wildlife habitat, timber stand improvement.
Ojibway, Marenisco, Mich.....	49	208	682,573	5,175	Recreation improvement, fish habitat, roads.
Poplar Bluff, Poplar Bluff, Mo.....	50	223	546,357	4,686	Recreation improvement, roads, beautification.
Ripton, Ripton, Vt.....	31	136	308,090	6,939	Building improvement and beautification.
Vesuvius, Pedro, Ohio.....	32	110	339,702	5,648	Recreation improvement, building construction, beautification.

<sup>1</sup> Staff on rolls Mar. 13, 1967.<sup>2</sup> Corpsmen on board Mar. 13, 1967.<sup>3</sup> Total net obligations July 1, 1966–Feb. 28, 1967.<sup>4</sup> Based on total man-years earned July 1, 1966–Feb. 28, 1967.<sup>5</sup> Opened Sept. 27, 1966.<sup>6</sup> Opened July 7, 1966.

"One hundred thirteen Job Corps Conservation Center graduates have been hired by the Forest Service. The weighted average Nationwide hourly rate paid is \$2.10 or about \$4,400 per hour.

"The Conservation Centers work programs are on a 'backlog' of projects not financed with regular programs. This is in accord with requirements of the law that Job Corps projects will not displace any local employment. From inception of program to December 31, 1966, the appraised values:

"Conservation oriented.....	\$5,131,000
Center oriented.....	5,123,000
Community oriented.....	104,000
Total.....	10,358,000"

Mr. CLIFF. The work of the Job Corps can be fully assessed only by comparing what a young man's life might cost society if he didn't have this chance for training. Most of these boys, when we get them, are already school dropouts; they have had very little chance. They are on their own way to becoming public wards, or worse, and if we can reclaim these young men and give them a chance to become useful citizens and earn incomes rather than absorb incomes from other sources and to become taxpayers over the length of their life, we can make assets out of them rather than liabilities and this is the real measure—this, plus the human benefits that derive from this program.

Mrs. HANSEN. This, the committee completely understands, but we do think we should have for the record a measurement on the economic side of the ledger too.

It is very interesting, when one compares the figures of the average State cost for penal institutions, against some of the other costs, but I think also there are those who are interested in knowing what the income level is that the trainees are able to achieve.

## EMPLOYEE-ENROLLEE RATIO

Mr. McDADE. When those figures are being supplied for the record, I think I am correct in saying that the ratio of employees to enrollees is now 7 to 2, is that right? Seven thousand enrollees and 2,000, roughly, employees, is that correct?

Mr. HENDEE. On Friday I got the figures as of March 9, which would have been last Thursday. At that time we had 8,013 corpsmen in our 47 centers, which is up quite a few hundred. We had anticipated this as a result of recruiting that was done in January and February.

We have a roughly 2,200 employees for the 8,000.

Mr. McDADE. That is a considerable improvement over what it was, and I am glad to see it.

Is there an optimum ratio figure, given by anybody, of employees to enrollees, either OEO, Bureau of the Budget, or anybody?

Mr. HENDEE. There has been considerable discussion from the early part of the program. Early in the program you will recall we started out with a much lower staff. Many of us were very concerned about the proper ratio of staffing to enrollees. I think that the success in the program bears out the staffing ratios established. Comparison with other organizations staffing that are handling youth shows reasonable relationships. Admittedly some of the comparisons were very difficult to make.

Mr. McDADE. Have you an optimum ratio and, if so, what is it?

Mr. HENDEE. This particular staffing that is set up of 32 for a 100-man center and 52 for a 220-man center is working out very well. There are some areas where we still are unable to give the total supervision that we would like, even though the averaging does look high. Nevertheless, the judgment on staffing for this particular program is a result of the success we are having and in recent months it would seem to indicate that we have a pretty good ratio right now. The experience in recent months of giving employment and being able to move Job Corpsmen along quite rapidly in teaching them the world of work and improving their reading and their arithmetic and other skills along with the work habits has really been quite satisfactory.

Mr. McDADE. I am sure it is. I just want to get the guidelines that have been established and have them furnished for the record if you haven't already done so.

Mr. HENDEE. We will be very glad to do this. (The information follows:)

"The Forest Service has not been furnished an optimum ratio figure of employees to enrollees. The 32 employee staff for the 100-man center, and 52 employee staff for the 220-man center, were provided by OEO-Job Corps and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. An interdepartmental task force is being formed to determine if the present staffing is sufficient to perform and satisfy program requirements."

## VISIT TO FENNER CANYON CAMP

Mr. REIFEL. When I visited the Angeles National Forest I was taken down to the camp.

Mr. HENDEE. Fenner Canyon?

Mr. REIFEL. Yes. The type of individuals they are reaching are persons that no one

else would touch, I guess, or are being helped by any other educational effort. There was one boy who had been there almost a year. This was late in the evening. He was poring over a book of some very elemental sentences in English. I said, "What are you doing?"

He said, "I am taking an examination."

I thought he was getting ready to graduate from the camp. After questioning him some more, I discovered he was trying to graduate from one level in the program to get into the next one. He was applying himself in a manner that I have seen few human beings trying to improve themselves.

As I left the building, I ran across a young man who had just come from Los Angeles. As I understand it now, you are able to take people within the general area.

Mr. HENDEE. This is true, Mr. Reifel.

Mr. REIFEL. He had just been there for a day.

I said, "How are you going to like it here?"

He said, "Well, I think all right."

I said, "When you divide 4 by 2, what do you get?"

He said, "Sir, I just don't know."

I have some concern about the successes and lack of successes at the Job Corps camps. As you have indicated, I think they are more successful in the Forest Service and the Park Service and other places in the Interior Department where they are being established.

I mention these two instances to indicate the need for something like this. These are young men who, if you could get them to use their hands and apply whatever mentality they have, could develop to a point where they would be useful and can be worth much more than what is invested in them.

That was the only Job Corps camp I ever visited, but that is the impression I got.

## EMPLOYMENT OF JOB CORPS GRADUATES

Mr. CLIFF. We have a standing offer from Boeing Aircraft that they will take any of our graduates as fast as we can put them out. We have placed a number of employees with Boeing, with logging and lumber firms. There is a standing order in this camp and others for the graduates when they move out of the Job Corps to go into fairly well paying jobs.

## TRAINING AND EDUCATING ENROLLEES

Mr. REIFEL. Coming from, as you know, an Indian reservation and having been reared there and not having left it until I was 19 when I went away to high school, probably being a continuous dropout from the time I started to school when I was 5, I appreciate the necessity for some kind of intense per-



son-to-person relationship in trying to lift individuals out of the treadmill they are in.

Sometimes if they can step into a program like this it will be worth whatever we put into it. I do hope that it can be gotten onto a level of operation that will get the support of the country.

I saw an article the other day that wasn't too encouraging. It was in one of the Washington papers. These kinds of boys—and, I may say, girls, wherever they have them in these programs—are certainly in need of it. I know most of you have indicated—such as Dresser, the supervisor, and the extra hours he is putting in, and the woman who was the cook at Fenner Canyon working with boys was a motherly type who works with these boys in the kitchen, helping them to understand what is important about cleaning dishes so as to provide a sanitary plate and cup and knife and fork—the kind of thing that I suppose some of those boys had never experienced in all their lives before they came there.

Mrs. HANSEN. At one of our camps they had a class in cookery taught by very practical down-to-earth women. There were jobs waiting for all the boys taking it when they had learned to read the recipes.

I saw classes in driver training. They were handicapped because they could not read the road signs.

You wonder sometimes at the cost of the Job Corps camps, but they have to have the teachers for the first-grade level, second-grade level, third-grade level, this type of thing.

And speaking of the other parts of the country, I am sympathetic with the problem, but yet about 40 percent of the trainees in that camp were from the east coast and were boys who had no opportunity in their own communities. They were moved into the West where there is not much feeling about status and so on, and they had found themselves.

There was a young man from Richmond who was a high school graduate. He was the supervisor of the office. Until he went to the Job Corps camp he had no chance for a job at all. It was a fine experience to watch him.

The day that I was there, nine of the boys had just been employed by one of the biggest timber companies. You know what their contribution in taxes will be because the minimum wage I believe in those lumber camps is \$2.60 an hour. So they went from nothing to \$2.60 as a base and undoubtedly they went higher.

I saw them learning carpentry. They had a practical construction man as supervisor, and each of them was handling some phase of the building of their own gymnasium.

I saw the boys who were interested in the Forest Service—the construction of trails, fire trails, and construction of bridges. It was a fine example of the best kind of a work training program.

I was interested in another way they were teaching them. They were not spending one-half day in the forest and then doing a half-day in the school. The schoolwork was set aside in a special grouping for 1 or 2 days, and then they would do the forest work. They could retain their scholastic interest and their training and then do the forest work. It was a very interesting experience and I want to commend the Forest Service for this splendid camp.

#### ENROLLEES IN ARMED SERVICES

A number of their young people have gone into the armed services that could not possibly have done so without this training. They could not read and write, they could not pass, in some instances, the physicals because of defects that were correctable. No one had taken the time, or they had not had the money to correct the deficiencies. Certainly they could not have passed the mental test at that time because they simply lacked the education.

#### EMPLOYEE-ENROLLEE RATIO IN JOB CORPS CAMPS

Mr. McDade. Last year when I raised the question about the number of Federal employees relative to the number of enrollees in the Job Corps camps—I think at that time it was a ratio of about 1 to 1—and there was assurance that as the program got going it would expand, the ratio would grow higher, and my recollection is that in last year's hearings you said it would be somewhere around 7 to 2, or maybe 8 to 2, and that is exactly what you have done. Sometimes that doesn't quite happen that way, so I want to compliment you for living up to what you said you were going to do last year.

That is all, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. McDade.

#### PACIFIC NORTHWEST FOREST FIRES

Mrs. HANSEN. And also due to the length of the fire season out there. It is still continuing.

Mr. CLIFF. That is very true. We have fires out of control right now again in Idaho and Montana.

Mrs. HANSEN. It was 94° there yesterday.

Mr. CLIFF. Ninety degree weather plus low humidities. We have had a half dozen bad fires on our hands the past few days.

Mrs. HANSEN. I am not asking for concrete figures but I was in the Northwest during August and earlier this month. You had several fires raging all over the Northwest. I noticed in one Idaho fire they brought the Eskimo people down from Alaska and the Job Corps people were utilized. I noticed one fire in my own area which did not last very long, and they utilized the Job Corps there. You will have substantial fire costs in the supplemental estimate, will you not?

#### SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR FIGHTING FOREST FIRES

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct. This fire season, from the standpoint of costs, will be one of the most expensive we have ever gone through.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RETURNS FROM FIRE RESEARCH

Mrs. HANSEN. The investment that this committee has made to provide equipment and to provide more fire research, and so on, has paid off.

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct. I think it has been a remarkable response.

Mr. NELSON. There is no question about that. The type of the fire season and the types of fires we have had through lightning this year compares with our big 1910 season where we lost pretty near 3 million acres this Idaho-Montana area. The efficiency, the types of things this committee has allowed us to move forward in, the use of aircraft being one example, the infrared detection system, the smokejumpers, the interregional crews—these are very efficient crews that move fast from one area to another—all of these have had a great deal to do with holding a great many of our fires to less than 100 acres. Without this added attention to fire control the losses and cost would have been greater.

Mrs. HANSEN. Have the Job Corps people been useful?

Mr. CLIFF. Very much so; particularly in support services to the fire crews.

In conclusion, I urge support of our Job Corps and its programs. Yes, there are failures, but there are successes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of the district containing the largest urban Job Corps center in the country, I would like to make a few comments on Job Corps, and on several other of the poverty programs.

The Camp Gary Job Corps Training Center in San Marcos, Tex., has been put under the spotlight ever since the program began. Hundreds of visitors, reporters and educators have seen the camp in operation and so far as I know, nearly everyone has made a favorable report on the results he saw there.

To begin with, the San Marcos Record on the second anniversary of Gary, back in March of this year said:

With two years under its belt, Gary has shown remarkable progress. Many call it the best Job Corps Center in the nation. It has served 6,957 boys, including the more than 3,000 presently enrolled. The boys must like it, for the relatively low 20-percent dropout rate of the first half of lessened to 13-percent for the last 18 months.

Gary has done the job that was intended—to help potential welfare cases learn to pull their weight in today's economy. Of the 3,009 who have been placed, most are at work while 133 are enrolled in colleges or other schools and 302 are in the military.

The San Antonio Express, in an editorial of March 1967, stated that Gary is "a diversified, well-operated vocational and technical training center with a record of success that would do credit to any institution."

Late last year, Chesey Manly, of the Chicago Tribune, wrote a comprehensive report on Camp Gary and concluded that it is doing an outstanding job. Later, the editorial staff of the Tribune endorsed the Manly report, and indicated that:

While the Tribune has been skeptical of some manifestations of the "war on poverty" and has been critical of waste and corruption in parts of the program, we are glad that our reporter has been able to find and acknowledge an experiment which is generally successful.

Finally, the Dallas Morning News, an acknowledged conservative newspaper, ran a full-page spread on July 15, 1967, commending the work that has been accomplished at Gary, and citing many good examples of how work they have done leads to permanent successes.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hands dozens of other clippings from newspapers from all over the State and Nation, and I invite your inspection of them.

The successes of Gary as reported by these papers have also been of favorable effect on the expenses needed to operate the center. The national average for 12 months of training has been cited at \$6,950, though that amount is still dropping as the Job Corps program becomes more tightly organized. But at Gary, it was recently announced that the average annual operating cost per trainee has dropped to \$4,344. I believe the figures speak for themselves: The money being invested in Job Corps, and particularly in Camp Gary, are producing good results, and the cost prospects for the future are bright. I might add another point here—Gary last year deobligated a considerable amount of money, I believe in the neighborhood of \$1 million. They had been allotted this money, but found it was not needed and turned it back to the national office. To my knowledge, Gary was the only center to have done this.

Over the past few months, some Members have criticized the teacher hiring and pay practices being conducted at



Camp Gary. The inference is that Gary has raided the neighboring school districts by inflating the salaries paid to the Gary instructors. This simply is not true.

When the figures are compared on an equal bases—that is, when both sets of figures are either on a 9-month or a 12-month period—it is evident that the teachers at Gary lowest in experience and training are making only about \$61 a month more than those in selected average Texas cities. For the more experienced, the records actually show that teachers in the neighboring public school districts make more than those at Gary.

The salaries of Gary teachers are set by the Texas Educational Foundation, a nonprofit group selected by the Governor, and the procedure today is that hiring is done in cooperation with surrounding school districts. Due to pay increases for all Texas teachers in the past 2 years, the difference is slowly closing, with the result that teachers are leaving Gary, rather than flocking to it.

Finally on the teacher pay issue, I would say that the Texas Educational Foundation has many special considerations it must take in account in setting Gary teachers salaries. There is not the security or retirement given under the Texas teachers system, as enjoyed by teachers in adjoining districts; the classes at the center present unique teaching problems and challenges, and qualified, motivated teachers must be found to keep the operation moving; and finally, there is the additional problem of relocation and commuting. All of the items indicate that Gary teachers deserve slightly higher salaries.

Overall, the expenses of Camp Gary, in my opinion, reflect sound, prudent administration. Of course, I understand that part of the economies are due to the fact that Gary is the largest center of its kind; that the facility was ready for use at the time Job Corps first moved into the camp; and that there has been good cooperation with the State largely through the support of our Governor, the Honorable John B. Connally.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some criticism of the Job Corps, to the effect that the location of a camp in a particular area causes problems of crime and disturbances. The Gary corpsmen have never been involved in any kind of demonstration or riot, and the incidents there have been minor indeed.

Contrary to the reports of the critics, the Gary corpsmen appear to be among the most civic minded young men of the community. My files are filled with news clippings from the newspapers of surrounding towns commending the corpsmen on their efforts. There are countless episodes of Gary corpsmen giving blood, searching for lost children, fighting forest or pasture fires, and raising funds for local charities. Only last month in the midst of Hurricane Beulah, more than 100 Gary corpsmen were cited by the San Antonio Salvation Army for their help in loading hurricane and flood supplies for the evacuated. The corpsmen also worked in the kitchens set up for Beulah victims by the Red Cross and the civil defense agencies.

Generally, the center can look with pride on the relatively low crime record they have. The San Marcos police chief is quoted in the Waco, Tex., Daily News Tribune as saying that the trainees seldom get into trouble, and when they do, the incidents are not likely to be more serious than drunkenness or an occasional fight.

I have here a letter from the mayor of San Marcos, Ellis Serur, dated only a few days ago, saying, and I quote:

The City of San Marcos is proud to have the Center as our neighbor. We have always enjoyed excellent Center-Community relations, and hope to continue.

Mr. Chairman, the Gary center has inspired many of the businessmen in my district to become active in the efforts to give training and guidance to the young people. Some 40 of Texas largest business corporations formed a group known as Opportunities, Inc., to provide professional advice and assistance in getting Gary on its feet. They sent their top people—without cost to the Government—to Gary to help them lay out the shops, select equipment, and plan the courses of study. Also, they have a standing invitation to all Gary graduates to make application for jobs after graduation. In this way, they are actually partners in the program, and not merely on the sidelines criticising.

Gary now trains over 3,000 young men at a time in 37 vocational classes and shops. After 30 months of operation, the center has turned out some 11,000 youths with new trades and new attitudes toward life. The training given ranges from bricklaying to commercial art—from underwater welding to heavy equipment repair.

And the demand for the young graduates is tremendous. The center's placement office receives up to 400 requests a month from businesses seeking graduates of the training programs—a demand 17 times greater than the center currently can fill. Officials there indicate that they could easily broaden the demand for Corps graduates simply by widening their mailout of new graduates. The jobs are at good wages, too—ranging from \$1.12 an hour for a tailor to \$4.72 an hour for a welder.

The very success of the program, and its eager acceptance by the business community, has been one of its drawbacks. Presently, most of the corpsmen complete only the first phase of their training rather than staying on for advance courses. The average stay at Gary is just over 9 months. After that time, the skills learned by the young men are marketable and they are anxious to join the working force and take advantage of those new skills.

If they could be convinced to stay on, they would not only reap the benefits of better training, but they also would advantage from the basic education courses. When corpsmen enter Gary they have, on the average, an eighth-grade education with fifth-grade competency in reading and math. The Gary staff has developed two separate programs to correct these deficiencies and both have proven extremely successful. The so-

called kinesthetic approach is used in both reading and math, and the materials used have been developed for the most part by Gary personnel. Corpsmen are tested by the Stanford Achievement Test and the average gain being shown in the math program is 1.7 years per month and for the reading program, 1.2 years' gain per month. Also, many corpsmen are able to complete high school equivalency exams after receiving this education.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to say a few words on other facets of the poverty program in my district. In Austin, we have a community action agency known as the Human Opportunities Commission, an arm of the community council. Human opportunities is governed by a 35-man board comprised of representatives of the poor, businessmen, lawyers, doctors, civic leaders, and educators. It represents a good cross section of the community, and already satisfies the committee amendment which would require representation of one-third, one-third, and one-third for the poor, the local government, and local businesses and groups. Under any of the plans for operation, it is well-established and ready to continue its work. I hope they will be afforded the funds to do this.

Likewise, the VISTA program has met with success and in fact, 10 VISTA volunteers on assignment in my hometown of Austin have indicated they do not intend to give up simply because Congress has been late in providing them food and living allowance.

After VISTA's able national director, Bill Crook, wrote them on November 3 to notify that they may not be paid their food and living allowance because of the time lapse in the continuing resolution, they fired a telegram back to Washington, which read, and I quote:

Austin VISTA volunteers met today to discuss loss of living allowance. We agree among ourselves that our commitment is such that there is no retreat. We will stay to serve the poor.

This was the first of more than 150 telegrams to be received by Crook.

This is not an isolated case, I might add. There have been reports of this same attitude among VISTA people in several major cities including Washington, D.C., where volunteers are moving in with families in neighborhoods where they are serving.

It seems that volunteers are more than justifying their eloquent statements of faith and I am hopeful that this body can display the confidence these people have in their commitment to the poor.

From listening over the past few days to the debate here in the House, I take it that most of the opposition is not against Job Corps as such—though we must continue to make improvements. It appears that the main amendment to the program will be in the form of attempts to transfer Job Corps to the Office of Education. I am not prepared to say this would not work, but I do know that no other Federal agency once entered this area of effort prior to the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The problems Job Corps attempts to solve are



the very ones that our educators have not solved. They are doing something that, heretofore, no one would touch.

We can speculate on how the program would work under a different agency, but I am afraid that it would slowly become watered down to the days when very little was done. Job Corps is just now coming out of the woods. We have learned a lot in the past 3 years, and a transfer at this time would greatly harm the progress. No one has given facts as to how this proposed transfer would work, and it is my opinion that the suggestion is inspired by politics more than by facts.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the record amply supports the conclusion that at least two of the poverty programs; namely, Job Corps and Community Action, can and will do a good job. The measure of success of any human endeavor is not taken solely in terms of dollars and cents or of jobs filled and training completed. It is also made on the basis of renewed thinking and revised goals. I believe that on both sets of criteria, the Camp Gary Job Corps Center and the Austin Community Action project stand the test. I think it shows that this approach will work and that it will work with notable success.

It is my hope that this House will act reasonably and prudently in considering these programs and that it will weigh carefully the individual successes witnessed under them.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], for the remarks that he has made here for our information, all of which I can vouch for because I have had the privilege and pleasure to visit Camp Gary upon more than one occasion and have been very much impressed with its operations. It represents an activity of which any Member of this House who has visited it could not help but be favorably impressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I can only confirm this with letters and statements from the officials and from the members of the chamber of commerce proving that they desire to obtain in San Antonio many of these graduates from Camp Gary.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman is correct. Both San Antonio and the city of Houston have organized committees to help these young men and their cooperation with reference to helping these young men has grown. They have further stated that these young people have not been the cause of any disturbance, but have been of assistance in keeping down, any element of disturbance.

As a matter of fact, they are well received.

I would like to point out just one more thing to the House: At Camp Gary we have what we call the "Opportunities, Incorporated." This is a committee consisting of about 40 of the big businesses in Texas, the largest business cooperation we have. These men sent their top technicians down to the camp, and they helped lay out the programs and establish the courses. They said to these boys, "If you stay and graduate we will see that you get jobs."

And that is one reason why we have over 400 more requests each month now for placement than the Camp Gary Job Corps Center can develop. I believe that is proof of the program in itself.

In other respects, in the city of Austin our community action program is working with a group of 35 people who are balanced off one-third, one-third, and one-third and the VISTA program is working well, and we have not had any real difficulty. Our difficulty has been success instead of not success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, 22 of the 24 counties of my congressional district are in the Appalachian region. I have been extremely interested in the poverty program. I strongly support its purpose. I have been in a position to observe the results of this program.

Again, it has been my avowed purpose to see that the program be made to work for the poor people of my district.

It is with extreme regret that I must say that the program has never been as effective as hoped for. At best, only parts of it have been helpful. No dramatic effect in lightening of the load of poverty has been made, although the law went into effect in October of 1964.

One part of this program has caused resentment and has resulted in much dissension. It is the role of the Appalachian and VISTA volunteers. I must state that some of the VISTAS have been dedicated young people. But most of these people have made it plain that they are in Appalachia for breaking down what they call the "power structure."

The power structure actually is the local government and its supporters. This, of course, has caused resentment toward the Appalachian and VISTA Volunteers, and toward the entire program by all officeholders who have, in most cases, the same feeling for the poor that we have, and who desire just as much as we do that the bonds of poverty be eradicated. Breaking down the power structure means removal of duly-elected officials and people in positions of prominence. This, in a sense, would mean anarchy.

The idea, in many cases, which is presented to the people of this section is that they have been discriminated against by officeholders and that they, the people, have not been given their

just dues—roads, jobs, and wealth—when this is far beyond the capacity and ability of the officeholders to accomplish.

This portion of the program may be remedied by employing native, vocationally-trained people as directors. The purpose is economic improvement—advancement of political ideas should not be associated with the poverty program as it has been.

I shall do all in my power to help the poor in my area. However, under this program, far too much is paid for administration and far too little filters down to the poor. The basic purposes of this program, it seems to me, are to train and educate so that these unfortunate poor may obtain worthwhile jobs. No one has a greater feeling of satisfaction than an individual who is successfully employed in a job productive of good. I believe this is the goal toward which we should strive.

Housing is a great problem in this area. Of course, the Appalachian Act has some provisions for housing. If, Mr. Chairman, the Members could see the houses in which many of these people live, they would be shocked. A program to build houses in which the poor themselves could contribute in labor, money, or kind, loans for which should be guaranteed by the Federal Government, is a program which would be greatly beneficial to the poor. Whenever these people or any people have even a small equity in a home or a piece of ground, they become loyal citizens. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I commend this to the Members for their consideration.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield briefly to the gentleman for a question only.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I did not have any question in mind. I merely want to tell the gentleman that I think a very successful program along the lines he is talking about—which permits people of low incomes to make a capital contribution to a housing program is being conducted right now among the Cherokee Indian people in eastern Oklahoma. They are putting their time and the work of their family and the work of their neighbors into the job of building homes. It has proved to be a very fine new approach and a healthy innovation in meeting our housing problem in eastern Oklahoma.

I think the gentleman is making a suggestion that has a great deal of merit in terms of meeting the housing needs of the country.

Mr. CARTER. I think the distinguished gentleman for his remarks. I certainly would like to see a like approach used in other areas.

The Headstart program has, it seems, been quite successful. In most cases, it has been administered by the county boards of education; and I feel that it should continue to be administered in this manner.

The work-experience and training program so-called happy pappy—has been helpful in that the children of these employees have had better food, clothing, and medical care. It could be improved by requiring these employees to attend



vocational schools where, again, they could obtain skills useful in securing productive jobs.

The working time of these employees has been consumed, in many cases, in such tasks as cutting weeds, picking up paper, and janitorial services. I have talked with many of these men and they desire to improve themselves by vocational training so that they can depend upon themselves. I strongly recommend this latter course.

The in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps has been helpful for many poor children who otherwise could not have remained in school. I recommend its continuance. Again, there has not been sufficient supervision in many cases; little if any work has been required of them. The parents of these children state they desire that they work for their money. Otherwise, as they stated, when the children become of age and seek jobs they will think they should draw their money without working. I strongly recommend that these young people receive in-school training in vocational education—mechanics, stenography, secretarial work, and other vocations. Direction, supervision, and administration must be improved.

The community action program in many areas of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky has been controversial. It seems the county councils and the district councils are composed of so many members of different trends of thought that arguments, much vituperation, and bitter factional fights occur—with very little help for the poor.

Since I wanted very much to see how much of the money being spent in my area was of benefit to the poor, I asked the General Accounting Office to make a survey. In one county of my district, I quote from their report:

From the receipt of the first grant in December, 1964 through November, 1966, expenditures for execution of the county's community action program amounted to about \$1.1 million. On the basis of our analysis, we estimate that about \$295,000 of the \$1.1 million expended for the program was in the nature of direct benefits to the poor. Travel over this period of time by council employees amounted to more than \$97,000, almost one-third of the amount of funds that supposedly went directly to the poor.

Mr. Chairman, with so much spent for administration and so little going to the poor, is it any wonder that the poor themselves are disenchanted with this program?

In another county in my district, the GAO report revealed that the local anti-poverty organization, with the approval of the Office of Economic Opportunity, entered into an agreement with an Ohio firm to rent a portable building at a daily rental of \$97, or \$33,000 a year, to house its medical clinic for the poor. This building, which I have visited, could have been constructed for about \$15,000 or less. The auditors found that no competitive bids had been taken on construction of the building to which the contractor retained title.

It was stated at the beginning of this debate that a bundle of money was thrown at Sargent Shriver and he was told to start fighting poverty. With this statement I am inclined to agree. This

is exactly the way the program was started and the way it has been executed. It appears that Mr. Shriver has thrown money all over the country, most of which has gone to white-collared workers, with only a small amount trickling down to the poor. Cost of the administration of this program has been beyond reason. The purpose of this program is to help the poor. Direction and administration must be improved if we are to accomplish this purpose, and this must be done.

Mention was made on the floor here yesterday that many of the poverty workers are ready to quit if poverty funds are reduced. I cannot agree with this statement. Firing one of these workers would be like weaning a 1-year-old bull calf. Once they get on such a sugar-tit, it is an awful job to get them off.

Mr. Chairman, my area in Appalachia could benefit by the poverty program if it were properly programed, wisely directed and effectively administered. I ask that all Members work toward improvement of this program.

Mr. Wallace J. Coomer, superintendent of Adair County schools, Columbia, Ky., commented:

We have had no direct contact with Appalachian and VISTA Volunteers. But I have talked to school people who advised me to keep them out of my county if at all possible. It is the Superintendent and local boards' feeling that we can run a better Headstart Program with a minimum of Federal control.

Harold Murphy, superintendent of Casey County schools, Liberty, Ky., comments:

We do not have the Appalachian and VISTA Volunteers in our county. But it seems as though they cause a lot of unrest in the Eastern part of the State.

Mrs. Mallie Bledsoe, superintendent of Clay County schools, Manchester, Ky., comments:

The VISTA Program has never been successful in our county. The OEO Programs are nearly impossible to cooperate with. The Appalachian Volunteer Program is most objectionable. We do not want Appalachian Volunteers nor VISTAS.

Waymond Huddleston, superintendent of Cumberland County schools, Burkesville, Ky., comments:

We have not had a Youth Corps Project in Cumberland County. But I have been told that one small factory nearby has had trouble with those who were enrollees of a Youth Corps Project in high school. In fact, the manager made the remark that all the workers he had had to dismiss had worked on a Youth Corps Project in their high school. These students had received their checks but had not worked very much for them.

Lucille Guthrie, superintendent of Green County schools, Greensburg, Ky., comments:

I wish the Headstart Program would be taken away from OEO. We would like to have a Headstart Program, but not under OEO.

James A. Cawood, superintendent of Harlan County schools, Harlan, Ky., comments:

I feel that the AV's and VISTAS are strychnine in a very well prepared diet for relieving poverty. Frustration, confusion, and ill will, it appears, is what they believe.

Bill Forester, attendance officer, Harlan, Ky., comments:

The Appalachian Volunteers and VISTAS are a bunch of misfits and dropouts who are actually being used to instigate a revolution against our county.

Ruby Carter, assistant superintendent, Harlan County schools, Harlan, Ky., comments:

We have two programs for which I feel the money would be just as well dumped in the Atlantic Ocean. They are the VISTA and Appalachian Volunteer Programs. Also, the Teacher Corps. VISTA workers have turned neighbors against each other, antagonized the community, and, on the whole, it seems to me, would be better off in Vietnam.

Sylvia Burnette, Harlan, Ky., comments:

The VISTA and AV Programs are totally unjustified. Even though the original intent may have been good, people who display communistic actions have infiltrated these organizations.

Mary E. Carter, Harlan, Ky., comments:

My contacts with the VISTA worker and Appalachian Volunteers have been very distasteful. In any area in which these workers have been, there has been strife and turmoil, nothing else.

Marie Everidge, Harlan County schools supervisor, Harlan, Ky., comments:

The Appalachian Volunteers and VISTA workers have done everything they can to undermine the schools of our county. They are antagonistic, belligerent, and totally untruthful.

Mildred Rowland, assistant superintendent, Harlan County schools, Harlan, Ky., comments:

The Appalachian Volunteers and VISTA workers have caused more trouble than we can live down. Many of them fit the description of well-trained communists.

Jesse D. Lay, superintendent of Knox County schools, Barbourville, Ky., comments:

If any part of the Poverty Program is to be reduced or cut out, I would like to recommend reduction or elimination of the Community Action part.

Hayward Gilliam, superintendent of Laurel County schools, London, Ky., comments:

From discussion that I have had with officials of surrounding areas where Appalachian and VISTA workers are present, I do not feel that we would want these people in this county.

Hayes Lewis, superintendent of Leslie County schools, Hyden, Ky., comments:

The In-School Youth Corps Program has made it possible for many youngsters to remain in school who otherwise would have dropped out. The Unemployed Fathers Program should be continued for the needy, but they should be required to attend vocational schools. The AV's and VISTA workers are a nuisance to society. They create strife within communities. They go dirty, unclean and as far as sexual morals are concerned, they are on the animal level.

Patrick Bell, superintendent of McCreary County schools, Whitley City, Ky., comments:

In this county, Headstart is an educational program. It should and in this country will continue to be run for that purpose. We are in the third year of our Youth Corps Pro-



gram. It is the best one in which we participate. Our program is living testimony that teen-agers will work if it is made clear what is expected of them.

Robert Barker, publisher, Irvine Times, Irvine, Ky., comments:

We have an OEO office in Ravenna, with a highly paid staff, but nobody seems to understand what they are trying to do. At least, the results of their efforts are not visible. If the program should be eliminated here, this office would not be missed. Most people feel that the program is useless.

John L. Crawford, publisher, Corbin Times-Tribune, Corbin, Ky., comments:

The Poverty Program in this area is still a question mark. The idea is all right—but its administration leaves a lot to be desired. Some of these paid volunteers, rushing into the area to tell folks what to do, are preaching what I consider anarchy. We could do without the AV's and the VISTAS.

Maurice K. Henry, publisher, Middlesboro Daily News, Middlesboro, Ky., comments:

As time passed, the VISTA workers gradually began to work against what they called the 'power structure.' The power structure was not just people in elected office, but everyone who had a good position, status in community, or an individual who had influence. Unfortunately, the Happy Pappy Program has increased the popularity of being unemployed. The percentage of former Happy Pappy participants now holding jobs must be very low.

Clarence H. Bates, superintendent of Wayne County schools, Monticello, Ky., comments:

Our county has had no Appalachian or VISTA Volunteers, and from what we have heard about them from others, we do not want any.

Mrs. Neurel Miracle, superintendent of Rockcastle County schools, Mount Vernon, Ky., comments:

The Appalachian and VISTA Volunteers, if continued, will disrupt our nation. At first, we accepted them with great faith, but now we are very sorry. They cause class hatred and try to overthrow local government. They are causing our people to lose confidence in our leaders in Washington.

Othello Gaskin, superintendent of Russell County schools, Jamestown, Ky., comments:

The Headstart Program could be cut out. The amount of learning taking place in six weeks is very little. More bother than worth with present set-up.

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, the poverty war, otherwise known as the Office of Economic Opportunity, was conceived and born in politics in the year 1964, as President Johnson's own idea and personal domestic reelection program. The poverty war has never been able to get out of the stigma of this political birth and has been up to its eyebrows in politics ever since.

Never in the history of our Government, at least in our time, has a program been so fraught with incompetent mismanagement, colossal waste, political infighting, and great lack of achievement. Paraphrasing Winston Churchill's famous words, "Never has so much money been spent to accomplish so little."

The voluminous hearings held this year and previous years contain a wealth of material proving countless different ways and instances how the program has not worked.

Polls taken by Members of Congress reveal that constituents are overwhelmingly of the opinion that the poverty war is a failure, in every conceivable kind of community, big city, small city, and out in the country.

News media, the length and breadth of our Nation have cited in their news columns example after example of the waste, inefficiency, and failure of the program.

In my own congressional district the poverty war has been a constant political football, with various groups struggling to get in power and use it for their own political ends.

I brought before the Committee on Education and Labor as a witness at our hearings, Dr. Paul F. Douglass, who is a professor of government and director of the Center for Practical Politics at Rollins College. The Center for Practical Politics has performed outstanding work over the years in studies of politics and government in action in Florida. Their most recent project was a study in depth on the war on poverty in Orange County, Fla. Dr. Douglass was at the time and still is a member of the board of directors of the Orange County Economic Opportunity, Inc., the local community action board.

Some of the substance of his testimony was that the poverty war program was "deeply embroiled in politics"; that it has been ineffective and operated by people "unconcerned with the situation of the poor."

In Orange County, Fla., as in many other places, enormous expectations were built up in the minds of the poor by the poverty war propaganda efforts, with almost no accomplishment to help the poor. This prompted Dr. Douglass to testify:

To frustrate the expectations of the poor is both bad business and bad politics.

Dr. Douglass stated that the study of his Center for Practical Politics revealed that the community action process of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Orange County, Fla., afforded the opportunity "for a new species of political interloper and associated staff," who for the most part "generated confusion, animosity, and heat but no light," and that—

Community action further provided a ponderous and complicated net of professed public purpose and private political connivance.

He pointed out that for the most part the people in the program are untrained and not competent to handle their responsibilities.

The Headstart program is generally recognized as one of the more worthwhile programs in OEO. But here also the experience has been poor in my home district.

One of the local churches lent its facilities to be used by the Headstart people this summer, 1967. The church staff sent me detailed and careful evaluation of the program. Their conclusion was that the program was pretty much of a failure,

except that it did provide the children enrolled with some good food and with some medical attention.

As their report put it:

The program at All Saints' did not do anything but feed the children. They needed to be taught basic things such as how to communicate with one another, respect for one another and for the teacher, respect for the property of others, how to eat properly; also, they needed to be taught that there is a time to go to the bathroom, to the drinking fountain: a time to have fun and a time to be quiet and just listen. From observation, it would seem that these children, at least very few if any of them, learned any of these things. There seemed to be continuing chaos and confusion at this center but even though this condition existed the feeling that the children gained some good from the program is still present albeit they did not gain what they might have if the planning and execution of the program had been more thoughtful and thorough by the local Office of Economic Opportunity.

The downstairs classrooms in which these children met received extreme use during this eight weeks' period. It took a great deal of hard work and one week after the center closed to get the rooms to look orderly and neat again. In a majority of the rooms the classes were chaotic, the rooms were filthy, and much of the equipment that was of a portable nature was damaged, the tables where some of the children ate were heaped above and below with garbage after every meal and the lavatories were unspeakable messes.

Three of the chalk boards in the downstairs classrooms have been damaged by the fact that crayons were used on them several different times depositing a coat of wax which is difficult to get off, and in the process of getting it off has not made the chalk boards any better. If anything, they are worse. Two or three of the cork bulletin boards have had some kind of a greasy substance put on them which is impossible to get out and therefore they are permanently damaged. The exterior walls have dirt on them, as a result of the program, which will not come off with washing.

At their two week orientation period, the teachers were told they had to give the children a taste of art, music, nature study, science, etc. There seems to be much at stake in the Headstart program. Giving these children help is a task which must be done: There is no choice in the matter, if we are to call ourselves civilized. It is our responsibility if we are to call ourselves Christians to help with this work. "It was the children themselves who should have been the primary concern of all and they were not. At times they seemed to be little pawns in the games of do-gooders, of politicians, of self-assertive members of the various races, and of people who wanted nothing more than fat salary checks. The Federal Government should not direct this work. It cannot possibly be aware of the real personal needs of these people. By its very nature, it imposes rule: It does not answer particular needs." An indication by a representative of the poverty program from Washington was that the concern was not primarily to help children or to alleviate poverty but to deal with the issue of integration.

The rector, in a letter to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, copies of which went to Senator Smathers and to Representative Gurney, said: "We are delighted to have any persons of any race or background as members of our congregation or participants in the school, but when it becomes necessary to take 4 and 5 year old children and subject them to as much confusion and changing in their little lives as happened during the first three weeks of this program here, I seriously question its value. More important, I seriously question



the value of the guidelines insofar as they appear not to be guidelines but rigid rules. Making pawns of children to satisfy an unrealistic, racial-political issue is not only unbecoming but is cruel. The routine line that we hear from the local office is that it is the Government's desire that this become a completely local operation. As far as I am concerned, I have grave doubts that it will ever function in terms of the value it seeks to establish and goals it seeks to fulfill until such time as the guidelines are modified and the program is, indeed, left up to local individuals. I regret that such a high ideal and objective is so botched up as to appear to be hurting little children and setting the program back instead of moving it forward."

There was undue and excess interference by Federal personnel both from Washington and Atlanta and from the local OEO who came to make observations and to initiate changes that seemed to be detrimental to the children who were trying to be helped through this program. The adage that "too many cooks spoil the stew" certainly applied to the administration of this summer Headstart program. Those in positions of administrative authority on every level flaunted that authority to those who were working at this center.

The food was a plus factor in the summer Headstart program. There was an abundance of it, and it was carefully and well prepared each day.

During the summer program at All Saints', a doctor and a nurse came about every 10 days to administer certain shots to the children and to give the examinations. This unquestionably was of value—another "plus" factor.

Our facilities at All Saints' do not permit for adequate recreational area. The courtyard is far too small and the parking lot too hot for the children to play games. The playground which used to be at the Park Avenue School, which has now been completely taken over by Rollins College, is still there but the equipment is gone thereby minimizing its desirability and its use. This lack of recreational area and the lack of recreational facilities should be considered when thinking again of a program of this nature.

The teaching personnel were a prime factor in the administration and success of this center or its lack of success. There did not seem to be much control over the students and it was the feeling of most of the staff of All Saints' that the reason for this was that the teachers were too young and inexperienced. It has been expressed that the teachers should be older and should have a minimum of 5 years experience with preschool children; that they must teach them how to behave in a group, how to take orders, how to treat one another, how to sit at a table, etc., etc. The head teacher should not have to teach a class as well as do the routine paper work which is required by the Government or OEO. As the days passed and the work proceeded here at All Saints' Headstart center, two things regarding the teachers became obvious: the best teachers were Negroes who were experienced and had had experience teaching young children.

The white teachers who were not experienced did not discipline and they did not teach. They appeared afraid of hurting the children's feelings or of giving them inferiority complexes. The Negro teachers on the other hand disciplined and corrected the children. They were "hard" on them. They taught them the things they will have to know to be accepted in public school. These children walked in tidy and obedient lines. You could pick out the tables at which they had eaten because the tables were cleaner, the rooms they used were cleaner and put in order at the end of the day. Their equipment was not damaged. If this work

is to be done well, if these children are to be given what they must be given, the teachers should be carefully chosen. They should not indulge the children just because they are under-privileged; they should understand the children well enough to know what the children can do and what can be done for them and they should love the children enough to be hard on them. Headstart must be a school where children can learn to go to school.

Of course, this is the experience of only one county in Florida. I have confined my remarks to it because I am personally acquainted with the failure of the poverty war here. However, I think it is fair to say from the evidence amassed, that our situation locally is not an exception, but the general run of things as far as the poverty war programs are concerned.

Probably the best thing that could be done to the poverty war, certainly the best thing which could be done for long-suffering taxpayers, would be to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity. Get the poverty war out of politics, and put the portions of it that might be worthwhile, if properly administered, under competent leadership. For example, headstart and similar educational programs ought to be put under local school direction. There should be much greater emphasis on job training and then follow up in finding jobs.

However, I predict attempts to do this will meet with the charge by proponents of this legislation, and especially the administration, that opponents of the poverty war are against the poor, playing politics with poverty and all the rest of the accusations that have been hurled around.

Perhaps the only sensible thing that can be done this year is to let the program stay as it is, but cut back the funding rather drastically. This will force the poverty war people to drastically revise their operation, get rid of their topheavy staff structure, revise salaries, sharpen up their operation, and hopefully salvage some good out of the whole sorry affair. I hope the Committee is able to take this course.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Mr. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU.

(Mr. POLANCO-ABREU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed by the threat to the Nation's needy in the economy move to slash funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. My fear for essential programs for the poor is shared throughout Puerto Rico. I have been receiving many cablegrams from Commonwealth legislators, educators, community action officers, mayors, public and private organizations, and private citizens.

Without exception, these messages urge the full funding of the OEO so as not to jeopardize essential work on behalf of those who most need the help provided by these programs.

Essential antipoverty programs in Puerto Rico will be in severe danger of dismemberment and discontinuance if

the amendments to cut OEO funds below this year's levels prevail. The voices which reach me through the communications that I have received also oppose, without exception, the requirements calling for contributions on the local level, because this money simply cannot be raised in Puerto Rico. Many of the recipient organizations are nonprofit institutions supported only by donations and subsidies.

If we discontinue or slacken our efforts against poverty at this time, we will find ourselves that much farther behind when again we give full heart to this fight. Our problems then will be compounded, more difficult, and more expensive.

I hope that the Congress in its wisdom will recognize this truth and, despite the obvious need for economy at this time, put appropriations where they are the most needed by our public and can do the greatest good for the most people.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I think that it can truthfully be said that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the programs administered by this Office are easily at this point the most controversial of any of our federally-sponsored Government programs. The Congress, to some extent, must share some of the blame for the shortcomings of the Office of Economic Opportunity, because it was this Congress, not the 90th Congress, but the Congress itself, which thrust upon the Office of Economic Opportunity the almost impossible task of spending huge sums of money without proper preparation and without proper planning. It is because of this haste and lack of planning that the Office of Economic Opportunity has made at least some of the mistakes that they have made.

I think it can as well be said that the Office of Economic Opportunity to some degree, to one extent or the other, can justifiably be criticized, as they have been, by almost every Member of Congress, to my knowledge, and I number myself among those who have been critical of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] yesterday made what, to me, amounts to a profound statement, when she said it was not the intent of the Congress in creating the Office of Economic Opportunity to interpose or create another level of government, as has come to be the case with the Office of Economic Opportunity and community action programs. It surely was not the intent of Congress to create another level of government such as this monster without responsibility to account for their actions.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] made another observation which I think is equally true, and that is that there are two points in real question: money and its amount, and community action programs. I am told, and I believe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.



AYRES] still plans to offer a substitute, which will be in the form of a continuing resolution, to allow the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue to operate under existing rules and regulations, but with reduced funds, until sometime next year.

It is a little difficult for me to see the wisdom of continuing to operate the Office of Economic Opportunity under existing rules and regulations when there is not a man in this House who agrees with the rules and regulations that the Office of Economic Opportunity presently operates under.

If we are truly believers that some change must be made in this basic legislation, then we should face the issue squarely and not pass a simple continuing resolution and continue to operate under existing rules or regulations. I know there are a number of economy-minded people in the House—and I am one of them. I doubt if there are any here who would dare call me a big spender—but I say there is something more important to be considered in this legislation this year than mere dollars alone. The perspective of this legislation must be changed. Responsibility must be achieved.

I feel very sincerely that what the committee has done in adopting the Green amendment is the salvation of this program, if indeed it can be saved. A number of people on the committee have insisted upon it, and I am told they are going to insist upon it through conference. If we can maintain this feature of the bill, a new structure of community action agencies, then this is easily the most revolutionary and important part of this legislative proposal.

As far as I am concerned, I am willing this year to spend a little bit more money if we can inject new criteria for the Office of Economic Opportunity to abide by, in defining for them what a community action agency is. The committee bill says that a community action agency will be a State of a political subdivision. They are talking about elected public officials. Agencies will be represented, the poor will be represented.

I say, as sincerely as I possibly can, if we are going to correct what is more apparently wrong with this bill than any other feature, then we are going to have to start with this new level of government we are all critical of, that is going to rise up in ever-increasing degrees to haunt us all. Even though I might like a little additional wordage, what the committee has done and what the committee recommends in turning over to States and political subdivisions the community action program, I believe we must do if we are ever going to get anything out of this program. It is totally irresponsible now.

So I say to every Member of this House, if the Members really want to put some responsible people—and I am not critical of everybody who is associated with OEO or community action programs as being irresponsible—but if we want to make this program responsible, then we must give the operation and the administration at the community level to people who have to account to voters, to elected officials like you and me. Let us

retain this feature in this bill. If we do not, the time is going to come when this program is going to fall of its own weight—and that would make a lot of people happy, I know. But I say, if we do want to make a going business out of the community action programs by turning their responsibility over to responsible local elected officials, I predict it will not be many years when legislation such as this will pass this House with ease.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ZION].

(Mr. ZION asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity before us that is unparalleled in the history of the world. We can, if we have the courage, enact legislation for our young people that will significantly reduce the tragic specter of illiteracy, disease, and poverty.

We in this country, with more than 50 percent of the world's wealth, are rapidly losing our most valuable asset, that is, the capacity of our young people to contribute to their future and to the future of their country.

Every day brings another group of dependents to the Nation's welfare table, and away from the ranks of production. We must reverse this trend if we are to continue the progress that has made this the greatest nation in the world. This can be done.

It is a three-step approach:

First, abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity as it now exists.

Second, extract those education and training programs that are the confused, conflicting concoctions of the Great Society now being administered by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Third, give substantial guidance, and substantial financial support to our local educational systems, so that they can expand their facilities to administer preschool indoctrination, vocational education, on-the-job training, part-time employment, and so forth.

I am not suggesting that we take these programs away from the national bureaucrats and put them under the bureaucrats in city hall.

I am suggesting that we already have dedicated school boards, competent administrators and educators in local communities who can do the job, if given the help they need.

Now as to point No. 1: We here in the Congress are trying to hack away at the branches of this OEO problem when we should be digging it up by the roots. We should recognize that we cannot carve rotten wood. You cannot dress up a skunk and pretend it is an Angora cat. You can not take elements of the OEO, rearrange them and pretend that they are something new.

In response to a questionnaire I recently distributed throughout my district, 85 percent of those responding indicated they did not feel the OEO had been effective in getting at the real causes of poverty. These constituents may strongly approve of a given project

in the war on poverty. They may have good words for a Headstart program, or Upward Bound, or Green Thumb—but many are seriously worried at the internal mismanagement of these programs. They are alarmed at watching what could be highly beneficial programs becoming hamstrung, and weighted down by a fumbling bureaucracy not attuned to the people they are supposed to serve.

Perhaps even more amazing are the comments from poverty officials themselves. I have had letters and phone calls from distressed men and women who are called upon to operate programs at a local level, while strange policy decisions in Washington and Chicago are delaying operating funds. Vouchers are lost. Checks mismailed. Applications disappear. It is no wonder that a great majority of those capable people who originally joined the OEO have resigned.

One poverty program director stated to me:

Sometimes I get so angry, I want to explode. We're waiting for money to start our program—we have hired persons and have begun to train them to supervise the program. All we need is money . . . so instead of money, we get telegrams, and these aren't properly addressed.

He goes on to say:

I could certainly tell you what I think of the way these programs are run from the top—redtape and mix-ups. I'm disgusted.

Another poverty official related:

There is so much confusion in the national and regional O.E.O. offices that very little of the money ever filters down to where it can be used for the people. Power-hungry officials at the top are too busy empire-building to provide us with a program down here that we can responsibly execute.

Another director wrote me:

I don't really care how they want us to do our work, I'll just be glad when they stop making directional changes long enough to let us get something done down here.

When the OEO becomes hopelessly snarled in its own redtape, it starts looking for a scapegoat. During one of the "lost check" episodes in my district, the regional office put out the story that the program could not be funded until the Congressman had "announced" the project. This colossal bit of ballyhoo had wide circulation in southern Indiana.

I have observed that propaganda is a major product of the OEO. Recently, a flock of mail supporting certain poverty programs contained a large number of letters written on stationery bearing the Federal watermark. Does this suggest a spontaneous expression of unbiased people?

Many of my correspondents are concerned with recent revelations that upwards of 70 percent of OEO expenditures go for salaries. The little people on the other end suffer when bureaucracy has managed to siphon off such a large portion.

There are some outstanding poverty programs in existence. I want to help save them from destruction at the hands of an outraged public that will eventually bring the OEO "house of cards" down. It is imperative that bureaucratic interference in local programs be reduced. It



is also imperative that politics be kept out of the picture.

#### A DUAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION?

It is a regrettable situation that we are spending so much time and energy developing a dual system of education in this country. Headstart is a good example of this.

If the fine features of Headstart could be incorporated into good existing school systems which are responsive to local need, it would represent a tremendous savings to the overburdened taxpayer.

Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Upward Bound, Job Corps, on-the-job training, manpower development—all of these have their areas of merit, and yet collectively they form tentacles on the poverty octopus that gobbles funds and talents and regurgitates very little for the people.

OEO mismanages several of these—still others function through the Department of Labor or Health, Education, and Welfare. Too many of them are Washington oriented or regionally oriented, and not community oriented.

Too many of these programs rob funds, facilities, and faculty from our regular educational system and, at tremendous expense to the taxpayers, divert these funds to the perpetuation of another bureaucracy.

I cannot, in conscience, condone a continuation of the OEO.

Programs designed to provide education and job-oriented training for the poor can be incorporated into existing school systems where they have the guidance of the many dedicated and capable teachers who can greatly improve and expand our total educational environment. Each program could then be funded at much less expense and performed with much greater efficiency in a vastly broadened educational system. America's teachers might then be paid as they deserve, and could teach in facilities worthy of a country whose technology leads the world.

Perpetuation of a national bureaucracy such as OEO serves only to create a costly, competing program of education.

I hope this 90th Congress will seize the initiative in the war on poverty. Let us close the ill-run poverty campaign of the OEO once and for all, and begin effectively to eradicate poverty at its sources.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, on this side we have two more 3-minute speeches and then I expect to move that the Committee rise, unless there is objection on the other side.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is one request for a 2-minute speech on this side.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, it would be much easier for me to support a continued war on poverty if I could point to the evidence of sound progress in my own community. My belief that Syracuse can have a good poverty program must neces-

sarily be tempered by the weight of our past performance. However, I know that our low-income citizens want a better life for themselves and for their children, and so I shall again support this legislation to provide them this opportunity.

The elements we look for in a sound community action program are not to be found in Syracuse. I believe that the Congress envisioned a community action agency as an organization having the capacity to mobilize all of the resources of the community to wage an effective war on poverty. We have had a great deal of strife in Syracuse, but there has not been that effective merging together of the purposes and the resources of all individuals and agencies, public and private, for the common effort.

Attitudes have changed a great deal in Syracuse since the initial skirmishes of the war on poverty. One can perceive a general willingness on the part of most of the public and private entities which are concerned with the manifestations and the causes of poverty to participate in the common effort. This general willingness, however, has not been effectively utilized.

The low-income people of Syracuse are now actively aware of the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act; but the poor, both Negro and white, have not yet discovered the consistent or continuing leadership they need to fight poverty within the framework, the meaning, and the requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Syracuse has experienced entirely too much conflict. Distrust and bitterness have prevented the birth of that total community effort. We have many underemployed and unemployable people. Over 30 percent of our public high school students never graduate. However, we have many businesses and industries which desperately need additional employees. Yet we have been unable to launch the total community effort which should bring the unemployed and the waiting jobs together.

Even now, the Office of Economic Opportunity is attempting to create a new community action agency in Syracuse. The old agency, the crusade for opportunity, was defeated in a protracted conflict with the Office of Economic Opportunity. The crusade violated many OEO guidelines, regulations, and suggestions. The crusade did not assume the responsibility to effectively and efficiently manage and administer the program grants awarded by OEO. But most of all, the old community action agency failed to mobilize all of the resources of the community to wage an effective war on poverty. Many battles were fought, but few were against poverty.

I am pleased with what the Education and Labor Committee has proposed in its community action amendments. These changes, hopefully, will provide the new foundations for a poverty program in Syracuse. I deeply regret that some of my colleagues can see only the dangers of greater involvement by local government. I happen to feel that the attitude and the degree of participation of local government are key elements. I welcome the committee's clarification of the com-

position of the community action agency's governing board. Of even greater benefit is the strengthening of the powers and responsibilities of the governing board. One of the problems which contributed to the collapse of the community action program in Syracuse stemmed from the fact that the board of directors was unable to exercise effective control over the poverty program. The unwillingness of the crusade for opportunity to vest in its board of directors the power and the responsibility to run an effective program contributed to the OEO decision to withdraw support from the crusade.

I believe that the Education and Labor Committee makes a strong case for greater participation of community government in community action. Syracuse has made great progress in mobilizing low-income people to participate in the poverty program. This progress has not been complemented with a similar mobilization of local government, private agencies, community leadership, and all citizens of good will who are concerned about poverty. The Economic Opportunity Act, and the funds we provide for its purposes, cannot possibly be viewed as the sum total of the war on poverty. A community action agency cannot by itself mount an effective and continuing campaign to prepare and place jobless persons in gainful employment. We do not have to create jobs in Syracuse; we have to create workers. An effective employment program demands full participation of the State employment service, the public employment training entity, and above all, private industrial and commercial concerns. A community action agency can guarantee that the special problems of the hard-core unemployed are recognized in the formulation and management of an employment program. Such an agency, because of its special relationship with low-income people, can create and strengthen the willingness of an unemployed person to participate. Such an agency can supply the additional funds needed to make the program meaningful in the sense that the program will be really effective for the hard-core unemployed.

The success of a community action program depends greatly on its capacity to create a peaceful and working relationship with the local educational agency. How best can the poverty program and the local educational agency work together to see that the children of the poor finish a high school education? How best can they cooperate to foster adult basic education? How best can they work together for even more effective manpower development and training programs? How best can they work together to create maximum benefits from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. If these amendments to the community action program will stimulate a closer relationship between the poor and the various agencies of local government, much good will come of it.

A community action agency cannot singlehandedly set out to conquer the problem of poor housing. The financial base of a community action agency is completely inadequate. The local public



housing agency must be either stimulated or permitted to participate, depending on local circumstances. The local urban renewal agency, the municipal officials charged with zoning and code enforcement all must participate. I believe it is both dangerous and destructive for community action agencies to have as their principal operating assumption the belief that no agency of local government will ever care about low-income people.

If a community action agency is not concerned about jobs, housing, and education, it is wasting its time and our funds. It is true that we hope that the evolution of a working relationship between local government entities and the community action program will create a continuing attitude of concern. We hope that this will be true also in the desired working relationship with private service and humanitarian agencies. Hopefully, community action programs will develop this common attitude of concern and the habit of broad partnership in the pursuit of common aims. I think it is foolish to expect more from community action than this.

Congress wants the community action program to stimulate and work toward a wider path for all into the mainstream of American economic and social life. It will not happen overnight. It will not happen if we permit this program to be used for new barriers of distrust and unrest even as we seek to tear down the old ones.

I support the recommendations of our Committee on Education and Labor, and I urge the passage of this poverty bill. The city of Syracuse is in the process of refitting itself in order to fight poverty. This legislation will aid in the avoidance of past mistakes. It will strengthen our chances of achieving total community participation and mobilization.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

(Mr. CAHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, the entire poverty program has been discussed on the floor of this House for the past several days in great depth, and it would serve no useful purpose for me to repeat many of the statements and to allude to many of the facts that have been so thoroughly discussed.

Every Member of this House must recognize the enormity of the challenge which the Congress accepted 3 years ago when it enacted the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The objectives sought were desirable, the aims were lofty, and the belief that the job could be done was, I am certain, sincere. Now after 3 years and some \$4 billion of expenditures, there are many who question the success of the program and the justification for its continuance.

I would merely point out to the House that in this program, as in all others, there are both successes and failures. As in most instances, failures are usually more widely publicized than successes. It is, therefore, not surprising that the failures of this program have been well documented and that they have received wide

publicity. I join those critical of those failures and I join those who insist that the abuses so fully discussed here on the floor be completely eliminated. One of the outrages of this program has been the partisan, political participation by many of the poverty employees. Another outstanding and glaring failure has been the allocation of almost 70 percent of the funds to administration and executive salaries. The direction of the program from the top to the bottom leaves a great deal to be desired. I have also been particularly disturbed by the diversion by OEO of large amounts of money which should be used for the immediate needs of the poor, to visionary and costly research projects. I was amazed to learn that a grant in excess of \$500,000 given to the University of Wisconsin was subcontracted to a corporation in New Jersey to do research among a thousand families to determine the effect of a guaranteed annual income.

Without going into the merits or the philosophy or the justification for such a research program, I find it impossible to understand why OEO would be involved in this type of activity. This is but one of a score of similar activities which have brought justifiable criticism on the directors and the administrators of this program. The record is replete with an itemization of the failures, and no words of mine are required to embellish that sad record. However, Mr. Chairman, we must not forget in our hurry to criticize, the thousands of men and women, boys and girls, who 3½ years ago had little or no hope of participating in the prosperity of the American economy and who now have aspirations, hopes, and dreams for decent lives. We must not forget the hundreds, if not thousands, of dedicated men and women who have devoted their every energy in an honest effort to carry out the lofty ideals and objectives of this program and who have in truth and in fact brought help and hope to many of the poor of our Nation.

While the OEO has not expended very much money in the district that I represent, I have personally met and have been tremendously impressed by the highly motivated efforts of the responsible people actively associated with this program who have achieved by their efforts a great many worthwhile successes. I have been particularly impressed with the progress of Headstart, Followthrough, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. I know that this has been a contributing factor in reducing the tensions and the despair in certain areas in my State. I commend all who have devoted themselves in the spirit of the program and who have unselfishly given of themselves to assist the less fortunate among us. Once again, it seems to me that adequate leaders, proper direction, and the elimination of the abuse and misuse in the program could accomplish a great deal more and most certainly shorten the war on poverty.

While I realize that we are at war in Vietnam and that we must reduce spending on a Federal level, I also recognize that we are, in fact, spending hundreds of millions of dollars on refugee programs in foreign lands and in our own land for the victims of Communist aggression in

Cuba. Certainly, we cannot do less for our own than we are doing for strangers. Certainly, within the sphere of fiscal responsibility, we must provide sufficient funds to aid the poor, to bring hope to the hopeless, and to minimize, if not completely eliminate, poverty in the United States.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, early in this debate, comments were made to the effect that vocational educators are not equipped to teach and train the disadvantaged youth of this Nation.

At this time I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the testimony before our committee regarding successful programs being operated by vocational educators and training the same disadvantaged youth as the Job Corps:

#### MAHONING VALLEY RESIDENTIAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

Mr. Don Watson, director, Trumbull County Vocational School, Vienna, Ohio, information regarding the Mahoning Valley residential vocational school, Ohio, which serves the disadvantaged youth:

Placements are verified to exceeding 80% of our graduates.

The cost per year (per student) includes operating costs, subsistence, training allowance, every cost, capital outlay—remodeling, equipment—\$4,573. This cost is being reduced this year because we have most of our equipment.

We do not believe we have to have a student a full year or even two full years to help him. Our purpose is to train people to the point that they can go out and become employed. If we can do this in a period of three or four months, we do this and we encourage them if they feel they are solid enough to remain employed and not end up back in the same boat.

Our enrollment would include 50 percent high school drop-outs and the other half would have completed high school, but were still considered unemployed or unemployable because of lack of vocational skill.

The average reading level of our students has been running fifth or sixth grade level.

Mr. Watson also testified that the Mahoning daily training program ran eight and nine hours a day with many youths returning for 2 hours in the evenings.

He boasts a placement rate of 70 percent overall, and over 80 percent for graduates, and commented that many youths receive five and six offers.

Mr. Watson also testified they had no recruitment problem at Mahoning Valley and generally had a full complement.

Our committee chairman [Mr. PERKINS] was impressed, as we were, with the Mahoning Valley School and commented at that time:

I am particularly proud of the school in Vienna, Ohio. I think this is a great institution and I just wish that more states had inaugurated residential schools years ago.

Mr. Watson concluded with a final thought:

I would like to mention just one more thing to the committee as far as using the existing structures to operate a network of residential centers.



I think if each state were given responsibility, I think there would develop a friendly competition there that would make every state want to do the job and do it well, provided they had funds to do it, and I think this network, with the leadership that is available now at the Federal and State level, that this network could be put into effect pretty quickly and effectively, and I think there would be a great deal to be set for the state being so actively controlled and actually responsible for taking care of problems in their State, and I think the State and local people would have a better view, knowing exactly what the problems are, where they are, and what has to be done about these problems.

#### MILWAUKEE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL AND ADULT SCHOOLS

Mr. George A. Parkinson, director, the Milwaukee Vocational Technical and Adult Schools (not residential), during hearings on antipoverty legislation before the House Committee on Education and Labor testified regarding their efforts and experiences with disadvantaged youth:

We are operating a Continuation School, or dropout school, in which we have approximately 650 students. Slightly less than half of these are Negroes. I would like to add that approximately 500 of the 650 are currently on parole from various disciplinary institutions.

Currently our programs for disadvantaged youth involve: Automobile mechanics, clerk and general office training at various levels, machine operator training (male and female), power sewing machine operators (male and female), welders, certified laboratory assistants (male and female), clothing alteration women, cooks and counterwomen, industrial electricians, janitors or custodial workers, mechanical draftsmen, small engine repair, waitresses, gas engine repair maintenance, and nurses aides; special programs for older workers (for example, teaching them to take the examination for postal employees), machine molders, sales clerks, and a host of students who are slotted into our various regular programs, of which we have approximately 1500 different classes, courses—that is, not programs—but 132 programs.

In addition to this, all of those who lack basic education are given an opportunity to at least acquire functional literacy; that is, reading and comprehension at the sixth grade level, and the use of simple arithmetic in actual operational practice, in these programs.

A year ago last June we graduated about 50 students, and every student except one had a job before he walked across the stage and got his diploma. This year we were about 98 percent of placement.

I think it (Residential Vocational School) would run us between \$3,500 and \$4,000 per equivalent fulltime student per year (precluding capital costs which would add approximately \$1,000 to \$1,500). That is a thumbnail thing, and that has not been refined, Congressman, because until you sit down and actually develop your costs sheets, you can't tell. But I made a preliminary estimate for our board.

I think we can operate (a Residential School) for \$2,500 or \$3,000 (per student) less than Job Corps.

About 80 percent of those who complete, and we follow those up, and we find out that of the 80 percent who are placed in entry jobs in the area for which they are trained, a year later about 80 or 85 percent of those are still working in that area, though not necessarily at that same job.

... if you can train ten students in a school like mine, where you can train one student, maybe, in the Job Corps, for the same money, the need is so great in your

great metropolitan areas that I think it is foolish to waste the money on the other side.

Many people running Job Corps are amateurs—they have spent more money than I think you have to spend to attain the object.

Mr. Parkinson has estimated the cost for the Milwaukee Vocational School to run a residential program would be approximately \$3,500 to \$4,000 direct operating cost or a total of approximately \$5,000, including capital outlay.

Mr. Watson of Mahoning Valley testified that their residential operation costs are \$4,573 per student, which included everything the Job Corps figures include, except some medical provision which was taken care of by another public agency.

These figures should be compared with the price tags on different Job Corps centers, a few of the highest examples being:

#### Centers in existence over 9 months

Rodman	\$10,517
Parks	9,091
Albuquerque	12,658
Clinton	10,298
Omaha	+9,000
Cleveland	+9,000

#### Centers in existence under 9 months

Guthrie	\$13,238
St. Louis	12,203
McCoy	17,395
Clearfield	16,299
Lincoln	18,516

We would like to note also that the cost figures above for these centers were furnished by OEO to Congress and do not include \$600 per enrollee for capital costs or \$603 per enrollee for overhead—headquarters and regional expenses, screening, and some direct enrollee fees.

Among other testimony on vocational education, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman JOHN DENT, commented:

At this time, I would also like to ask you another question. There is a great deal of flak surrounding my proposal that the Job Training Corps be tied directly to the vocational and trade school training program. I believe we are missing a golden opportunity in the job training programs under OEO by not having them directly tied to vocational training schools. We are blessed in Pennsylvania with the greatest number of well-trained experts in the trade school training program.

Dave Hill, director, Pittsburgh, Pa., antipoverty program stated:

It does make sense to have the Job Corps Centers tied to specific vocational centers, and this is projected as part of our need in our industrial complex. I think it also makes a lot of sense for projected vocational training in conjunction with this very same effort.

One of the problems we find as far as the Job Corps is concerned, there is a great deal of slippage between when the person finishes the program and referral to a State Employment Office for employment. We very often get the information a little late. Sometimes the youngster is back in the neighborhood for a week or two or a month or two before we know he is there. I would like to see a closer tie in between the Job Corps Center and the employment service's referral of that youngster back to the neighborhood so we will know what kinds of skills he has and what he has been trained to do so that we can immediately start finding jobs for that youngster, promoting that youngster, so to speak, before he bets back.

When testifying before the Senate this year, Dr. John M. Lumley, spokesman for

the National Education Association, said it would be the position of that association "that the Job Corps should be under the control or under the direction of educators in vocational education. In other words as far as the Job Corps operation in California, it should be operated under the direction of whoever is the director of vocational education for the State of California—the thing that we are greatly concerned about is that the commonplace expression among people that are noneducators is that educators have failed and that the States have failed. This is untrue."

Miss Cynthia Parsons, author of a series of articles on vocational education that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor in the summer of 1967, testified before the House Education and Labor Committee regarding the events taking place in the field of vocational education:

There is a great interest in an entirely new type of facility, and that is called the Area Vocational School, and Somerset, Kentucky, has an area vocational school.

It serves counties—I think it is three—and something like 11 school districts. The longest distance any student comes is something like 60 miles, and the director of the school has found approved lodging in town so in a sense it is almost residential for some of the students who come a long distance.

Pinta County, Ohio, has gone into vocational education—Pinta County High School; there is no county named Pinta—Pinta means 5—it serves five counties south of Toledo. It serves many high schools. The students in those high schools continue to have their identity in that school. They are a Fulton County High School student who rides the bus every day over to the Pinta County Vocational School, and returns in the afternoon to Fulton County High School where he joins in the athletic program, extra curricular, or whatever, and when he gets his high school degree, he gets it from his own school, not from the area vocational school.

The Somerset area vocational school is one of a different variety, slightly different in that it does grant a degree. It is a high school; it has a high school program of its own.

Both kinds of these vocational school operate on a six or seven days a week, 17 to 21 hours a day basis every day out of the year.

It (the Los Vegas vocational school) is the most beautiful vocational school in the country. It has wall-to-wall carpeting. I was treated to frogs legs provencal, and asked where the school got the fronts, and was told the school had gotten a grant to get rare fish delicacies in order to teach the foods they would be cooking if they got jobs at the fine casinos and hotels in Las Vegas.

The school has unbelievable equipment, and for two years in the planning stage, it is a completely comprehensive school.

It has closed circuit television, it is wall-less—as a magnificent place, really.

Its programs are very exciting. One very kind of interesting thing in its secretarial training is that girls generally—boys are supposed to have, for auto mechanics; live production work to make the work interesting and to make it realistic, instead of working on mounted engines.

Girls have had traditionally dead work to do. They copied letters that weren't going anywhere, and wrote finger exercises on the typewriter that also weren't going anywhere.

Each girl in this school sits at a station and there is a switchboard, and someone in town who may want a letter, a lawyer or doctor or businessman, can call and ask to dictate a letter, the phone hookup goes to one of the instructors and the students. She then writes the letter, it is corrected



by the supervisor and is then sent downtown to the doctor, lawyer, or whoever, for his signature, et cetera.

I went deliberately to schools that were doing what they felt was a very good job, and at all of them that offered this provision, they were all very, very complimentary about it, and that was to allow into the classes with high school students, older students, who had dropped out of school. They all were very complimentary about the effect this had if they could control the numbers, if they had six or eight young adults who were particularly interested in getting a certain training, and they put them in the classes with the high school students, that this worked out very well.

The ones (area vocational school) in existence now are not being terribly effective, and the interest by the Federal Government is not in them, so the money is not going there, and the local communities don't seem to be doing much about them.

Yes, there seems to be very clear evidence that the stronger the vocational offering and the wider the vocational offering, the more students will stay in school. The Pennsylvania State study showed that quite clearly, and I didn't talk to anyone who didn't believe it, who did not say if they had a good, strong program—the Las Vegas school, which has only been operating now a year, the area vocational school already has earmarked over 150 students who were classified ready to be dropouts who said in order to go to the area vocational school, and, interestingly enough, they must get themselves there, and it is up on a mesa.

I visited both of those (Milwaukee, Wis., and Portland, Me.). The Portland school is special in that it combines in one facility some of the most outstanding students in the city determined by their intelligence quotient as well as their achievement level in Math and Science.

They are not allowed to go to visit Polytech in the eighth grade unless they are two or three years ahead and—on standard achievement scores.

They have technical programs that have sent them on to be, presumably, engineers, and go to Cal Tech and MIT and Purdue and the other fine technical institutions.

The other half of the student body at Vincent Polytechnic are those below the average in achievement.

When they finish the eighth grade, and who are thought could benefit from a terminal vocational program. These boys are sent to Vincent Polytechnic. The onus of being a dumping ground is thus avoided.

The school has an extremely fine training program, and I was especially impressed with the fact that geometry, for instance, which is taught, the finest and the newest geometry and the best new math geometry is taught to the summer students, but at the same time the students who are going to be the tool and diemakers are taught a special geometry whereby they have to solve geometric problems on their lathes and in their pattern-making, and the school designed this course themselves.

Mr. QUIN. I would like to have her finish with Milwaukee, but I will be glad to yield then.

Miss PARSONS. In the Milwaukee facility is probably the finest vocational technical school in the world. It has got 1,800 courses, and that wouldn't be good unless the courses were good, and they are—they are pretty good.

I spent oh, most of my time, in the printing department, not feeling that I knew more about printing than anything else, but they have decided to combine—they no longer can teach a boy or girl just to run a linotype, or if he chooses just to be in graphic arts,

or if he chooses to be in photography—they have hooked up a linotype to a computer, and have insisted that the boys learn that.

They are taught in the printshops by their own people.

They learn to run offset presses as well as hot type. They learn to work, not only with old photoengraving equipment, but with the newest, which does almost all the work for you, where you have to be more skilled in the design of what you put on the plate, and the acid man dipping the plate.

I won't go into the process, but photoengraving has moved from the 18th Century to the 21st Century with no spaces in between, and most schools haven't gotten to the 21st.

The presses, there are new presses that run off a computer-run linotype. That is, you can even go one step further. If my newspaper were that modern, and it is not, I could call on the telephone a story. The telephone would translate it into a magnetic tape, which would be fed into the linotype, which would set the type, it would be corrected by a computer and go directly into a special press and come out in the paper without having had to be handled at any of those points in between, and suddenly the printer no longer has to be able to work a linotype, but he has to be able to keep the tape running through the machine and understands whether it is working properly.

He becomes a mechanic.

(In response to the question:)

What do you think of such a proposal connecting with the area school, in line with the Opportunity Crusade, in which we recommend a residential vocational school concept?

Miss PARSONS. Almost all the area vocational people are interested in this, and especially those who are willing to takeout on the dropout, the young man or woman who dropped out of school.

Personally, I am strongly in favor of the residential facility, especially for the ghetto, even the city child. I can't think of anything better for a child from the Roxbury area of Boston to be able to put into a dormitory situation with some sort of counselor-type arrangement in connection with a strong vocational and academic program.

I didn't talk with a vocational educator who wasn't interested in doing this, running a vocational school. The man in Boulder, Colorado, is especially keen to do so, and he sees this as solving a distance problem, and Dr. Stirmer of Las Vegas is the same way. What they really want is to be able to—well, I have to use the educator's terminology and make it "environment control," but what they are talking about, if you are really going to retool someone who has dropped out, he has dropped out of a lot of things. He hasn't just dropped out of the welding, or automechanics or beauty school, he has dropped out of a belief in adults and out of a belief in the strength in the American way and so forth.

So if you create for him a place where there is human dignity as well as in which hand skills can be developed, then you have a really strong authority.

Let me briefly explain a program that Las Vegas has which is very good. Las Vegas made a study of its community needs. One of the things they turned up was that there were two hundred gasoline service stations in the Las Vegas area and the people manning those service stations felt that they badly needed boys who had some training in salesmanship, in a little bit of auto mechanics, knowing the differences between the compositions of various tires and things. In other words, were trained not only to be good handlers of the money and that area of the gas station but really when somebody came in and wanted a new tire, to be able to describe to them the differences in the kinds of tires. So they have built a course

of study around service station attendants. The students are taught their chemistry, their physics, what they need, their English, bookkeeping, various things, and then do a work study at a service station until they have completed their high school so that they are actually at a service station, they get paid for some of their work, they are at school all day long learning to be a good service station attendant. At the same time the door is not closed for them when they finish, if they decide (a) that they want to become the owner of a gasoline station, and would like to come back to this vocational school and get the kind of business training that you need to run a small business, or (b) if they decide they really would like to specialize in body work, they may come back to the school and take a course in body work or auto-mechanics.

#### COUNSELOR

Mr. Chairman, the "counselor" proposal which is in the opportunity crusade will expand to many more needy youths the opportunity to obtain part-time employment on a work-study basis and enable them to finish school.

Congressman BURT TALCOTT inserted into the RECORD earlier this year an excellent example of how such a program is operating in Salinas, Calif.:

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days of programs to improve the lot of school dropouts and others in our society who for one reason or another are not equipped to compete effectively from an economic standpoint.

Regrettably, such efforts have shown all too few signs of success.

The ultimate answer to the dropout problem, purely and simply, must be to eliminate it—by keeping our young sufficiently interested in, and challenged by, their schooling.

A program being conducted by the Salinas Union High School District, Salinas, Calif., suggests that one means of maintaining student interest in educational pursuits is to integrate their studies with practical work experience opportunities offered by private business firms in the community.

Not every community or school district has such a competent and dedicated program director as Gordon Ray, of Salinas, but the work experience program he administers could be emulated by other school districts with immeasurable benefits.

Staff Writer Eric Brazil, of the Salinas Californian, described the vocational work experience program of Salinas High School at some length in an article appearing in the November 28, 1966, edition of the newspaper as follows:

"SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT: SUHS DISTRICT WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM GROWS IN POPULARITY  
(By Eric Brazil, Californian Staff Writer)

"The course which is growing fastest in popularity with students in the Salinas Union High School District is work.

"It is as if the district built a better mousetrap. Vocational Work Experience began as a 22-student pilot program last February, and it now has an enrollment of more than 180.

"Student demand to enroll in the course, which uses Salinas' entire commercial community as its classroom, presently exceeds the supply of jobs for it.

"Vocational Work Experience is but one facet, albeit the largest one, of the district's increasingly comprehensive work experience education program.

#### "Other facets

"That program includes the Vocational Education Act (25 students) and Neighborhood Youth Corps (65 students) projects, both of which receive federal financial assistance, as well as work training (35 stu-



dents), a 100 per cent private enterprise project for training mentally retarded youngsters.

"Gordon Ray coordinates the district's work experience from a tiny office in the music wing at Salinas High School. But he doesn't warm the office chair much. He is a man on the go.

"Ray has been selling the program hard, and the business community, as well as the students, seem to be buying it. One hundred sixty employers are participating in the work experience program, and more are coming in.

"Vocational Work Experience is open to junior and senior students over 15. Students work three to five hours a day at a minimum wage of \$1.30 an hour. They receive five academic credits for each bloc of 180 hours of work.

"Trainee jobs fall into a variety of fields, but the clerical and sales fields predominate.

"Students are referred to the work experience program by vocational counselors at each of the district's three high schools. And some of them just find out about the program on their own and inquire about it at Ray's office.

#### "Typical" trainee

"Ray finds that the typical student enrolling in work experience 'has not had a great deal of academic success,' despite average school attendance. And 'he's searching for some way to achieve status. He thinks that if we can find the right job for him, he'll achieve success.'

"Ray attempts to fit students into jobs that will put them on the road to their ultimate vocational goals.

"One particularly good fit has North Salinas High School junior Paul Lewis learning the electronic technician's trade at Kane & Zech Television and Appliances on Main Street.

"Young Lewis plans to be an electronics technician after he graduates from high school and finishes military service. Right now he finds himself busy as the proverbial bird dog checking out TV sets and phonographs, making service calls, deliveries, etc. And he finds the whole work experience 'a lot of fun.'

#### "They're doing fine

"Lewis' boss, Fred Kassing, who also supervises another young work experience trainee, Paul Molinari, says that 'as far as I'm concerned, they're doing fine . . . They haven't missed a day of work yet.' Kassing believes that by the end of their high school training period the two boys will be well on their way toward becoming first-rate technicians.

"Harry Wardwell, a principal in Kane & Zech, says he is 'real tickled' with the program so far. One of the really serious problems facing the television and appliance business today is an acute shortage of qualified technicians, he says. And the work experience program is helping its firm to grow its own, so to speak.

"The two boys between them are almost filling the job for one person—a man I couldn't find,' he says.

"Ray views the job as 'a classroom away from school teaching material we can't duplicate at school. And the employer is the instructor in this class.'

"How, for example, could the schools go about duplicating a doctor's office classroom? Couldn't be done. Therefore, Miss Georgia Flamos, a Salinas High School senior who has 'always wanted to work in a doctor's office,' is a work experience trainee in the office of optometrist Dr. Tracey O. Beagle. She is the receptionist now, and Dr. Beagle is planning to train her as a nurse's assistant.

#### "FEW FLUNK OUT

"Of all the work experience trainees Ray has placed in jobs so far, only four—count 'em—four have flunked out on the job. (Two of those have since been given a sec-

ond chance on other jobs.) Ray says that 'we haven't had a single youngster drop school since we started this program,' although the preprogram dropout potential among the trainees was quite high.

"The J. C. Penney Co. employs three work experience trainees at its Valley Center store, and assistant manager Joe Montgomery is one of the program's big boosters. (In fact he is a member of the high school district's 16-man work experience education lay advisory committee.) 'We think this program is excellent. As a matter of fact, we'd like to see it expanded,' Montgomery says.

#### "TEACHING ATTITUDE

"We're happy to be the classroom if the kids really want to learn. But we won't have any truck with a kid who doesn't really want to put his heart into it,' Montgomery says. 'Our first responsibility to these kids—even before we teach them any kind of skill—is to teach them responsibility and a good attitude toward holding a job.'

"Ray believes that the full potential of the work experience program has not yet been attained. If the jobs materialize, 'there could easily be 500 kids in the program next year,' he says.

"Besides, he says, 'I feel that 90 percent of the kids in high school need some kind of work experience, whether it's in our program or a job they find on their own.'

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill which will continue the so-called war against poverty because time and experience has proven it to be a very expensive and dangerous experiment.

We are all interested in helping to eradicate poverty, but, in our desire to help the poor, we must not allow ourselves to be blinded by the vast deficiencies of this wasteful program.

A bad program can be worse than no program at all because it generates hopes which cannot be fulfilled, spends moneys which cannot be spared unless they are used constructively, and subverts the normal desires of the poor to help themselves into cravings for hand-outs and revenge against those who are more successful in life.

In my judgment, the poverty program, as presently administered, has definitely proved itself unfit to help the poor. There is little doubt that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been at the bottom of much of the rioting and troublemaking which we have sadly witnessed in the past few years throughout this country. It has ignored the activities of poverty workers in fomenting riots, encouraging black power, supporting partisan political candidates and issues, and generally doing more to arouse the unfortunate ignorant than to help the poor help themselves.

The records will show that the Office of Economic Opportunity has hired muggers and criminals. It has subsidized revolution and social agitation. It has provided tax dollars for the dissemination of what can only be called—hard as it is to believe—Communist propaganda.

In my own city of New York, more than \$100,000 was given to LeRoi Jones,

the black nationalist playwright whose contempt for the white people is evident in his plays which portray white people as degenerates and homosexuals. When the New York City police raided his theater last year, they found an arsenal of shotguns, crossbows, and meat cleavers, presumably bought with our tax dollars. I know that New York City is supposed to be "fun city" but this is carrying "fun" a little too far.

As if black nationalists were not enough, the New York City "war on poverty" also included a sprinkling of Communists. This September, I pinpointed Robert Schrank, now an assistant commissioner of the New York City poverty war, as a onetime, card-carrying Communist. Mayor Lindsay's spokesman admitted that Schrank had been a Communist for 15 years, leaving the party only 3 or 4 years ago. Nevertheless, the mayor called Schrank a "distinguished public servant." I do not see why the American taxpayer should have to put up with this stupidity.

It seems that there are two types of people that make up the bulk of the staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity: First, there are the hard-core social troublemakers who always delight in the chance to use Federal tax dollars to undermine and warp the national social fabric. Then, there are the do-gooders who think fighting poverty is romantic. Because all of these people are getting fat salaries, they have also found that fighting poverty is a profitable business. The poor may not be getting much out of the fight, but every half-baked sociologist in the United States has made a fortune "consulting" with the various sections of the poverty program.

Efforts to improve the poverty program through amendments in 1965 and 1966 have been largely unsuccessful. And further attempts here today to improve this wasteful program will be just as ineffectual.

There are many aspects of the so-called war against poverty which have basic merit—for example, the Headstart program. This program which is aimed at helping preschool disadvantaged children, appears to have some good results. But Headstart no longer belongs in OEO, for it is basically an educational program and should be put in the hands of a responsible agency where it can do a better job at a much lesser cost.

There is also some useful work being done in job retraining which should be transferred to the Department of Labor where the program can be better administered and at less cost to the taxpayers.

As this House knows, I have been a firm opponent of the phony war against poverty. I am 100 percent against spending billions of taxpayer's dollars to support all the sociology consultants and antipoverty generals who are getting rich by milking the poverty of the slums.

I am 100 percent for programs to train little kids for school, to help young mothers find work, to retrain unemployed workers, to provide adult education, and so forth, but I do not like the idea of hiring six Ivy League sociologists at \$15,000 a year each to supervise 10 kids. This is what makes the poverty war



such a phony. It is principally a gravy-train for the social planning establishment. A lot of worthless bleeding hearts are getting rich with taxpayers dollars to the detriment of the poor.

When the New York City comptroller recently did an audit of the Haryou-Act program, he found that of the \$14 million spent, about \$9 million had been spent for salaries, travel, and consultants' fees. About \$5 million was directly spent on the poor. What a waste.

I wonder how many of the Ivy League bleeding heart liberals would care about the poor if they were getting \$3,500 a year instead of \$15,000? I remember back during the depression, the WPA hired people at \$15 to \$30 a week and it was a great thing. We needed it. But it is 30 years later now. The people the poverty program hires do not need handouts and they do not deserve \$15,000 a year for talking about poverty at cocktail parties.

Of course, as part of the poverty program ideology, all the \$15,000 a year Ivy Leaguers run around talking about the "deprived" and "black revolution." This has helped to stir up the riots. Indeed, as I stated earlier, I believe that the poverty program is partly responsible for the riots, and I do not mean just because a lot of poverty workers were leading the riots. I mean because the antipoverty generals have been stirring up all kinds of wild expectations even while taking most of the antipoverty money for their own fat salaries.

The nerve center of all these Ivy League planners and well-heeled cocktail party poverty generals is the Office of Economic Opportunity. If Congress breaks up this group of parasites who are making fat salaries while the poor go hungry, then perhaps the war on poverty will start to get results. Besides, if we can get rid of the Office of Economic Opportunity, then the sound parts of the antipoverty program can be transferred to the regular departments of the Federal Government, where they will be administered by sensible civil servants, not hordes of overpaid dreamers. It is also fair to say that the Federal line departments will not send their employees into slums fomenting revolution and engaging in partisan political activity.

I think it is extremely important to break up the clique of overpaid poverty generals at the Office of Economic Opportunity if we are to give the poverty program a chance to succeed. For my own part, I am more than willing to support sound job rehabilitation and pre-school training programs, but I will not support OEO's war on middle-class morality, nor will I support OEO's community action and riot-agitation program.

I would like to point out to the Members of this House that even the poor are getting sick of the endless studies of the social planners. Let me read you a quotation from the New York Times concerning New York City slumdweller disenchantment with the demonstration cities program, which is another social planner gravy train. In expressing disappointment, he said:

We're beginning to feel like laboratory animals. We've been surveyed and studied to death. You don't have to draw any more maps. There are maps downtown that say we're supposed to get six garbage collections a day, but you don't see those cats out there.

Of course. Who can imagine a poverty general caring about a humdrum thing like garbage collection? They only care about fancy things like black power, community action, and racial balance. Now some people will say that the social planners care about rats and that Congress does not. I can answer this one, because I have not only introduced a rat extermination bill, but I have introduced legislation for garbage collection, street lighting, and fire hazard elimination grant-in-aid programs. So let me tell you about the social planners and the rat bill. The administration bill set up a rat bureaucracy at an estimated cost of \$6 per dead rat. Most of this would have gone for studies and salaries, of that you can be sure. Fortunately, the new rat bill is a good bill. It would not sponsor a new HUD payroll.

I have made these observations because they go to the root of the Great Society and the war on poverty alike—there is much too much money being spent on agitation and social planning and too little on things like garbage collection and job retraining.

One of the first things we can do is to get rid of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which has warped the war on poverty into a gravy train for agitators, social planners, and even Communists. If we disestablish the Office of Economic Opportunity and farm the good programs back to reliable agencies, we will have gone a long way toward getting the antipoverty war back on the right track, but I know that I for one cannot see my way clear to vote for any program which is to be still run by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The American taxpayer deserves his money's worth and it is incumbent upon us here in Congress to see that his tax dollar is not wasted in unsuccessful and dangerous experiments. It is time for Congress to act and scrap this ill-conceived and badly administered program.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I have found myself in a peculiar position every time the poverty issue comes up. I strongly believe in Federal programs to help individuals caught in poverty.

The Federal Government was spending some \$30 billion a year for the alleviation of poverty before the Economic Opportunity Act was enacted 3 years ago. I believe strongly that the Office of Economic Opportunity has not effectively administered the program to alleviate poverty.

A reading of the minority views for the past 3 years reveals that we predicted the shortcomings and failures of the poverty program which are now well documented, especially by the news media of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see an agency with Cabinet-level status or even higher status, to coordinate the activi-

ties of the Federal Government to alleviate poverty. I would like to see operating programs which complement the operating programs of longer duration, to be placed in the traditional agencies, rather than to continue the fragmented programs of the past 3 years.

I have been striving hard to see that the poor were assured of an adequate voice in the poverty program. I have tried to involve the States in an acceptable and effective way. I have tried to see to it that private industry is involved in a much more direct way.

Therefore, it is ridiculous for anyone to accuse me of trying to kill the poverty program, a rumor which must have been circulated by the administration.

My Republican colleagues and myself, in offering the opportunity crusade, are not trying to kill the poverty program. We are trying to strengthen and improve it.

The opportunity crusade would provide \$1.4 billion in Federal funding this year, compared to the current funding of \$1.6 billion and the administration's proposal to spend \$2.06 billion this year. But more important, the Republican bill will release \$3 billion from Federal, State, local, and private industry sources, while the committee and administration bill only releases \$2.4 billion from these sources. We placed the total Federal funds in the opportunity crusade at \$1.4 billion since it appears that that is all the House will accept at this time.

The disillusionment with the war on poverty, as operated by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—is so deep and widespread that even the large Democratic majority cannot assure passage of this committee bill.

So unpopular has the present mismanaged poverty operation become among Members of Congress that the Democratic leadership stalled bringing the bill to the House floor all summer and into the fall. They knew they did not have the votes. I do not believe they have the votes today to pass this bill.

Now we are informed that the bill will be carried over into next week. This is added proof that the leadership does not have the votes.

I categorically deny that I or my Republican colleagues who have worked with me want to kill the war on poverty. We want to strengthen it. We want to make the kind of changes that will make it function better to correct the mistakes which have been glaringly visible, and we would not destroy the voice of the poor as the Democratic bill has done, either. If the bill is killed in the House, it will be at the hands of the Democrats, who enjoy a substantial majority.

Mr. Chairman, there are a multitude of reasons why I have not supported antipoverty legislation since 1964; many of these were concerned with inadequate and loosely drawn legislation, and others with poor administration and mismanagement of war on poverty programs.

#### POVERTY PLUNDER

Mr. Chairman, despite a 1966 amendment requiring regular audits of antipoverty funds, the past year has produced a series of fiscal irregularities in antipoverty programs which have



reached alarming proportions. These situations suggest that the Office of Economic Opportunity has not tightened fiscal policies. Until that agency faces up to its responsibilities in overseeing grants of Federal funds, it appears we can look forward to more chicanery and diversion of money during the coming year. I cite the following examples of abuse of Federal funds:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

In October of this year, suspected check forgeries and kickbacks from employed youths were uncovered in Project Job Power, a summer program operated by Westminster Neighborhood Association, a Watts antipoverty agency. The matter is currently under investigation by the Los Angeles district attorney's office.

SUFFOLK COUNTY, N.Y.

In October 1967, an Amityville, N.Y., neighborhood opportunity center employee was arrested and charged with having pocketed more than \$5,000 by filing false reports on former Neighborhood Youth Corps workers.

According to a district attorney's report, the antipoverty employee had filed almost 100 false time reports for Youth Corpsmen. When the checks were received at the center, the employee cashed them by forging the Corpsmen's signatures. Investigators estimated up to 99 checks amounting to \$5,500 were involved.

Curiously, the antipoverty warrior involved had been fired a year before from the Suffolk County, N.Y., Neighborhood Youth Corps for having recruited 60 ineligible youths and for suspected irregularities in connection with check forgers.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

In August of this year, the director of the older teenagers summer program, an East New York antipoverty program, was arrested and charged with demanding and accepting kickbacks from antipoverty employees who did no work.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

In October of this year, funds for crusade for opportunity, the Syracuse antipoverty agency, were cut off when auditors received unsatisfactory explanations for \$200,000 to \$300,000 in war on poverty spending. After spending several million dollars in war on poverty funds, and two separate community action agencies having failed in Syracuse, it is interesting to note the Office of Economic Opportunity is tooling up a third prospect for community action in that city.

NEWARK, N.J.

In September 1967, it was reported that Federal investigators were unable to account for an undetermined amount of money expended by the United Community Corp., Newark's community action agency. Interestingly, the UCC director accused the Office of Economic Opportunity of failing to monitor the funds of UCC.

BRONX, N.Y.

In March of this year, a Bronx, N.Y., minister was indicted for stealing over \$20,000 in antipoverty funds. The minister, director of a summer antipoverty project, who was accused of demanding

and accepting kickbacks, had been paying himself \$200 a week; his father \$150 a week, his mother \$100 a week; and his sister \$175 a week. This director paid out a total of \$3,125 in salaries to himself and family over a 5-week period.

Mr. Chairman, can we be expected to believe that the poor are benefiting from this kind of antipoverty program?

SHREVEPORT, LA.

In September 1967, an audit of the Community Action Program of Caddo and Bossier Parishes, Inc., La., disclosed \$101,016 in costs were termed "questionable." The audit disclosed the following:

First. Personnel files were not kept by the agency during the period of the audit.

Second. Inadequate accounting and safeguarding of funds.

Third. Inadequate documentation of payroll costs and property.

Fourth. Failure to use prescribed contracts for consultant and professional services.

Fifth. Failure to keep time and attendance records for some employees.

NORFOLK, VA.

In September 1967, the FBI in Norfolk, Va., commenced an investigation of shortages of about \$10,000 in war on poverty funds of the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project—STOP—in Norfolk, Va. The director of the Headstart program involved had refused to turn over his books for audit for several weeks prior to his resignation.

NEW YORK CITY

In August 1967, it was announced that the New York City controller's office would again look into the tangled fiscal operations of Haryou-Act. A previous report found Haryou-Act owed the Federal Government \$199,732 plus interest in unpaid withholding taxes, and that \$600,764 was owed to commercial creditors.

Mr. Chairman, I have summarized some of the cases of boondoggling and diversion of antipoverty funds that have come to my attention. These are instances that have been detected. I cannot help but wonder how many countless others continue to siphon off taxpayers' money that was intended for the poor.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Sar Levitan, in a consultant report prepared for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty—August 1967—included the following regarding the Neighborhood Youth Corps program:

The requirement that sponsors contribute only 10 percent of costs which may be made in kind presents a serious problem about the effectiveness of the program, particularly in connection with out-of-school projects. Agencies which provide jobs—work stations or work opportunities in the parlance of the program—secured the NYC labor at minimal or no cost and have little incentive to provide productive or meaningful work. They may therefore offer only marginal employment opportunities. This appears significant in connection with the out-of-school projects. On the other hand, it is not at all clear that NYC would be in a position to find a sufficient number of sponsors if the latter would have to share significantly in the actual costs of running the projects. The fact that NYC labor is for all practical purposes free labor

to the sponsors and the cooperating agencies may be a serious impediment to achieving a major goal of the program, requiring that "meaningful" work be given to the enrollees.

The crucial test of the effectiveness of the in-school program is whether it provides sufficient incentives so that enrollees complete their high school education. Thus far no conclusive data have been developed on this point.

A sample study by NYC showed that the bulk of the 1966 summer enrollees (98 percent) attended school prior to enrolling for a summer project and that 96 percent of the participants returned to school in the fall. The extent to which enrollment in NYC projects influenced return to school is not known. The study observed that "counseling and remedial education were largely ineffectual or nonexistent in many projects visited." The survey also suggested that "the NYC summer program still is not an effective vehicle for attracting young dropouts back to school." The same study showed that one of every four enrollees dropped out of the project before completion. But the same proportion of this group returned to school as those who stayed with their projects until termination.

The goal of developing new careers and equipping disadvantaged youth who missed the opportunity at school is noble and in line with our democratic traditions. However, the more pressing need of these youth is to secure a job which would provide them at least minimum support. The out-of-school NYC program fulfills for many enrollees this immediate need, but it is misleading to claim that it does more than that. NYC performs a more useful function as an "aging vat," helping youths when it is most difficult for them to find employment. The rationale of NYC as an "aging vat" is based on the fact that unemployment rates among youths decline as they mature from teenagers into adulthood. There is room, therefore, for a program which would provide youth with some income and work during their early years in the labor force.

The positive reaction of former enrollees must be weighed against the early departure of the majority and the fact that nearly 2 of every 5 who found jobs did not use NYC as a reference. In addition, nearly 5 of every 6 enrollees thought that they would need additional education or training to meet their occupational goals. Whether they possess the ability and motivation to realize their goals is not known, but if they are to have a chance it will be necessary to develop the institutional arrangements and adequate support to help them fulfill their goals.

A Neighborhood Youth Corps—NYC—sponsor included in his testimony before the House hearings descriptions of work classifications for NYC enrollees. This list included library aides, custodian aides, playground attendants, remedial education aides, Headstart aides, and indicated these jobs were for in-school and out-of-school youth. From the description provided, some of these sound like very useful and helpful jobs for in-school youth to learn to take on responsibilities, but do not provide any potential impact on the status of out-of-school youths who need to have skill training for meaningful jobs.

Sar Levitan testified regarding make-work jobs at the hearings:

A major problem of NYC has been that most enrollees were assigned to "make work" projects. The public and nonprofit agencies that sponsor the vast majority of programs contribute only 10 percent of the cost of a project which can be made in kind. In most cases, NYC labor is free labor. As a result, it is not surprising that NYC enrollees are fre-



quently assigned to perform only marginal work. Requiring public and nonprofit agency sponsors to increase their contributions in hard cash might improve the situation. I am not at all sure, however, that many areas which need NYC the most could or would raise more funds to finance NYC projects.

A study of National Analysts, Inc., of the NYC, which involved interviews of NYC and non-NYC youths, found that among those youths of NYC age and eligibility, except those who were currently enrolled—

The attitudes toward the NYC are grossly negative, primarily because the salary is seen as too low and the status of the jobs they perform is very low.

Mr. Wirtz testified that 32 percent of the out-of-school enrollees have been filling education and clerical aide jobs; 8 percent health occupations; and 22 percent working to increase recreation facilities and conserve our natural resources.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in an evaluation of the NYC, found several deficiencies in the program:

A reduction in high school dropout rates and job placement of former enrollees will be the final measure of success of the NYC. As of this date, neither the Labor Department nor the OEO maintain regular follow-up records of past enrollees . . . Follow-up is conducted as long and as well as the sponsor is financially able—which in most cases means not at all.

Even with the little follow-up information available, it is evident, by the Labor Department's own admission, that NYC is not measuring up to the final yardstick of attaining jobs and providing the training leading to jobs. The main reason is that the work does not normally provide enrollees with salable skills and, therefore, does little to increase the youths' chances for employment. Equally important is the need to couple meaningful work with basic education.

The chamber of commerce concluded:

It appears that the in-school program has functioned well towards accomplishing its goal of giving disadvantaged youths the means by which they can continue their education. Out-of-school programs has suffered, by the Labor Department's own admission, from a failure to provide enough remedial education and direct training in job skills.

#### IN THE PAST

Last year one of our major criticisms of the NYC was the small percentage of enrollees receiving any form of remedial education or vocational training. The Office of Education testified at the 1966 House hearings that only 20 percent of all enrollees and only 10 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving any such education or training assistance. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz confirmed this and admitted he was not satisfied. Since the intent of the Congress in legislating the out-of-school program was to enable high school dropouts to return to school or to provide them with meaningful vocational training on which to build a career, we are, like Mr. Wirtz, totally dissatisfied. It was felt much of the problem was created by the Economic Opportunity Act itself, which barred the participation of private, profitmaking firms, leaving the enrollees to be placed in make-work jobs with local governments or nonprofit agencies. For this

reason, Congress last year amended NYC legislation to permit private, profitmaking employers to participate in the NYC.

We returned to the 1967 House hearings and we were disappointed to learn that only four projects involving private employers had been approved, which included a mere 164 enrollees out of 25,000 total enrollment. And when asked again this year, "How many enrollees were receiving any remedial education or vocational training during fiscal 1967?" Mr. Wirtz said that 30 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving remedial or vocational education training. So it appears that 70 percent of all out-of-school NYC enrollees; at \$2,930 apiece, are still in make-work jobs and receiving no remedial education or vocational training.

#### COSTS AND NEEDS: OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The cost per enrollee in the out-of-school NYC program is estimated by the Labor Department for fiscal 1968 to be \$3,050. The Labor Department has also estimated the universal need for this program or the total youths who are eligible as 660,000. They have also stated the projection for fiscal 1968 will only cover 10 percent of this need for the program.

If the Industry Youth Corps were adopted with private industry paying three-fourths of the wage, the number of youths who could be reached would more than triple and for the same amount of money approximately 225,000 or roughly one-third of the estimated need for this program could be filled.

There are numerous signs that private business and industry are ready and willing to take on training programs and to help train and upgrade unemployables. A recent Business Week article says that in the wake of the summer riots, companies are accelerating current programs, initiating new ones, and revising hiring policies. William F. X. Flynn, head of the National Association of Manufacturers—NAM, said that after this summer "we found companies impatient to move faster." For example, in Detroit, between 7,000 and 10,000 ghetto residents were hired by auto companies since the riots. In Baltimore, over 1,000 ghetto residents have trained in a crash employment program initiated by area companies last August. Ford Motor Co. has even created a top-level department of urban affairs.

An official of the U.S. Gypsum Co., presently involved in a rehabilitation project, says:

We're going along, not with the expectation of a great profit, but to demonstrate that private industry does have a role and responsibility. We are beginning to feel a deep-seated involvement that can't be measured in return to stockholders.

The article also notes that many companies have begun hiring people who cannot begin to compete with whites. Many realize the old rules and practices may be screening out potentially competent people. Numerous Government officials likewise see the need for private participation.

I could list indefinitely some of the excellent training programs which are

being operated by private firms without the help of Federal funds. A few of these programs are:

In Manhattan, the Chase Manhattan Bank has launched a training program for potential high school dropouts. Trainees receive individual counseling, attend lectures, take field trips to banking and investment institutions, and work 3 hours a day at \$1.86 an hour for as long as 21 months. Most of the students who have completed the course are now full-time employees.

In Chicago, Carson Pirie Scott, the big department store, is conducting another education-training program for actual or would-be dropouts. Two students fill a single job: while one works, the other attends school. Since 1961, when the program began, the work-study idea has spread to 31 Chicago companies.

In Racine, the J. I. Case Co. is helping dozens of potential dropouts to finish high school by employing them as part-time trainees in a wide variety of fields.

In Rochester, N.Y., the Xerox Corp. last year launched a 19-week training program for unemployed men, many of whom had police records and were not more than functionally literate. Trainees are given classroom instruction, informal counseling, remedial reading, arithmetic, and job training.

In Wilmington, Del., Du Pont has been training workers in 14 job categories from carpenter to chemical operator. Since 1959, 15,000 employees have completed more than 45,000 courses and Du Pont now is offering its series of 110 programmed courses to other companies as well.

It has been estimated that private industry spent between \$4.5 and \$20 billion a year just on job training alone. If this resource could be tapped adequately, this country would be well on the road to removing from poverty all of those except the disabled and aged.

Further examples of private training programs extend to the Yellow Cab Co., in Chicago; the National Cash Register Co.; the American Machine & Foundry Co., in York, Pa.; Monogram Industries of Los Angeles; Eastern Airlines; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; the New York Telephone Co., and endless others.

The companies I have listed are large firms with hundreds and thousands of employees. These firms can well afford to hire disadvantaged and unemployable youths and upgrade them "out of the goodness of their heart"; but there is a vast area in the business world of those employers who do not hire so many employees and cannot afford great risks or cannot afford the loss that would come about by taking on the training of such youths. It is for this reason that we propose a 25-percent wage subsidy to these employers who would be able to contract with the local community action agencies with a minimum of redtape for the training and employment of these youngsters.

A Christian Science Monitor article on August 16, 1967, indicated hundreds of letters had been received by the Secretary of Commerce giving reasons why medium-sized and smaller companies did



not desire to take part in summer employment programs this year. The article stated that largely these people complained about new labor legislation, especially the increase in minimum wage from \$1.25 to \$1.40 and to the hard line insistence of the Government that the summer employees be paid the minimum wage. Some examples are:

**From an Oklahoma manufacturer:**

With your government regulation indicating a minimum of \$1.40 per hour it is ridiculous for us to consider such a program. On one hand you ask us to hire a youth opportunity worker and on the other hand you tell us we would have to pay \$1.40 per hour for work that would not be worth more than \$.50 per hour. Therefore, to us your program is impractical and ridiculous.

**From a construction company in Wisconsin:**

We are very sorry that we cannot support this campaign for one of many reasons. The laws are such that it is almost impossible to teach the youth to help themselves. . . . I think your Youth Opportunity Campaign would be overwhelming if you would also add to it a youth opportunity campaign to give young Americans a chance to work with various companies such as ours and others at the minimum wage which would give them an incentive and an interest to prove their ability that they could help themselves.

**From a motion picture theater owner in Arkansas:**

You are asking for work—we are begging for workers. Something must be wrong. Last year high-school students, working part time for us in the spring, quit in the summer to take government "hand out jobs"—because they "got paid more money and had to do nothing," as they told us.

Vice President HUMPHREY recently called for the partnership between free enterprise and Government in meeting any public needs, and said profit incentives should be used to the maximum possible extent to involve private enterprise in the solution of urban problems. He has also stated:

The Federal Government was not omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent enough to meet the challenges of the war against racial discrimination, unemployment, and inadequate training. The challenge cannot be met efficiently or adequately without the initiative, the investment, creative imagination, the flexibility, the capacity to work out details of specific problems that are the hallmark of a free enterprise system.

Mr. Don Hummel, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has commented:

Government can urge, stimulate and offer opportunities, but only if we involve the dynamic forces of our civic and commercial organizations can we expect to make the progress that our cities so urgently require.

Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner suggested at a Business Council meeting in Hot Springs, Va., recently that tax concessions and grants from the Government as inducement to business to apply itself to the war on poverty.

Mitchell Ginsberg, head of the New York City poverty program, at the same time suggested subsidies for employers who train the poor; for example, making up the difference in worth and salary.

Testimony on Industry Youth Corps—House Hearings on poverty program:

Dr. SAR LEVITAN. I also think that H.R. 10682 would strengthen the Neighborhood Youth Corps by subsidizing private employers to hire disadvantaged youth, providing 25 percent of the enrollees wages. The 1966 amendment permitted private employers to sponsor NYC projects, but would only reimburse them for training costs to NYC youths. H.R. 10682 would provide a further subsidization.

Extending NYC to private employers should help. As long as a private employer must pay at least 75 percent of the youths' wages, it is unlikely that he would hire NYC youth unless he has use for their services. The proposal in H.R. 10682 should help to provide enrollees with "meaningful work," a major objective of the legislation. The 25 percent wage subsidization to the employer is not necessarily a gift. Hiring and keeping deficiently educated workers involves extra expenses to the employer, and the reimbursement would assist responsible employers to defray the added costs of employing youths qualified for NYC help.

As I suggested earlier, placing NYC enrollees with private employers who would pay at least 75 percent of total wages is more likely to provide useful work than the present sponsors. Five years of experience with MDTA and other manpower programs have provided Government officials with adequate expertise to monitor projects supported by the Government in private businesses.

**Mr. Joseph Dyer, former director of Connecticut State OEO:**

Mr. QUIE. What about the involvement of private industry? In opportunity crusade we recommend an Industrial Youth Corps. Presently the Neighborhood Youth Corps is available only from private or nonprofit organizations or institutions.

We propose similar to the on-the-job training that the Industry Youth Corps would function so that the young people would find employment and training in business establishments themselves, and as an incentive the Federal Government would give 25 percent of the wage, as compared to 90 percent in the case of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

How do you feel such a program could function?

Mr. DYER. I am a great believer that the answer we need is pay power. That is one good way of getting it, that industry might properly be subsidized as it is on-the-job training for the training of workers. That is where we want then, on a real paying job and not on a public roll.

Mr. QUIE. In this case, do you feel that the Community Action agencies could play a role in bringing the needy poor from the ghettos those 16 to 22 years of age that would be in the Industry Youth Corps, and bus these together?

Mr. DYER. Definitely. I think it is wonderful. I can give an example, too, of something like that.

The Urban League in Hartford went to the chamber of commerce and the Community Renewal team, which is the poverty agency, and said: "Let us get together and do something about summer jobs." The community renewal team with the Urban League, which does some of its manpower, got with the chamber of commerce, and there are 200 young people in Hartford this summer working because of the cooperation of community action groups with the chamber of commerce.

Mr. QUIE. So they actually worked right in private industry?

Mr. DYER. That is correct. It is tremendous.

**Mayor J. D. Braman, of Seattle testified:**

Mr. QUIE. The Opportunity Crusade provides the added assistance to the employer of paying the salary of the youth for 1 year at a period of time when the youth is not capable of fulfilling or doing work which would be worth the full amount of the wage.

How do you feel about this program in Seattle?

Mr. BRAMAN. I think it would work very well in Seattle. It has been my feeling that the best way to achieve training is to put a man on the job where he has the dignity of working and earning a wage but at the same time is learning.

As a longtime employer myself I recognize that we cannot expect employing units, most of whom are operating these days on rather narrow margins, to reduce the present efficiency of their work force and take on people who produce less than the value of the stipend they receive without some kind of compensation.

Louise Kapp, the editor of the American Child quarterly, after a thorough study of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, commented:

There is, an undisputed need to involve more private employers in the program, both in training and in employing the enrollees.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, psychologist-educator-humanitarian, has said:

Business should be provided by the government with incentives for realistic participation of private capital investment.

MR. ROBIE

Mr. Edward Robie, vice president, Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, testified before our committee on behalf of the Industry Youth Corps and told us about a program which his company has been operating for some time. Mr. Robie said in their current project they have hired 20 dropouts for lowest level jobs, such as messengers, Xerox operators, et cetera. They arranged through contract with the board of fundamental education for two instructors to teach classes 2 hours a night, 4 nights a week, at a cost of approximately \$700 per year. Their goal was to achieve high school equivalency. Eleven of the 20 stuck it out and will have reasonably good careers with the company. Mr. Robie stated the dropouts of this group compared with the turnover of a random sampling of high school graduates.

Mr. Robie said Equitable found the girl dropouts needed less fundamental education than the boys did, and they could put these girls into their regular typing and steno training, and noted Equitable trains most of their typists and stenographers themselves. He said the toughest problem in the ghettos is on the part of the boys.

Mr. Robie stated the problem with hiring these youths was they could not produce enough to warrant the minimum salary. Such hiring would result in all financial loss and no incentive. Mr. Robie estimated the cost for the supplemental education in the Industry Youth Corps program would be approximately \$700 each, or about 25 percent of the wage level. He also said there was not enough in it to get competitive advantage.

Mr. Robie thought it would cost any employer a little something, even with the subsidy, but he said most employers want to help, they are proud of their communities and want to better them. He mentioned others doing this or similar experimentation are Prudential, Connecticut General of Hartford, Eastman Kodak, Xerox, and Owens of Illinois. However, he felt there was a need to get



smaller business people involved because the big employers have fewer and fewer of these jobs as they are automating these positions out of existence. He said he thinks the jobs and work in smaller business are there and this avenue has a good chance opening it up.

#### EMPLOYEE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Program Dynamics Associates, of Houston, Tex., has developed an in-plant employee basic education program with the cooperation of Diamond Alkali Co. in Houston. This program is being used widely and is recommended by NAM. NAM has also come up with a programmed instruction course known as MIND, which has had outstanding results. In a stenographic course in New York using the MIND technique, after 6 weeks all of those enrolled had gained a typing speed of 65 words per minute, all of them had jobs, and it cost NAM only \$25 each to make them employable.

#### COORDINATION WITH STATES

Directors of State technical assistance agencies—STA's—held a conference in Washington this summer at which a position paper was drawn up and signed by all but two of the directors present. Some suggestions in this position paper were:

First. That the State agencies should be permitted to submit an annual State plan for expenditure of funds in concert with the Federal, regional, and local OEO, and consultation between State and regional or national OEO should take place before funds are granted or approved in any State.

Second. STA's should be included in OEO's checkpoint procedures relating to all OEO programs and that the STA's be involved with the OEO, regional and community action agencies in developing evaluation procedures.

Voluminous testimony at the hearings and numerous letters and comments from STA directors indicate the present State role is not great enough, that State agencies presently have no say in the allocation of funds within a State. The regional offices of OEO make such allocations taking no effort either to provide an equitable distribution of the money to the poor over the State or to concentrate it in the areas where most needed.

I shall relate some of this excellent testimony at the hearings:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. DYER, FORMER DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, STATE OF CONNECTICUT

I am a 33-month veteran of the Poverty War, appointed by Governor John N. Dempsey, with a mandate to insure that federal poverty dollars coming into Connecticut were properly spent. I have attempted, with a staff of four, to play watch-dog on funds coming to individual communities, agencies and institutions, amounting to nearly 33 million dollars.

I am known as a curmudgeon within the OEO, and it is to their credit I have been tolerated. However, I am like the pebble that is an irritant to the oyster, but which results in making a pearl.

This is internal criticism—they are the words of one dedicated to what OEO has stood for these past three years—if it was not for the ramrod efforts of this fledgling agency. It has been creative—it has been stimulating to traditional agencies—it has

probed deeply what has been hidden for so very long.

My criticism, coming from the inside, should be recognized as an honest effort to prevent its dissolution from the outside.

Under the terms of the present Economic Opportunity Act, a State Technical Assistance Officer has little muscle to impose regulations, has no responsibility for evaluating results, and is considered as an afterthought by most OEO Washington and Regional Office personnel.

*Mark this:* There has never been a formal calling together of the 50 State Technical Assistance Directors; despite the pleas of many of the directors in New England, we have never been called together in the Region I Office in New York.

The sole strength we have to control local poverty spending is a Governor's veto (which can be over-ridden by the National Director) and the public informational media. I say: Thank God for the public press. It has enabled us to somewhat control those who wish only to wage a sham battle instead of a war. It has enabled us to disclose those with a lukewarm approach to a cancerous poverty monster that is eating at the vitals of our state and nation; the press has enabled us in Connecticut to thwart those who would downgrade politics by seeking control of poverty positions; it has drawn attention to the salary schedules which this Congress thankfully limited with its amendments at the last session.

The Connecticut press has been laudatory when the occasion demanded; it has helped us by being constructively critical when we were attempting to prevent boondoggling.

As you can see, to operate with only this kind of authority is to invite overpowering by those who know how palpably weak we are.

I urge you to consider thoughtfully the strengthening of the State's hand in this attempt to eliminate poverty; I urge you to make true the words of President Johnson, who, in a directive to the former Governor of Florida, Farris Bryant, his present director of the Office of Emergency Planning, said this: "To the fullest practical extent I want you to take steps to afford representatives of the Chief Executives of state and local government the opportunity to advise and consult in the development and execution of programs which directly affect the conduct of state and local affairs. The present OEO operation is far afield of the President's directive. For example, no contact was made with any Connecticut state official regarding the allocation of Connecticut's share of the \$75 million is special money this Congress appropriated in May for special summer programs. Our state was accorded \$235,000 in five locations. This same allocation, in our opinion, to a large number of localities might have more properly attained the ends you seek.

The following colloquy took place after Mr. Dyer's testimony:

Mr. QUIE. I understand from your testimony, Mr. Dyer, that you are concerned about the fact that you and the State office are not informed about community action grants that have been approved in Community Action agencies throughout the State of Connecticut. Is that right?

Mr. DYER. Not that we have not been informed that they have grants, but that we are not consulted by the regional office in regard to grants.

Mr. QUIE. You say that no contact was made with any Connecticut official regarding the allocation of \$75 million which Congress appropriated for the special summer program—

Mr. DYER. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. You are not involved in the coordination of the expenditure of this money in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. DYER. That is correct. The first notice

we had was that they wanted advance approval by the Governor. The Governor does not like to give advanced approval unless he has seen what he is approving.

We immediately informed New York that this was the first we knew of it and that until we had the papers in our hands that had been submitted to them and could look at them and make sure that they were all right, we would not give advance approval.

So, then, eventually we got the papers in our hands. We had no say either as to which cities in Connecticut should be given special funds.

It is my personal opinion that if we had been consulted, we might have distributed the same amount of money to a larger number of communities than the way it was distributed.

Mr. QUIE. What about distribution to the areas of greatest need? Have you been able to evaluate after the grants were made whether they actually went to the areas of greatest need, in your estimation?

Mr. DYER. We have repeatedly given information to the regional office in New York of areas that we think should have more money.

Chairman PERKINS. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield? I want to make sure I understand the response to the question.

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Chairman PERKINS. Did I understand the question you put to the witness is as to whether they were trying to scatter it evenly around the State, or in the areas of greatest need, and you asked the witness just how the disbursements were being made from the Office of Economic Opportunity? He has not answered that question.

Mr. QUIE. The question was that he suggested if they had been given some jurisdiction or coordination, they may have been able to be spread more, and more areas would have been reached.

My question is, really, Must there be more to it than reaching the areas of greatest need?

Mr. DYER. What I am saying is that I have repeatedly advised the New York regional office on areas that I feel should be given more attention.

I cannot say that the advice has been followed, because they make a predetermined listing versatile CAP funds without consultation with the State.

Mr. Robert Neal Smith, Wisconsin State OEO director, responded to Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

Mr. STEIGER. On page 6 of your testimony, you touch on the relationship of your office in the State with OEO and make the recommendation that the regional office give greater emphasis to prior recommendations by the State's technical assistance agency.

I concur and I am happy to see that in your statement. I think that is important. Would you generally say that there could be a greater effort underway to involve the TA's throughout the country to a much greater extent than they are now in this whole Federal-State-local partnership operation in the war on poverty?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. Generally speaking, over the past several years the regional Office of Economic Opportunity has exercised its own judgments by and large regarding any local CAP or single-purpose agency request. All too often the Governor's office is informed of a program that is being seriously considered or certain amendments to the contract or revisions in the proposals have been made, and we are then at the last moment via this telephone call expected to pass judgment almost immediately and approve the project application.

I think to the credit of OEO, this difficulty is not as bad as it was in previous fiscal years. However, I think a vast improvement could be made in this process. I must say that the present regional OEO Director



has invited me and the other State directors in the Great Lakes region to a meeting on Monday and Tuesday, at which time we will discuss some of these priorities.

The regional OEO office has often directed the operations of the antipoverty program in Wisconsin at variance with State advice. The regional OEO sitting in judgment upon CAP activities and developments in Wisconsin has not expressed the practical judgments needed to carry out a higher level of performance in our State.

At this point, all too often, the only information the Governor has on a project at the time he is asked to waive his 30-day review period is a telephone call. We believe in the OEO and its general administration of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Therefore, it is our advice that the funding of projects through the regional office pay greater emphasis to prior recommendations by the State TA agencies. The State TA is rarely asked to assist in planning new fiscal year approaches to the campaign against poverty. Priorities are similarly neglected. Also, State TA's should be funded on a formula basis.

I further believe the States and the Federal Government should require either through statute, Executive order, or Federal regulation that multipurpose physical, economic, and human resources planning and development agencies be established in non-metropolitan areas. I believe the Federal Government should provide grants and conditions so each State can divide its counties into logical single or multicounty areas.

Some counties in Wisconsin have already organized physical planning commissions with from five to seven counties within their geographical boundaries. How much better it would be if the entire State were organized with governing bodies, technical staff, and facilities to provide a comprehensive set of services for physical and social economic planning and development. Wisconsin intends to do much more along these lines.

#### VIEWS FROM THE STATES

One State director commented on the problem of coordination of various programs within the State:

The linkage between community action programs and work programs is tenuous at best, especially in the rural areas. The Office of Economic Opportunity has to be given muscle to effectively coordinate these programs with its own. Likewise, the State officials should be a critical point for this function, and it should be spelled out in the law.

E. R. Rankin, Jr., director, North Carolina Department of Administration, likewise complained that:

Federal antipoverty programs are usually prepared without any knowledge of the Governor and are submitted for the approval or disapproval of the Governor after public announcement in Washington that the OEO has approved the grant, or other Federal assistance.

Further concerned with the lack of coordination with the States, Mr. Rankin states:

The well-known OEO policy of ignoring and bypassing existing State and local governmental agencies has certainly not assisted in North Carolina's efforts to improve poverty and poverty conditions. Any long-term improvement in local community conditions must involve the existing agencies and local leadership in these agencies.

Another State director notes the nearly complete exclusion of the State from proposal review, and the lack of program evaluation by OEO:

Presently, a proposal, when submitted by the CAA to the regional office, is reviewed by

a regional analyst, who has the authority to add or delete from the component. This practice in almost all cases goes on without consultation with the State TA. The local community, thus sensing that the ultimate responsibility for the success of their proposal rests with a regional analyst, turns to the regional office for assistance. In all too many instances, the analyst encourages the local community to obviate the STA. This dual service leads inevitably to confusion and mistrust.

At present, the evaluation of funded programs is not required. Thus, proposals are refunded without a knowledge on the part of the reviewer if the program was effective and meaningful to the lives of the disadvantaged. It is conceivable that good money is supporting ineffective programs.

The following letter from Governor LeVander of Minnesota not only provides an excellent statement of the plight of the States under present policies of OEO, but also furnishes realistic alternatives that we think would immeasurably strengthen community action and other poverty programs:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
St. Paul, Minn., April 18, 1967.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUITE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I am most grateful for your letter of April 13 and the copy of the news release outlining your proposed "Republican Opportunity Crusade" to inject new life into the faltering poverty program.

Public reaction to your proposed changes is generally quite favorable, and even enthusiastic in some quarters. However, there are many who are confused—and have been led to believe that your plan for new direction and new vitality in the program is really an effort to discontinue Federal programs for the poor. This is unfortunate, and you might consider another release stressing your concern for redirection and realistic administration of antipoverty programs in order to restore confidence and respect of the American public and those who should be benefiting from these expenditures.

Of particular importance is the development of sound administration, new direction, and new vitality for the poverty programs and the establishment of sound management and direction so desperately needed by the local CAP councils.

Actually, here in Minnesota, the Governor's office of economic opportunity is the "Governor's" in name only. The State OEO office "dangles" haplessly, between the local CAP councils and the regional office, doing housekeeping chores, providing routine assistance to CAP councils, with no real authority to act. Only out-State (rural) OEO programs in Minnesota are under the Governor's OEO office. As you know, metropolitan programs in the Twin Cities, Indian programs on reservations, and special service programs funded with earmarked moneys require my approval (waiver). As Governor, I have neither control nor authority over the programs once they are operational. Similarly, programs of local community action councils require executive approval (waiver), but regulations provide no real basis for authority by the State over the council actions once the funds and the projects have had approval from the regional office.

As part of your proposal for reestablishment and rejuvenation of these programs for the poor through the opportunity crusade concept, there is great need to strengthen the State's position in administration of the programs and in allocation of funds. Ideally, allocation and utilization of funds should be handled by a designated State office responsible to the Governor. This office, operating with a combination of State and Federal

funds, and working with local communities and community action councils would make determination of programs and projects based on local needs, with specific goals and purpose.

There is, as your proposal indicates, need to lift the philosophy and attitudes of the program and the people involved to a "positive" rather than negative approach.

There is need for more imaginative programs keyed to local needs. With funding approval centered in a regional office by people who have no familiarity with an area or its problems, it becomes almost impossible to get acceptance of a special, imaginative program that is different than the standard. This, in itself, defeats the purpose of the community action concept and results in the sameness of programs throughout the State.

Under present administrative procedures, the regional office in Chicago now handles the function of funding and approving programs, completely bypassing the State office. It certainly would be desirable to amend the act and/or regulations to allow funds for administration and programs to be granted directly to the State. With the funds, there should also be requirement that local CAP councils meet minimum standards in administrative procedures, bookkeeping, management and other criteria to insure proper utilization of funds in keeping with the intent of the law. States desiring to administer the programs should be required to meet certain criteria such as:

- (1) A demonstrated knowledge of the goals and philosophy of the act based on past performance;
- (2) Full compliance with civil rights legislation;
- (3) Adequate staff to give technical assistance to CAP councils;
- (4) A demonstrated ability to write, suggest, and evaluate programs to meet specific needs;
- (5) A continuous evidence of interest in helping low-income people improve their position;
- (6) A demonstrated understanding and willingness to have liaison with the programs of other State and Federal agencies, so as to avoid costly overlapping, duplicating effort;
- (7) A willingness to communicate and furnish public information to the community, the State, and Federal agencies pursuant to the operation of the Technical Assistance Office and/or any CAP council under its jurisdiction.

It is to the best interests of the Governors of all States that the community action programs which go on in their States be more responsive to the needs within the State. It is unfair to ask a Governor to agree to participation in a program, to whatever limits, without his having any authority in the matter. The various State technical assistance offices at present, along with the various Governors' offices, are in the middle and with the planning outlined above, this could all be changed for the good of the program in the State involved.

Similarly, antipoverty programs on Indian reservations are inadequately supervised and potentially explosive. The programs on Indian reservations are funded directly from the Indian Desk in Washington, but I hold the responsibility of approval or disapproval—not really knowing precisely what is being approved. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity both stand on the sidelines with no actual authority over the programs or administration of the CAP councils on Indian reservations \* \* \*. Modifications in the act or regulations to provide each Governor greater jurisdiction over the antipoverty programs on Indian reservations in his State is imperative toward accomplishing the goals outlined in your "Opportunity Crusade" proposal.



As of mid-March, Minnesota had received \$40,497,212 in antipoverty funds since the initial grants were made to Hennepin and Ramsey Counties in December 1964. The seven Indian reservations in Minnesota have received \$5,908,130 since the start of these OEO programs for Indians.

There is great need for guidance in the development of meaningful programs on the reservations which will result in better utilization of these funds, and to provide programs of a more lasting effect than most of the projects now being funded.

Please accept my good wishes that your proposals for a new "Opportunity Crusade" will result in new and vigorous programs that are both meaningful and effective.

Kindest personal regards,

Cordially,

HAROLD LEVANDER,  
Governor.

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF CAP

The newspapers daily reveal to us that the community action programs need new direction if they are to make a dent in the basic problems of the poor.

Following are samplings of various articles which have appeared concerning the effectiveness of poverty programs:

CHICAGO.—"It just seems to keep growing and growing, but nobody outside of the CCUO (Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity) office knows what's going on. The efficiency of the poverty program is in doubt because of the whole obscurity of what they are doing."—Ald. Jack Sperling.

LAREDO.—An OEO, Austin, program analyst stated that regional OEO had determined "the poor are not getting their money's worth."

MILWAUKEE.—The director of an inner city development project commented: "The project is doing many fine things. But the root causes of poverty—we're not scratching the surface."

CINCINNATI.—Father William A. Sicking, during a congressional hearing concerning the Cincinnati antipoverty program said: "The poor laugh at the poverty programs, consider them 'pie in the sky' efforts and feel that they accomplish little real good."

DENVER.—John J. Herrera, board chairman of SER (Service, Employment, Redevelopment) wrote to Michael C. Moore, DO (Denver Opportunity, Inc.): "It is not so much the \$20,000 that we have asked in our last three proposals since December of 1966, but the principle of not being able to negotiate with you, so powerful, way up in your ivory tower." Herrera said: "We don't feel that Moore is working with our people. We haven't had the communications we feel we should get."

COLUMBUS.—Monsignor Hugh Murphy, a leader in Joint Organization for Inner-City Needs (JOIN) took CMACAO (Columbus Metropolitan Community Action Organization) to task for "senseless duplication of already existing programs." He stated, "Aside from the one obvious benefit of providing for the CMACAO staff, the poor in Columbus find little evidence of any effective antipoverty program."

INDIANAPOLIS.—An evaluation report of the local CAAP program charged that the program is: "Uncertain about its goals, fails to be democratic. Has board and staff members who are confused in their attitudes and uninformed about the program. Has an executive director in whom many have lost confidence. Noting that the report is 'direct and sometimes harsh,' in its evaluation of the program the firm added, 'To be less than candid would hardly be a service to those residents of Indianapolis who live in poverty.' CAAP does possess the 'imagination, the capacity and the commitment' to develop effective community action in the poverty war, the report said."

DETROIT.—Paul Masseron, who directed a report on the Wayne County OEO by Urban Research Coordinators, Inc., said the report was not optimistic. "Serious problems have existed at every step of the development of the Wayne County OEO programs."

BUFFALO.—"The Federal Government has provided \$327,290 in antipoverty funds into Orleans County in little over a year, but only 15 percent of the 3,100 poor, including migrant labor, have benefited from it."

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, in his in-depth study of 12 community action agencies, which included exploratory research in 53 other cities, noted that in the first 2 years of their work, "Most programs studied were either partly or wholly ineffective" in terms of the criteria which he felt characterized an effective community action agency. He found that—

Most programs were not directed to community action at all, but to traditional social service welfare benevolence alleviating some of the conditions of poverty but not addressing themselves to the abolition of poverty itself.

Mr. Clark finally concluded:

Federally financed community action programs have so far not resulted in many observable changes in the predicament of the poor and indeed that the programs generally are likely to reinforce the dependency and the powerlessness of the poor. In no case has effectiveness of program or change in the conditions of the poor been applied as a criterion for Federal support.

The following newspaper account relates the results of Kirschner Associates' evaluation of community action programs in various cities:

POOREST NOT BEING REACHED: SPECIAL SURVEY  
HITS 16 POVERTY CENTERS

(By Douglas Eldridge)

A special survey has found that neighborhood antipoverty centers in Newark and 16 other communities have largely failed to reach or help the hard-core poor.

The unpublished study, made by a private consulting firm for the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), is the first national evaluation of the neighborhood centers—a key feature of antipoverty activity here and in many cities.

The researchers found that the centers do provide new jobs and expanded social services, but conceded "most of the poor have no involvement whatsoever" in the antipoverty outposts.

#### SUCCESS SMALL

The report also declares:

"Success is very small in terms of the total numbers of persons to be reached, the quality of these contacts and the extent to which hard-core poor are being drawn to center operations."

And the survey team also claims it found "very skimpy" evidence that the centers are making any headway toward their two major goals—coordination of scattered social services and organization of the poor for basic social change.

It was learned from the OEO in Washington that the 70-page report is based on research last summer in Newark, Phillipsburg and 15 communities in other states. The report was prepared by Kirschner Associates of Albuquerque, N.M., after inspection of 20 centers and interviews with more than 500 officials and poor people across the country.

#### GENERAL TERMS

However, all the findings in the Kirschner report are in general terms. There is no mention of Newark or other cities, and no comparison of specific centers.

An OEO spokesman said cities and centers of various sizes and types were chosen for

the survey. They are not named in the report, he said, because OEO wanted "an assessment of a national program . . . not a long, drawn-out debate" over the performance of individual agencies.

The Kirschner researchers examined Area Board 2 (Operation We Care) of the United Community Corp. at 415 Springfield Ave., and the Phillipsburg center of Northwest New Jersey Community Action Program, Inc., a tri-county agency.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES URGED

The Kirschner firm says the neighborhood centers should be retained, but developed into independent agencies. As long as the centers are controlled by a citywide organization, says the report, neighborhood residents will have little real voice or interest in their programs.

In Newark, the UCC has been planning for some time to turn its eight area boards into separate, independent corporations.

Kirschner's other findings may have broad implications for UCC, which earlier this month decided to channel half of all future federal aid into the neighborhood centers. This means the area boards in Newark will get about \$1 million this year alone—about four times more than last year.

The researchers said many of the centers are too new or their records too spotty for any final judgment on their worth. But the report offers these observations:

#### INCOMPATIBLES

Most of the centers have been unable to combine two "mutually incompatible" tasks—mobilizing the poor to demand social change while assembling traditional employment, education, health, welfare and recreation services under one roof.

The centers have given help and fresh hope to some of the ablest of the poor. But those worst off "appear to be almost completely uninvolved as active participants in center programs."

Employment and other agencies have extended and improved their work through the centers, but "the result has not yet been an effective integration of effort to solve the problem of neighborhood poverty."

Many of the centers suffer from "internal disorganization and lack of an adequately trained staff." But those which are most businesslike and efficient have the least success in attracting the poor.

Employment of the poor at the centers is "well advanced and largely successful." But most of the poor people serving on staffs and boards were already active in the community before the War on Poverty.

Most of the centers are dominated either by the government-social agency "establishment" or by civil rights groups. In both situations the poor are discouraged from playing any role in making policy.

#### "REASONABLE COST"

In spite of all these misgivings, however, the research team concludes that a neighborhood center is still "an effective organizational device for reaching out to the poor, for engaging the participation of other neighborhood groups and local residents, and for changing existing organizations. For the most part these functions are being achieved at reasonable cost."

And the report claims the centers have made "a significant beginning in reaching at least one stratum of the poverty group."

While it does not refer to specific centers, the report criticizes those which put top priority on community organization—such as the UCC's area boards have done. Says Kirschner:

"Where community action is emphasized, a good deal of effort has been expended for what appear to be relatively minor results in the way of resident participation."

#### ISSUES AND INTEREST

Centers in big cities have had trouble finding issues and sustaining interest for any



SEPTEMBER 8, 1967.

long-term protest campaign, the report says. It notes that the centers "can blunt the aggressive impulses of the poor" by providing additional services and hiring some of the most outspoken leaders.

The result, it says, has been "a potpourri of rather fitful actions which are often ill timed and ill planned."

Kirschner researchers also found that all the centers in small communities—including, presumably, Phillipsburg—are "utterly devoid of anything resembling collective action" to change conditions.

But the report says the smaller centers sometimes offer a wider range of social services, and are often more inviting to the poor than the larger ones.

#### CONFUSION ON EMPHASIS

The report says there is "confusion at all levels" over whether the neighborhood units should stress social services or social action. "It is extremely rare to find both aggressive community action and well executed service programs within the same center," the report says.

It was also found that most of the poor who serve on neighborhood boards have been "inarticulate and ineffective," mainly because they lack the experience or the authority to deal with complex meetings and projects. Most of the board members find their work "unrewarding . . . futile and circumscribed," the report adds.

Some 80 per cent of those who use the centers want help with specific problems. Only 20 per cent are concerned with organizing to improve the community, the report found.

#### POOR POLLED

The Kirschner group also found that 46 per cent of those who used the center said they got nothing from them, while 15 per cent obtained jobs and 30 per cent received various services. Most of those who used the centers had learned of them from neighbors or door-to-door canvassers.

Donald Wortman, deputy assistant director of planning and research for the OEO in Washington, said the Kirschner report is considered important, but its effects are uncertain. The study is still being reviewed by OEO planners, he said.

The report was authorized by the federal agency last March at a cost of \$75,000. The research was done by three staff members of the consulting firm and 18 experts from various universities.

#### UCC REACTION

Officials of the UCC said they had talked with the researchers last summer, but have not seen the report. James Blair, program director and former head of community action for the Newark agency, said he agreed that the centers have not yet become fully effective.

Other communities in the survey include Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Washington, Houston, Tampa, Wichita and Chester, Pa.

#### LACK OF COORDINATION

During testimony before antipoverty hearings of the Education and Labor Committee, various comments were made concerning the lack of coordination in local CAP's, both in its own organization and with other agencies at a local level, probably one of the major reasons why CAP's are not effective. Some of these remarks follow:

Whitney M. Young, head of the Urban League, stated:

The attitude of the local CAP agency toward local existing agencies is also a factor frequently cited by Urban League executives as an obstacle to greater achievement in the War on Poverty. CAP programs are

very often seen as shutting out existing agencies and refusing to delegate programs to them. In some instances, CAP duplicates what existing agencies do, rather than buttressing independent efforts. There is a feeling, particularly in smaller communities, that the CAP program does not encourage participation by other community agencies.

Joseph Dyer, former director of the Connecticut State OEO, said:

We have been dismayed concerning the failure of Community Action groups to coordinate and cooperate with hundreds of volunteer groups in our state.

To attempt to fight poverty by ignoring the efforts of the many thousands of volunteers associated with church groups, youth groups, fraternal and civic organizations and the business sector has proved to be the greatest weakness of current Community Action in Connecticut. Proper use of volunteers will reduce costs and greatly enhance the spirit of dedication of paid staff members.

City Councilman John Held, of Cincinnati, asked permission to read a letter dated July 1967 from Lewis H. Evans, area manager of the Ohio State Employment Service, to the city manager of the city of Cincinnati. Mr. Held stated he wanted to show the lack of coordination or to indicate it, the lack of coordination between programs particularly manpower programs in the city of Cincinnati. The letter read:

DEAR MR. WICHMAN: You are no doubt aware of a public announcement appearing on Friday, July 7th, concerning the establishment of a "temporary labor exchange" involving cooperation of several job finding agencies which is to begin Monday at the Community Action Commission. The release indicated that plans have been worked out among four agencies, including the Ohio State Employment Service and contained a plea to all employers who have summer job openings to contact the Community Action Commission.

Our office was completely unaware of this arrangement prior to reading the announcement and did not participate in the planning.

The Cincinnati office of OSES, including the Youth Opportunity Center, began planning early this spring to participate in the President's campaign to secure summer employment for youths which was spearheaded by Vice President Humphrey. Much publicity attended the initiation of this campaign and included the mailing of hundreds of letters to local employers to solicit their active participation in the program and encourage them to list all their summer job openings with OSES. The program has been pursued diligently and, of course, is still in progress at the present time. We are also heavily involved in a permanent program of Human Resources Development (HRD), in which the full cooperation of other agencies and groups is not only heartily welcome but is mandatory if the desired results are to be achieved.

We are not in a position to delegate the responsibility assigned to our agency by the President of the United States and we consider the "temporary labor exchange" as a dilution of this nation-wide effort, a situation which we have constantly tried to avoid in Cincinnati and which surely can only work to the disadvantage of those whom we are obligated to serve.

The following letter was sent by Congressman GOODWIN to the Labor Department after receipt of a letter from a president of a Florida firm who cited his problems with local antipoverty officials:

Mr. ROBERT GOODWIN,  
Administrator,  
Bureau of Employment Security,  
U.S. Department of Labor,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: On September 6, 1967, Mr. Douglas P. Cone, President, Florida Prestressed Concrete Co., Inc., 6301 N. 56th Street, Tampa, Florida, furnished the following information to a staff investigator of the House Education and Labor Committee:

Florida Prestressed Concrete Co., Inc., and related companies are manufacturers of precast and prestressed concrete products in the State of Florida. The companies involved maintain a work force of 1300-1800. Generally the starting wage is \$1.60 per hour with automatic raises provided after a period of probation. Mr. Cone estimates an availability of 50 jobs per month for the Florida Prestressed Concrete Co., Inc.

Since early June of this year, Mr. Cone has attempted to set up with anti-poverty officials in the Tampa, Florida, area an arrangement that would coordinate efforts to provide prospective employees and trainees for his industry. To date, no satisfactory procedures have been developed.

It is disturbing to me and other members of the Congress to learn of the above situation and others similar to it. We are reminded daily that unemployment is one of the most pressing domestic problems and yet we hear frequently from prospective employers that are unable to find employees to fill job slots.

It will be appreciated if you will arrange for a responsible Labor Department representative to confer with Mr. Cone in the near future. I would further appreciate hearing from you when the matter has been assessed and provisions made to link up unemployed with job availabilities in Mr. Cone's companies.

With kindest regards, I am,  
Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

In a study for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Marshall Kaplan, a San Francisco economic and planning consultant, says:

Even if the local war on poverty had all the money in the world, they themselves could still not make a dent in needs of the poor without help from existing agencies.

The report criticized tension between the central office and target area boards jealous of their prerogatives:

Such tension is mostly responsible for the lack of a sorely needed program evaluation system.

According to an article in the October 10, 1967, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Register:

Local poverty officials are under federal pressure to improve working relationships with other agencies in the community.

Donald McKenzie, executive director, told the Executive Committee of the Polk County Community Action Council:

When we started out we were a knight in shining armor coming to slay all the dragons. Now we are becoming another agency that has to fit in with the other agencies. We are getting away from the period of reckless abandon and into more co-operation.

It is absolutely apparent the community action agencies must cooperate and coordinate with all agencies and sectors, especially the private business sector.

Joseph Dyer, former director, Connecticut State OEO, also sees this great need and testified before our committee:



Community Action boards working as a team should work more closely with the business community which has much to offer in the elimination of poverty. The emphasis of every Community Action group should be to achieve "paypower" for unemployed and underemployed. To operate without the cooperation of community business firms and labor unions is akin to working in a vacuum.

Dr. Frank Russman:

I would like to add on that that there are a number of firms now in the private sector that are quite interested in careerizing their operations. For example Shoprite Supermarkets are now developing a plan whereby a person can begin at the entry position and they are producing some new entry job positions and move up through on the job training and various kinds of other training mentioned by Dr. Fishman to move within the supermarket business to develop a whole career there.

I think this very much compliments the points you were making about this that there is no reason why this should remain in the public service sector.

#### EARMARKING OF PROGRAMS

During debate on the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 we warned that earmarking of funds under title II-A would impair the effectiveness of community action programs. Despite our pleas a bill was passed which provided that 60 percent of the funds—\$486.5 million—be allocated to specific, prepackaged programs. As we predicted, this formula resulted in priorities of programs at local levels which contrasted with the needs of respective communities.

The following statements of community action directors, 6 months after the bill was passed, reflect the feeling of knowledgeable antipoverty administrators:

Too often we are told by the OEO what to plan, in fact, given the plan and told to "sign here."

The long arm of Washington is reaching in with funds and telling us what to do.

Community Action programs have reached the turning point in whether they will live or die. There are those who say Community Action programs will not work and that local authority is being usurped by the earmarking of funds.

The key to the success of such programs is that they be geared to specific needs and that we maintain the local concept.

Mr. Clark said he would like to remind regional officials that St. Paul is not Chicago, not Detroit, or Omaha, but has its own unique problems and cannot be fitted into a mold.

"But we must also maintain the grassroots level. We have shown that it works and must continue our efforts to keep local autonomy," said Carlson.

We should be free within board policy lines to determine our own needs and perhaps, even make our own mistakes.

The OEO seems to have overlooked the fact that many communities—including St. Paul—have interwoven networks of agencies, many of which have pioneered efforts to abolish poverty.

In testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor, July 12, 1967, Shirley Tannenbaum, director, Frederick County, Md., CAP, stated:

Shortly after assuming the role of CAP Director (1966) the national picture began to change. Not only did Congress begin to cut appropriations, but it also began deciding what the funds should be used for (i.e., Headstart, Upward Bound, Legal Aid, etc.).

This seems to me to be a direct contradiction to the philosophy put forth the OEO and the original law which required maximum feasible participation of the poor and local determination of priorities.

It is conceivable that none including Headstart of the so-called canned programs may be applicable or seen as necessary by the poor themselves in some localities. \* \* \*

We were told that homemakers programs were low priority. Low priority to whom? In Frederick County it was high priority.

It seems to me that if the legislators want to earmark funds and decide on a national level what programs will get funds they should also eliminate the hypocrisy of getting representation of the poor. Why bother to ask them what they need and then say you can't have it because there are no funds allocated for that?

If this alternative is chosen, then OEO will become another dispenser of programs and services. Another bureaucratic empire will be built. But it will not eliminate poverty.

Despite a 1966 amendment which the Congress hoped would take politics out of the war on poverty, the OEO continues to allow the most obvious political abuses to flourish in antipoverty programs.

In Durham, N.C., this year, Operation Breakthrough—the community action agency—with the advice and consent of OEO officials, developed a highly professional vote delivering apparatus.

Again this year we find the Senate bill (S. 2388) earmarks 50 percent of the funds authorized for community action programs. We intend to oppose this provision of the Senate's bill and leave the funds free for local communities to establish their own priorities.

I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: During recent weeks, many of you have received a large number of letters complaining about the cutback of funds for community action agencies under Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act. The usual complaint points out that the Office of Economic Opportunity requires that money for the current fiscal year be used for specific programs such as Head Start, Scheuer-Nelson training programs, narcotics, and legal services, leaving little or no funds for on-going programs which have been well received in the respective communities. For example, Community Action funds for the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Indiana were divided as follows: Head Start—54%; Scheuer-Nelson training—18%; and versatile (unearmarked)—28%.

During the debate on the Economic Opportunity Act last session, the Office of Economic Opportunity quietly generated a campaign urging community action directors to wire and write members of Congress requesting support of the Administration's bill. Members of the 89th Congress received a large volume of these communications which also asked for the rejection of Republican amendments to the bill. Republicans offered thirty-six amendments which would have changed significantly the direction of the faltering and confused War on Poverty. Twenty-four of these were rejected, largely along party lines. Few of the amendments accepted resulted in significant improvements.

Late in November last year, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity called a press conference and blamed the Congress explicitly for the reduction of funds. He said, "This impact will be great and grave."

You may recall that the Republicans, both in committee and on the floor of the House,

consistently opposed the wholesale earmarking of Community Action funds for narcotics, legal services, the Kennedy-Javits program and the Nelson-Scheuer program for the very reasons that have resulted in the difficulties confronting community action agencies at this time.

The Republican "Opportunity Crusade," offered as a complete substitute for the War on Poverty, would have doubled the money in Community Action without earmarking. This would have put the money and the control where they belong at the community action board level, so that they themselves could determine local priorities. The Opportunity Crusade was rejected on the floor of the House by only twenty-eight votes despite a 2 to 1 Democratic majority.

#### WISCONSIN COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM DIRECTORS,

Madison, Wis., March 27, 1967.

WISCONSIN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The directors of the Wisconsin community action programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity would like to call to your attention the original purpose of community actions programs:

"The purpose of federal assistance to community action programs is to help urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty. Because community needs and resources differ widely, considerable latitude is allowed in the development and conduction of a community action program." (CAP Guide Volume I, page 7.)

During the early days of the War on Poverty the establishment of rural CAP programs was slow in getting started, primarily because of the difficulty of organizing rural people. After a year of work in rural Wisconsin, community action directors have laid the groundwork for carrying out the purpose of community action. It was at this time that Congress voted to curtail funds for community action programs. In addition, "versatile" funds (those which allowed the rural CAPs to carry out the purpose of community action) were reduced, further hampering our efforts. These "versatile" funds are important to rural CAP's in that local needs can best be met through programs designed by local community action agencies.

The community action directors of Wisconsin ask your help in supporting the restoration of community action program funds to the Office of Economic Opportunity budget for the 1968 fiscal year, and, particularly, the "versatile" funds which can do so much for Wisconsin poverty conditions.

Mr. Robert Smith, Wisconsin OEO, testified at House hearings concerning the earmarking of community action programs:

By and large, most of our Wisconsin standard CAA's have barely gotten through their program development grants and are being funded for so-called conduct and administration—outreach grants. The shortage of unearmarked funds for title II severely limits operational programs for Wisconsin's poor.

Mr. J. D. Brown, also testified at the hearings.

Mr. Mitchell Ginsberg, testifying for the National Association of Social Workers before the House committee had the following comments about "canned" programs. He recommended:

#### RETAIN CAP FLEXIBILITY

Against this background we are concerned that so many of the amendments seem to reduce the flexibility of operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs particularly CAP operations. A number of these amendments essentially propose to put into law a number of present rules and



regulations. We feel there would be little to gain in the resulting administrative inflexibility. Furthermore, several of the amendments place a construction on the purposes of the program about which are seriously concerned.

Thus, the first purpose of the Community Action Program, Page 36, lines 20-25 of H.R. 8311, places emphasis on planning and coordination, and seems to downgrade "maximum feasible participation" and establish it as an instrument primarily for program and project developments.

That funds be made available to local Community Action Programs without specific earmarking established nationally in order to permit the local community to establish its own priorities based on its study of specific needs in that community.

I think of one community, which I will not name, which tried very hard to get approval of a program which had been designed by the poor themselves. Most of us looking at it would see a lot of things wrong with the program; but there were a lot of good things about it, too, and there were weaknesses.

They were unable to get this program approved by the local community CAP. I think we have many instances where essentially this has been true. The programs increasingly now are handed down rather than evolving up or out of or with.

Further testimony on earmarking of CAP funds by Mr. Richard Boone, Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty:

Greatly increased versatile funds need to be appropriated for the hub of all anti-poverty efforts—the Community Action Program Congress should continue to support the local community's right to determine the shape of a community's anti-poverty program. While there are many common problems in dealing with the elimination of poverty, availability of local talent, resources and desires make the solution of poverty in each community a unique undertaking.

Mayor Barr for U.S. Conference of Mayors:

We sincerely suggest that what we don't need are more categorical programs; rigidly drawn legislation which attempts to specify every approach to the problems of poverty can hamstring the national effort to find solutions.

At the present time, the funds for local use at local discretion are severely limited.

Mr. Alfred Alexander of the Kentucky State OEO:

We in Kentucky feel that many of the very frustrating restrictions Congress has placed on the agency should be loosened. Localities must be given more freedom in deciding their priorities, to pick Community Action representatives, and to give OEO more coordinating powers, especially at the State level.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Sept. 19, 1967]

RAMSEY'S ANTIPOVERTY ADMINISTRATOR RESIGNS—OVER FEDERAL REDTAPE  
(By Dorothy Lewis)

William R. Carter Jr., administrator of the Ramsey County Citizens' Committee for Economic Opportunity, submitted his resignation to the citizens' committee board of directors Monday. He asked that it be effective Oct. 31.

Carter, who joined the program as its coordinator in April, 1965, said his resignation was "a personal decision based on changes taking place in the program planning and execution."

"What was at the start an effort on the local level to develop various programs and techniques is becoming a situation of having imposed on us nonlocal concepts, programs, techniques, methods and relationships," he said.

Carter is the second member of the anti-poverty group's staff to leave in the past month and a half. Robert Tuttle, Carter's assistant, left Aug. 1.

Other members of the committee have complained about the increasing number of federal regulations and standardized formulas for the various community action programs.

Much of the dissatisfaction has arisen since Congress began specific earmarking of funds for particular programs.

Ross Sweum, chairman of the antipoverty committee, said the executive committee already has started searching to find replacements for Carter and Tuttle, and hopes to have both posts filled before Carter leaves Oct. 31.

As to program planning, Sweum admitted, "We have a difficult job to do."

Sweum, also manager of the Minnesota State Employment Service, said programs the committee submitted to the Chicago OEO regional office were returned with certain conditions imposed which are difficult to meet but necessary if those programs are to continue.

He said the council's various task forces will report progress being made to meet federal regulations at a general membership meeting at 7 p.m. Thursday in the YWCA, Kellogg Blvd. and Minnesota Street.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman Review, Aug. 31, 1967]

POVERTY WAR CHIEF WANTS LOCAL OPTION

MISSOULA, MONT.—The director of the War on Poverty in Missoula and Mineral counties complained Wednesday the local agencies get "canned" programs from Washington, D.C.

Paul Carpino, staff director for the two county Human Resources, Inc., made the criticism of the federal poverty program in a talk to the Missoula Rotary Club Wednesday noon.

He said local agencies should have more to say in determining how local programs are to be run, rather than getting prepackaged, preplanned programs from 2,000 miles away.

At the same time, Carpino was high in his praise of some accomplishments in the local war on poverty, citing the preschool Head Start program in particular.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, how many little children went hungry to bed last night and woke this morning to another day of want, I do not know. If there were but five, it would be five too many in the great rich land that is ours.

How many boys and girls growing up are bereft of the means of schooling for the very serious and necessary job of making a living and of building within themselves the foundations of an enduring contentment, I do not know. But if there were but one child in all this rich land of ours on whom was slammed the door of a promising tomorrow because of the bleakness of the today, it would be one child too many.

If our country, rich, powerful, and great in its potential as the builder of a finer and nobler world were to win a dozen wars in Vietnam but should lose the war on poverty, the United States would have failed in its mission and would have missed her destiny.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking deeply from my heart. When one has lived as

long a life as have I, when one has witnessed his countrymen and has participated with them in the sunshine of prosperity and in the storm of depression, in the glad some years of peace and in the grievous years of war, for over eight and a half decades, one cannot fail to acquire a sense of evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill of transcending importance in the first session of the 90th Congress. We may increase the income tax to raise more money to fight a war and to maintain our programs of peace, or that we may not do. But the effect of raising the tax or a failing to do so will not determine the future of this country as a continuing world power. We can fail to do other things that should be done and the effects, however regrettable, at the worst will be temporary. But, Mr. Chairman, if we fail in the war on poverty because we have grown faint of heart and have lost our courage, we have started to write for future historians the final chapter of the story of the rise and fall of the American Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with emotion and with a deep conviction. There is nothing in poverty that is glamorous. There is nothing in the story of a child going to bed at night hungry or the story of a child growing up in the slums with no chance of being prepared ever to meet other children, grown up, on a plane of equality—there is nothing in all of this that is glamorous.

These are incidents in the tragical failure of you and me and our predecessors in this great and historic Congress of ours to make the laws that would forever end in a rich land the poverty that never could have been in God's vision for any of His children.

We have made the start, and it has been a good start. The first steps in the life of any legislative program of a new and novel design are like the first steps of a child learning to walk. Shame upon us, as grownup men and women serving in the Congress of the United States, if we should end the war on poverty or curtail its resources because a few of the steps of a newborn program have been no more sturdy than the first steps of a recently born baby learning to walk.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this great committee and as my colleague know, I have seldom spoken in general debate on a bill that came from a committee of which I was not a member. But on the bill we are now discussing, there is in the district that I represent a deep and a personal feeling. I represent many neighborhoods in the great city of Chicago—Hyde Park, Kenwood, Woodlawn, part of north Kenwood and all of South Chicago, with its great steel mills, and Roseland with its many churches, more than in any area of similar size in the Nation, Pullman, Calumet, and Thornton.

But, Mr. Chairman, also among my constituents are those who suffer from undeserved poverty. I put emphasis on what I have said, undeserved poverty. I would not wish to remain in this body another day if I should fail these constituents of mine who are the victims of an undeserved poverty. If I were not to life my voice for them, humble though



my voice might be, and they were left unrepresented during this debate, I should have a feeling that representative government had failed, at least in their case. I am glad to say, and I say it with pride in my district and in my constituents, that on this bill we are considering today, this bill to continue undiminished the war on poverty, I have received more letters, more telephone calls, more telegrams from my constituents than on any other legislative proposal that has come before the 90th Congress. I would mention the noble wife of Dr. Hans Morgenthau, famed member of the faculty of the University of Chicago, and Mrs. Frank Herlihy of the League of Women Voters as typical of the many, many who have written me, telephoned me at their own expense, wired me from the Second District of Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I close by reading this letter from Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, the esteemed president of the League of Women Voters of the United States:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The members of the League of Women Voters are becoming more deeply concerned about the fate of the anti-poverty bill, and specifically about the future of the Community Action Programs, in view of the House Committee amendments to the present Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Since its beginning in 1964, League members throughout all 50 states have followed the growth of the self-help approach to poverty erosion, and many have been directly involved in the programs in their communities. They have been encouraged by how well this concept has been accepted by the disadvantaged, and how its implementation is increasing. For example, our Boulder, Colorado, League writes: "There is a freshness of approach in helping the poor to help themselves, and we think that the small portion of the national budget which goes into this program is well worth giving these ideas a chance for fruition. The program is very young—it must have an opportunity to go on to further successes."

We know that this program has enabled many people to attempt to solve their own problems and to plan their own lives. It has given them an important role in defining their needs, and in developing ways to meet them. By offering these disadvantaged people an opportunity to develop their leadership abilities, community action has added a vital and constructive new element to the local scene in many urban as well as rural areas.

We of the League believe that the expectations of the poor and disadvantaged, if opportunities promised are now withheld, will certainly not diminish, but rather through frustration may be diverted from constructive to destructive ends.

Therefore, we must reiterate our concern for what may happen when the Economic Opportunity Act comes to the floor of the House of Representatives. We believe the Committee amendments will change the self-help concept of community action. Particularly, we oppose those which change the structure and funding procedures for the Community Action Programs.

While we believe that all levels of government—local, state and national—have a responsibility in providing equality of opportunity for all citizens, we think that the procedures for establishing and running community action programs should be left flexible in order to meet the needs of the wide variety of situations around the country. Too, the funding requirements should be left flexible so that those communities with very limited resources could be eligible for assistance through the Community Action Program.

Further, we object to any decrease in funding for the Economic Opportunity Act for 1967. It is our firm conviction that cuts should not be made at the expense of those least able to help themselves.

We hope you will keep our concern for this important piece of legislation in mind when it comes to the floor of the House.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT J. STUART,  
President.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, Charles Dickens once said of 19th-century England, "Few, save the poor, feel for the poor." I never thought that assertion could properly be applied to the United States. Certainly, the landmark social legislation passed in the 88th and 89th Congresses indicated a national commitment to break the vicious cycle of poverty and deprivation that has been such a scar on our national scene. However, statements made in this House in recent days lead me to believe that there are powerful forces at work to renege on that commitment.

Three decades ago, President Roosevelt spoke about one-third of a nation that was economically afflicted. Today, we estimate that the impoverished represent one-fifth of the Nation, about 35 million Americans. But our progress is reflected not so much in numbers, but more significantly in the fact that in the past 3 years we have launched a concerted and comprehensive war against poverty—a war that has many fronts and many campaigns. It is a war against one of the greatest evils of our time.

In just 3 years, the war on poverty has grown from a concept and a piece of legislation, to a program that is reaching out to help more than 9 million persons in 3,000 counties.

I am convinced that attempts in this House to kill the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs do not represent the feelings of the people and community leaders of this Nation. I present for inclusion in the RECORD some of the letters I have received from those involved in community action programs in my congressional district:

TAPPAN ZEE

MENTAL HEALTH CENTER, INC.,

North Tarrytown, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

Mr. RICHARD OTTINGER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OTTINGER: As a director of a community mental health center, I am concerned and involved with other community agencies which have an impact on the well-being of the communities we serve. One agency with which we have been working is the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns.

It is well known that Congressional action in the very near future may limit or eliminate completely the support for the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns. I wish to make known to you my opinion that the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns is performing a most useful function in the community and more significantly is performing it in such a manner as to be very deserving of continued support.

We hope and are confident that you will make every effort to insure that the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns can continue to serve its community.

Yours very truly,

J. MAGDA POLENZ, M.D.,  
Acting Medical Director.

TARRYTOWN, N.Y.,

November 6, 1967.

Hon. Senators and Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: As a volunteer teacher and youth worker with our deprived citizens through the Community Opportunity Center of Tarrytown, N.Y. and as an officer of the C.A.P. Board, I plead with you not to curtail our very essential anti-poverty work by any further cuts in appropriations. This is not a program; these are peoples' lives and human dignity we are dealing with.

If we volunteer workers, who are trying to restore a sense of worth and belonging to these alienated people, are not backed up by paid administrators, rented buildings, purchased education materials, we will have to discontinue our work. Our nation, our local communities, our poor citizens will be the losers. We cannot afford such a loss unless we are willing to see our society disintegrate.

People are more important than the moon!

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH S. LENZ.

THE NEGRO COMMUNITY CLUB

OF THE TARRYTOWNS,

Tarrytown, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: We, the members of The Negro Community Club of the Tarrytowns, ask that you as our Representative, voice our vehement opposition to the proposed cut back of funds to Neighborhood Community Opportunity Programs (Anti-Poverty Projects.)

Our membership has made various contributions to the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns so that it may continue to serve the youth of our villages. We feel that a government cut-back of funds would cause our center and our youth to suffer dire consequences. For many children this center, and others like it in many other communities, is what keeps the youth involved in worthwhile activities and keeps them off the streets and out of trouble.

We sincerely request that you voice our concern about this matter.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM N. BURNETTE,  
Corresponding Secretary, The Negro  
Community Club of the Tarrytowns.

GREENBURGH SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 8,

Hartsdale, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Congress of the United States of America,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Open Door Community Center, 391 Tarrytown Road, White Plains, N.Y., supported by OEO funds administered by the Westchester Community Action Program, is a most effective community action program. It is serving families in the poverty areas of the Town of Greenburgh in an efficient and effective manner in a number of areas, particularly in housing, legal aid and advice.

I strongly support this program and urge that funds be made available for its continuance and possible expansion. The Center provides competent services for a large number of families who have no other means of obtaining them.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. FITCH,  
Supervising Principal.

IRVINGTON, N.Y.,

November 6, 1967.

Hon. RICHARD OTTINGER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am deeply concerned about the proposed cutbacks in the funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity Programs. As a volunteer art instructor at the Community Opportunity Center of the Tarrytowns, I have had a chance to see the tremendous benefits



of this type of program. If the center were to have to close its doors or to curtail its activities, youngsters who can now spend fruitful afternoons and evenings would again be forced to return to the streets. At a time like this, how can one let so many young people down by cutting funds?

I would urge you strongly to put every effort behind continuing, if not increasing OEO programs.

Very truly yours,

RENATA RAINER.

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE,

Tarrytown, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

To the Members of the House of Representatives:

As a member of the Marymount College faculty and a volunteer worker at the Tarrytown Opportunity Center, I would like to express my concern about any attempt to cut government funds for this particular program. The funds that have already been given have been put to very good use and have done a lot for the neighborhood community. We are trying to assist all age groups especially in the area of education and providing activities that will keep people usefully occupied. Marymount College students do volunteer work there such as tutoring, teaching cooking, sewing, etc.

Any money that can be given to this project, I think, is a very worthwhile expenditure and I urge you to continue the appropriation. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Sister MARGARET ELLEN.

THE TUCKAHOE PUBLIC LIBRARY,

Tuckahoe, N.Y., November 1, 1967.

EASTCHESTER COMMUNITY ACTION,  
Tuckahoe, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KENDIG: I wish to congratulate you and Mr. Suppa on the attention and guidance your program has provided so many Tuckahoe students. The girls who have worked in the library have benefited greatly by your emphasis on positive values and greater achievements. I hope you have continued support for continuing success with this most important program.

Sincerely yours,

ANNE SELF,  
Acting Director.

VILLAGE OF TUCKAHOE,

Westchester County, N.Y.,

November 6, 1967.

Mr. DAVID KENDIG,  
Community Action Program,  
Tuckahoe, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KENDIG: I wish to thank you on behalf of the Village Board for the work that the Community Action Program has done and is doing for the residents of the Village of Tuckahoe.

Through the efforts of the Community Action Program Committee, great strides have been made especially in the area of the lower income group.

Personally, I wholeheartedly support the principles on which the idea of the Community Action Program was based, and as Mayor I will do everything my position permits to assist and support all worthwhile programs which will benefit our Village and its residents. As evidenced recently by your Committee's request to the Village of Tuckahoe to provide the necessary property for the erection of a Child Day Care Center to which the Board of Trustees agreed. Cooperation of this type, between the Community Action Program and the communities it serves, is proof that progress can be made to provide more benefits for our fellow citizens who cannot alone improve their circumstances.

With the continued joint efforts of your Committee and the Village officials, I am confident that the Community Action Program

will continue to make great strides in the years ahead.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D'AGOSTINO,

Mayor.

CHRIST CHURCH,

Bronxville, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am personally familiar with the work that has been carried on at the Eastchester Community Action Project in Tuckahoe and am convinced that it has proven its usefulness to the community. It would be tragic if this work were to be curtailed or stopped altogether because of inadequate funds.

Faithfully yours,

(Rev.) RAYMOND T. FERRIS,

Rector of Christ Church.

THE REFORMED CHURCH,

Bronxville, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am well acquainted with the work of the Eastchester Community Action Program and the contribution it has made to the life of this community. I would be greatly distressed if their program was throttled or curtailed for I have seen first hand the vital services it performs which are not provided by any other agency. Eastchester CAP is the one bright spot on a pretty dismal landscape, and we will all be the poorer if it is not able to continue its important work.

JAMES A. STACKPOLE.

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING ORGANIZATION OF EASTCHESTER, INC.,

Tuckahoe, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,  
Tuckahoe, N.Y.

Attention: Mr. Kendig.

GENTLEMEN: This is a letter of appreciation for your many activities in the village of Tuckahoe and for your efforts to alleviate many of the problems within our lower income families.

We hope that you will be able to continue your work in this community.

Sincerely,

LILLIAN M. SNELLMAN,  
Director.

THE METHODIST CHURCH OF

THE TARRYTOWNS,

November 6, 1967.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing on behalf of the community opportunity center of the Tarrytowns.

This organization has achieved genuine community involvement by providing a well-run, much needed service for Underhill residents in both Tarrytown and North Tarrytown.

This past summer when the program was jeopardized by a cut back in funds, local organizations such as the service clubs and churches, and private citizens responded by raising \$4000 in cash contributions within a 30 day period. Earlier in the spring, through the work of local citizens, a baseball field, a basketball court and a children's playground were constructed on a vacant urban renewal site adjacent to the center. Sisters from Marymount College lived in the center during the summer and carried on an effective program. Local government is also involved and have graciously provided the building to house the center, plus paying the utilities.

It is most heartening to see O.E.O. funds augmented by private capital. The work of local citizens and the support of local government has been an effective combination. Best of all, this community involvement and a bound program has developed needed leaders and leadership from within the group to show the center ministers.

To cut back on funds at this point would not only endanger the center's program, but would also seriously discourage the newly emerging leadership.

Unfortunately, local organizations, private citizens and village officials can not sustain the project without outside help. They have all demonstrated their willingness to share responsibility.

Would you please use your good offices to encourage rather than discourage what has been so well started.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM W. HOLMAN,

Pastor.

TARRYTOWN, N.Y.,

November 5, 1967.

Members of the House of Representatives,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR SIR: Here in the Tarrytown where I represent the Warner Public Library every week day afternoon at the Community Opportunity Center, a key part of the "War on Poverty" locally, I see how personal needs are being met by the Center's activities. The leading staff members, Mr. John Keels and Mrs. Blanche Miller, coordinate the total program including the Youth Corps in such a way that the Center means a great deal in helping young people and children, particularly, have more creative lives. Any cut in the funds necessary to continue the Center and the Youth Corps locally would be "cutting off one's nose to spite one's face."

Should not our aim be that each individual in the "poverty" category throughout the country be reached and helped to stand on his or her own feet. Our government's effort to meet the poverty situation here at home should be strengthened, not lessened, the total society will benefit.

Best wishes for your important work.

Sincerely,

RUTH NEUEUDORFFER.

NOVEMBER 6, 1967.

To Whom It May Concern:

During the past year I have become aware of the Eastchester Community Action Program and the work it is doing in the poverty area of Tuckahoe. I have been quite impressed with what they have accomplished and would be greatly concerned by any turn of events which would jeopardize the program.

JAMES M. JONES, M.D.

BRONXVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOL,

Bronxville, N.Y., November 6, 1967.

To Whom It May Concern:

It has been my privilege to work with the Community Action Program of Eastchester since its inception, and its influence has been greatly felt in the community. The variety of programs which it has been instrumental in organizing has served not only the youth of the community but the adults and families as well.

To lose this program would be a great tragedy for Eastchester and the adjoining communities. I hope that it will be possible for this very desirable activity to be funded through aid from the Federal Government.

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. BRAUN,

Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2388, the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments as reported by the committee.

It is obvious that Democrats and Republicans share support for the poverty program and for making funds for the program available. There is, however, a serious difference of opinion in the ap-



proach best suited to solving the problems of poverty. I feel that the diverse programs must remain under the central administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the capable leadership of Sargent Shriver.

In the past few days I have received overwhelming evidence of the absolute necessity for continuation and support of the poverty program in its present form. Literally hundreds of citizens in my district in south Florida have written, giving personal examples of the benefits each has experienced as a result of the OEO-sponsored programs. Their pleas are indeed forceful, and clearly indicate the vital need for our wholehearted support of the poverty program.

It is significant, too, that this indication of nonpartisan support has come not only from the direct beneficiaries, but also from State legislative leaders, city, and county officials, key community leaders, education leaders, civic organizations, the press, college and university professors, and clergy throughout the 12th district.

There has been rarely in my 13 years in the Congress such a unanimous demonstration of popular support for a Federal program.

As dramatic proof of the vital importance of this program, I would like to read excerpts from only a few of the letters I received from participants in OEO-sponsored programs in Dade County, Fla.

**From Emma Allen of Florida City:**

The money helps a lot of people that can't get their medicine supplies.

**Mrs. Norris of Florida City writes:**

The EOPI Center have done some wonderful things toward the poor people.

**Lillie Mae Reid of Florida City:**

For the first time in history that I now a adult can go to school to help get them some education to help thim self to get a better job and help take care their family.

**Ella Mae Williams of Florida City:**

This program is life to people of our community.

**From Mrs. Zehna Williams of Florida City:**

The EOPI center was and is the greatest thing that ever happen down here.

**Mary Nell Rogers of Florida City says:**

Our boys and girls have been given a second chance to further their education. It's has aided the poverty stricken families to an extent that they too are able to meet the minimum living standard code . . . [They are helped through programs such as] 1. Job Development 2. Legal Services 3. Home Management 4. Housing Specialist and 5. Hardship.

**Georgia Marshall writes:**

It has done a great dill for me and my children. It have help to in Medical care and food, clothing, and they have a day care center to keep my children when I go to work.

**From Mrs. Wright of Homestead:**

The EOPI has been a wonderful thing to me it help me get the hospital and to get my surplus food. It put my grandchildren in the Day Care center. Please don't close the EOPI program down. Please don't.

**E. Varn Moody of Homestead:**

I have a son who has been working in the bean field for two year and he is only 16 years old. He has signed up for the N.Y.C. program and has hopes to be hired. But if it is demolished his hopes will be destroyed. Please don't take his hopes away.

**Annetha Butler of South Miami:**

We need the EOPI. Please don't let them close down. I needed help so long and I didn't know what way to turn until those people showed me the way.

**Gwendolyn Hudson, a teenager from Homestead, writes:**

Legal help, home management, better education, better housing, food, jobs and a number of other services at the local center has contributed to the present advancement in my city.

**Lonnie Williams of South Miami, writes:**

I am 84 years old. Have no one to see about me. The workers from the E.O.P.I. Center have worked with me for about a year. And have helped me in many ways. I'm asking you all to please keep the E.O.P.I. in South Miami.

**From Evelyn Miller, South Miami:**

I cannot understand why anyone would want to close the E.O.P.I. Centers. The center here in So. Miami has done so much for the people since its been here I cannot begin to tell you. I found employment through them several times.

**Catherine Jones of South Miami, says:**

The EOPI center has been a great help to many peoples I don't make enough money to pay someone to take care of my little my husband makes a very little salary and I have four children to support I am not able to give my child snacks sometime I can't even give her milk every day the EOPI is a great help so please try to keep our day care I don't know what I will do if it will close.

**From LeRoy Ancrum of South Miami:**

The E.O.P.I. has done a lot for the people and me and my wife we the people needs the program to help us out of being poor so help us!

**Josh Knight of South Miami:**

The E.O.P.I. program has made a big change in the South Miami area. People that was doing real bad is now doing much better . . .

**Mrs. Lessie Mae Lane of Miami, writes:**

Please keep the EOPI office open in Dade County because it really have help me and my eleven children very much if it haven't been for it I really would not know what to do.

**From Cyril Baen of Miami:**

Why is everybody trying to do away with the poverty program. So many mothers have been helped to train for better jobs and have been able to go to work because they have a place to leave their children.

**From Eva Asberry of South Miami:**

When I didn't have know about papers that had to be filled out or sign by me I could always get help from the center. I hope it never closes.

**Twenty-two-year-old James Hannah of South Miami, says:**

The EOPI program has stop teenage children from hanging on street.

**Mrs. Merriam Miller of Perrine, writes:**

I could not work before to help support them [her nine children] but now I am able to work with some one keeping my baby.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also important to include, as a part of the permanent Record of this significant debate, the following letters and telegrams from responsible State and local officials and leaders who have indicated their support for the program:

NOVEMBER 7, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

For sake of our community, urge you to do everything in your power to resist efforts to curb President's antipoverty program.

Sincerely,

HON. GERALD R. LEWIS,  
State Representative, Florida.

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLA.  
COMMUNITY RELATIONS BOARD,  
November 1, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
U.S. Congress,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: The enclosure appeared on the front page of the Miami News this afternoon. In assuming that Paul Wyche has related the Legislative situation rather accurately, I must be anxious to offer a considered view. Should you need any supporting documentation, I can easily and would gladly provide it.

Because of my involvement in this community, there has been pressing reason for me to closely follow the accomplishments, disappointments and failures of the Office of Economic Opportunity since it began to become operational here in November of 1964. When considered in their entirety, it must be my judgment that the local OEO programs are succeeding in improving the health, welfare, job, and educational opportunities for our large poverty population which they endeavor to serve.

Several accomplishments, of the many which might be cited, seem deserving of emphasis:

1. You probably know that in recent years I have worked with Congressional and community leaders in advancing the public's knowledge and information about family planning. In the last year or two the OEO, in cooperation with the Dade County Department of Public Health, established a program to provide birth control data and services to that segment of our population which has been historically and almost totally uninformed. No program has ever benefited the people it touches more rapidly. The OEO has provided the funds with which the Public Health Department administers six clinics within OEO neighborhood centers. The return on this investment, for the betterment of our collective future, has been tremendous. The need, however, will not be adequately met until in time there are scores of clinics. It sounds incredible, but large numbers among the poor and the ignorant have no knowledge whatsoever about the processes of birth and how to proceed as a free-choice decision to control the size of one's family. In this area, the OEO is making possible the exercise of enlightened leadership and guidance.

2. Four years ago, the CRB was created by the Dade County Board of Commissioners. It was established to learn to speak as the conscience of our community. Its membership consists of the finest lay and religious leaders to be gathered anywhere. It works constantly to minimize the reasons for tensions, misunderstandings, and difficulties



between races. To this point the Greater Miami area has not erupted into those tragic instances of violence and turmoil which have troubled and injured other communities. As a spokesman for the CRB, I want to make clear that the OEO, particularly in the just concluded "long hot summer", has made some significant contributions toward keeping Greater Miami "cool". Participation by the poor in OEO community action programs has provided a means for the poor to seek redress for their grievances before local public boards which might not otherwise have been sufficiently in close touch with the problems and frustrations of the disadvantaged segment within our people. Here again, the OEO has earned impressive dividends from its investment in plans, patience, cooperation, and money.

3. As a citizen who has been a Miami businessman for the past decade, it appears to me to be a valuable and sensible investment to provide, as is being done through the OEO, job training programs which have the dual advantage of adding to our supply of skilled manpower and, at the same time, enabling families previously supported by tax funds to become wage earners and self-respecting taxpayers. Obviously the progress made has been extremely limited, but of the greatest importance, there has been progress.

These several observations only nibble at what the OEO is attempting to achieve by battling against poverty on many fronts. These include providing assistance for the legal, health, housing, and educational dilemmas of the poor.

I take for granted that many mistakes have been made. But intelligent policy makers and administrators, on the National and local levels, must be struggling constantly for workable corrective measures. My fundamental conviction is that demonstrable and refreshing improvements are being attained in areas of human activity which have not until recently been of National concern. The more we become urbanized, the more self evident is the need for an enlarged National concern and participation.

I can give you no advice about the guns and butter argument. But I believe it to be true that hoped-for military victories in far-off places will come back to haunt us if we are so preoccupied with waging war that we fail to devote a sizeable portion of our Nation's intelligence and resources to finding remedies for the neglect of domestic matters in years gone by.

In all sincerity, I beg to remain,

Cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY,  
FLA.,

Miami, Fla., November 1, 1967.

HON. DANTE D. FASCELL,  
House of Representative,  
Old House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: I am sure you are well aware of my interest in the Poverty Program and am therefore quite concerned over the difficulties that this Program has been encountering in Congress.

I have worked closely with the local poverty program, Economic Opportunity Program, Incorporated, and have found the services that this program has rendered thus far to be excellent in meeting the needs of those less fortunate citizens.

I therefore urge you to exert every effort possible to support OEO requests now pending before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CHUCK HALL,  
Mayor.

CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.,  
October 31, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: I am writing to you at this time to express my support for the fine accomplishments of the Economic Opportunity Program in the City of Miami, as I understand that this program is facing serious opposition in the House. I know you are aware of some of the specific accomplishments in terms of the thousands of poor families who have found jobs, job training, better housing, and good day care and educational programs for their children. Many more thousands of youngsters were helped also this summer through the EOPI sponsored recreation program in which the City of Miami played a major part as one of the operating agencies. Beyond the help to specific families and individuals it is a fact that this program has been a major factor in combating the kinds of racial tension and unrest which has led in other communities to senseless and costly outbreaks of violence. Any cut back in this program would be a serious blow to our continual efforts to make Miami a better community for all its citizens.

One of the amendments to the House Committee bill provides for a 10% cash contribution to the local program. In Dade County this would mean that approximately One Million Dollars would have to be found to provide for the continuation of the anti-poverty program at its present level. It is not very likely that this would happen in view of the ever increasing burden on the local taxpayer. The result of this amendment would probably be to put this program out of business in Miami and Dade County.

I know you will continue to do anything in your power to see that this program is continued. Please let me know if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN P. CLARK,  
Mayor, City of Miami.

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLA.,  
Miami, Fla., November 1, 1967.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,  
Old House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: We have, quite naturally, been concerned with the difficulty the Poverty Program has been encountering in Congress.

The local Poverty Program, Economic Opportunity Program, Incorporated, has generally done a fine job in providing many services to our less fortunate citizens; and we have enjoyed a close working relationship on a number of projects of benefit to our community.

I would urge you to to exert every effort possible to support the OEO requests now pending before Congress.

Sincerely,

P. W. HOMER,  
County Manager.

CITY OF SOUTH MIAMI, FLA.,  
November 1, 1967.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: I wish to register my firm support for the work of the Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., in South Miami. The City of South Miami administration has maintained a very excellent and very close working relationship with the local office. They have cooperated with us in neighborhood clean-up campaigns, recreation and beautification programs. The Neighborhood Center has provided a means of

motivating some of our disadvantaged citizens to become active in the affairs of their community. Beyond this has been the day to day work of the Neighborhood Center in providing high quality care for children of working mothers, assistance in getting birth control services and assistance in finding jobs.

Despite the hard work of those people working in the program, there still remains much work to be done. It is our hope that resources might be provided to serve even more of the families in our community who can benefit from the kinds of opportunities provided by this program.

Yours truly,

CLYDE M. TAYLOR,  
Mayor.

CITY OF HOMESTEAD, FLA.,  
November 3, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: We in the South end of the county frequently feel that we are the last to receive the benefits of many programs which are initiated in other parts of the County.

This has been the case also with the anti-poverty program in that the neighborhood center and the day care center down here were among the last to be established, however, the Neighborhood Center program has now been in operation almost two years and the day care center for more than six months. Both of these programs have demonstrated their value to the Homestead Community.

For Example, this past summer we were able to get additional funds through the E.O.P.I. to expand our recreational program, thus reaching a lot more people than would have otherwise been possible. We have worked closely with the center and its Advisory Committee on a number of community problems, such as in efforts to improve housing, cleaning up neighborhoods and to promote better relations between the races.

It would definitely be a step backward in our efforts to improve the community if this program were to be abolished or otherwise curtailed. On the contrary, we would like this program to be expanded so as to serve more people rather than less.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. DICKINSON,  
Mayor.

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Miami, Fla., November 2, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: In view of the continuing discussion in Congress related to the funding of programs supporting education and other services to the poor, it may be helpful to you if I express my thoughts on the matter. I am addressing similar letters to other members of our Florida Congressional delegation.

A quick review of the joint efforts of Economic Opportunity Program, Inc. and our school system indicates that significant progress has been made in developing programs of value.

From our point of view, the combination of the Child Opportunity Program and Head Start Program holds the most promise. At the present time we have 2,420 five-year-old children enrolled in a Head Start program. The facilities were provided with funds from Title I of PL 89-10 and program costs are supported by Head Start funds. In addition to the benefits of direct services to children, nearly 250 residents of low-income communities have found employment in this pro-



gram and significant strides have been made in training them for added responsibilities.

The Child Opportunity Program operated by EOPI with Head Start funds is the first concentrated effort to provide day care and establish an educational program for pre-school children under five. Indications are that we need to begin the educational process at a very early age and this program could well become the most significant of all the efforts to eliminate poverty.

We have approximately 850 young people enrolled in an in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. In addition to the obvious financial benefits to the enrollees, the early training for the world of work should be of even greater worth to them.

The Neighborhood Centers operated by EOPI seem to be effective in moving people to be concerned with the problems of their community. They often demonstrate this concern by appearing before the Board of Public Instruction or in conference with other school officials. The dialogues generated are often not comfortable for either party but the solution to many problems can come only through direct involvement of the people concerned.

Dade County has one of the Follow-Through pilot centers and planning for this project was done by school and EOPI personnel working together. The Community Resources Division of EOPI has recruited, trained, and helped to place a large number of volunteers in schools within low-income areas. The Upward Bound program at the University of Miami has been of considerable benefit to a number of our high school students.

Programs for migrants, health programs, and adult education programs, have all been significant in the lives of children and their families. I know that VISTA volunteers have helped in some difficult situations.

I would be less than honest if I indicated the path to community cooperation has always been smooth. However, I feel Dade County has made great progress and I would urge your continued support of programs which have such tremendous potential for our citizens most in need.

Sincerely,

JOE HALL,  
Superintendent.

HOLCOMB & HOLCOMB,  
Miami, Fla., November 3, 1967.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: I am deeply disturbed by newspaper reports that the local "war on poverty" has reached a point where it is without adequate funds to continue current operations. I am particularly concerned about the Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program, Inc. which is a component part of EOPI, and which was created through the efforts of the Dade County Bar Association and other concerned groups to assure justice to those who are otherwise unable to retain legal counsel.

This letter is to ask that you do whatever is possible to support the continued operation of EOPI and EOLSPI, with appropriations adequate to these purposes.

Sincerely,

LYLE D. HOLCOMB, Jr.

MIAMI, FLA.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: I feel very strongly that the poverty bill should not be defeated. While I am certain that there have been wastes in administering the program, I feel the benefits have been enormous and will be increasingly so in the future.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HENRY KING STANFORD.

CORAL GABLES, FLA.,  
November 3, 1967.

HON. DANTE A. FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

We the chaplains of the University of Miami view with deep concern the curtailing of projects under the OEO in Dade County and elsewhere in the United States as reported today in the Miami Herald. Such action can only result in bitter disillusionment on the part of the poor and the poverty workers alike and much hardship to the former. Some 50 students of this university are volunteers in these programs. We urge you to use your office in influencing Congress to provide funds necessary for the continuance of this work. We also plea that your considerable influence be brought to bear on the OEO to provide emergency funds for the support of these programs pending the action of Congress.

GEORGE A. BOYLE.  
POLLY L. COOK.  
RICHARD GRAF, Jr.  
FRANK MCCOLLUGH.  
HENRY N. F. MINICH.  
DONALD M. MICHELSON.  
LOUIS C. ROBERTS.  
FARLEY W. SNELL.

MIAMI, FLA.,  
November 4, 1967.

Representative DANTE FASCELL,  
Washington, D.C.:

Headstart day care shouldn't die. EOPI needs your support. The future Miami will thank you.

Dr. PAUL WOHLFORD,  
Department of Psychology,  
University of Miami.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS  
OF METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY,  
Miami, Fla., November 3, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: We appreciate the strong positions you have taken in support of the Economic Opportunity programs and hope you will be successful in influencing other members of the House during the current debate.

The League is particularly concerned with proposed changes in Title 11-Community Action Programs. We feel the change in the structure may put the programs in the hands of local political groups, which could be very damaging in certain areas.

We are most apprehensive about the 10% cash requirement from local sources. As you know, there has been good cooperation between Dade County and EOPI in local contributions but it is exceedingly unlikely we have the cash to meet a 10% cash requirement. In addition, the local budgets have already been established.

The doors have been partially opened. The people are beginning to see some possibility of hope for the future and to trust the assurances of interest and help. We believe the program has been meaningful and significant in its short, experimental history and this is certainly not the time to reduce its effectiveness.

It is gratifying to know that you support these programs as strongly as we do. Your continued efforts are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH METCALF  
Mrs. George Metcalf,  
President.

MIAMI, FLA.,  
November 5, 1967.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Thank you for all you have done and are doing to help the Eco-

nomic Opportunity Program in Dade County. I hope that you will continue to do all you can to preserve what is of worth in the War on Poverty during this week of debate and decision.

As a member of the Development of Human Resources Committee for our League of Women Voters, I have studied the Economic Opportunity Act and its application through OEO and our local EOPI in depth for the last four years. We have been fully aware of the problems and shortcomings of some of the programs in this initial period of trial and error. But I am deeply convinced that the need is vast, that our government should share in the solution, and that much has been accomplished but much more remains to be done.

For one and a half years I have been visiting girls in homes of poverty in West Perrine, Goulds, even some in Cutler Ridge, South Miami Heights and Richmond Heights, as a volunteer with the Women in Community Service, interviewing them for the Women's Job Corps. I have seen many of these girls return transformed. I am grateful that my government has made it possible for me to offer them this chance to help themselves.

Other programs that are particularly effective in this area are Child Opportunity Centers, Headstart, and Legal Aid.

Please vote to keep these and other worth while programs going.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DURBIN TABB.

MIAMI, FLA.,  
November 3, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DANTE: I have seen a lot of worthwhile benefits resulting from some of the poverty programs.

Of course, in any area of many and varied activities you are bound to have some goof offs and mistakes.

By and large if we can cut down the cycle of poverty and give folks useful education and employable skills all of us will benefit.

I would hope that you will do your best to continue the poverty program. I am.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very sincerely,

ABE GUREVITZ.

GREATER ST. PAUL A.M.E. CHURCH,  
Miami, Fla., October 31, 1967.

HON. DANTE FASCELL,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Dade County Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., having been designated in that position by the Advisory Board of the State Department of Public Welfare, District No. 9.

The public welfare program is a very necessary effort. However, it is not enough to simply provide a meager subsistence for poor families without providing opportunities for these families to remove themselves from the welfare rolls and become productive citizens where this is possible.

The opportunity for families to better their conditions of life have been provided through the anti-poverty program, and I can tell you that many of our families are taking full advantage of these opportunities. I have had the chance, myself, to observe, personally, many individuals, particularly in the Coconut Grove area, who have been helped to find jobs, to receive job training, or increased educational benefits for their children. In Coconut Grove the program has made it possible for the St. Albans Day Nursery to take in many more children from poverty stricken families enabling the mothers to go to work.

The Neighborhood Center provides a whole range of other services and has in the relatively short time it has been in existence had a major effect on the Coconut Grove area.



I am hopeful that you will continue your fine efforts to support this program.

Respectfully yours,

TEMPERANCE E. WRIGHT.

CHRIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,  
Miami, Fla., October 31, 1967.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: I wanted to let you know about my concern about reports that the anti-poverty program may be cutback or in other ways restricted. For those of us who have worked for sometime to provide opportunities for the poor, this is saddening to hear. Our program has just gotten into full swing during the past year and has demonstrated that we can with a combination of local initiative and federal sources provide the kinds of opportunities that enable the poor in large numbers to lift themselves out of poverty. If anything, we need to be thinking about how this program can be vastly expanded rather than reduced.

I have had the privilege of serving as Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Coconut Grove EOPI Neighborhood Center, as a member of the Board of Directors of EOPI, and as Chairman of a special committee investigating the work of the agency. I am, therefore, in a good position to know the kind of work that is being done. I can assure you that if this program is reduced at this time, it will be a great tragedy for all of us living in Dade County.

Sincerely yours,

THEO. R. GIBSON,  
Rector.

NOVEMBER 3, 1967.

Congressman DANTE FASCELL,  
Rayburn Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SR: I am writing to you to plead with you to help us continue the existing E.O.P.I. program in Miami.

These programs have helped the poverty-stricken people in Miami in many ways. It is giving people with poor education a chance to raise their level of living through retraining programs and by providing over 800 jobs.

It has enabled mothers to go to work and raise their family's income level. It has relieved the welfare rolls of many people.

E.O.P.I. has given over 1,000 children medical and dental care that their parents could not have afforded to give them. We have taken these children to places they would never have seen otherwise, thus enriching their lives. We have taught them to recognize the various community helpers and what they do. We taught them to recognize their colors and the names of the foods they eat.

Some children never knew their legal names until E.O.P.I. teachers and aides taught them their first and last names.

Other children never knew what it felt like to wear clean clothes and shoes. Others were rarely given baths or had their hair washed.

Some of our children are now in first grade. They read better than their older brothers and sisters because of past experiences we were able to give them.

These children and their parents need the services of E.O.P.I. if they are ever to break the poverty barrier.

Please help them by passing the bill giving Miami the funds necessary to continue the program as in the past.

If the amendment requiring Miami to provide 10% of the funds in cash, we will probably not be able to raise it and thus the programs will be forced to close. Defeat this amendment and let us continue as in the past by providing 20% of the total amount in in-kind contributions.

Sincerely,

JUDITH R. KARP.

HOMESTEAD, FLA.

November 1, 1967.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: The John F. Kennedy Neighborhood Center, in Homestead, Florida is one of the most wonderful things that could happen to any community.

The Center is well on its way to progress and it's very much appreciated by the Community.

They are always there in the time of need. Some of the mothers in the community can't furnish transportation for their children, and they send someone to pick them up, and also bring them from the Day Care Center. This kind of a problem a working mother, without transportation can appreciate.

They are doing a very well in finding jobs for the unemployed.

The J.F.K. Center is the most outstanding center in Dade County. The reason for this, the workers are very much interested in their work and progress of our center. To prove it, they make sure the community know what's going on by send fliers, pamphlets, letter and other things to notify the community of what's going on in the center.

The ideal of The Neighborhood Center can be marked as: "Mission Accomplished".

However I hope the government will continue to give Federal Fund for this purpose. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. E. COLLIER.

Mr. Chairman, I also feel that the support of the major newspapers in Miami, both editorially and in numerous articles is quite significant, and I would like several of the key editorials to also be made part of the permanent RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 8, 1967]

THE POVERTY PROGRAM AND A QUESTION OF SIZE

"Mutiny on the Bounty" someone called it years ago when relief clients went on strike against the WPA. That would not apply to anti-poverty Director, Sargent Shriver, who threatens to quit if Congress cuts his budget to tatters, but it does revive the real issue of the jobs.

In certain respects, Mr. Shriver is correct. The poverty program which we see as a substitute for the endless cycle of public relief ought to be workable or it ought to be abandoned. The appropriation which can make it thus has a crucial, critical size in dollars.

The Johnson administration has been told that the House Appropriations Committee will not approve more than \$1.6 billion. The Office of Economic Opportunity had asked for \$2.06 billion. Some House Members are talking of a cut to \$1.2 billion. At this figure programs which Congress itself has conceded are worthwhile and working would have to be eliminated and not simply curtailed. Of the Job Corps, the Committee majority said: "The Job Corps is making a significant contribution toward the eradication of poverty."

If the OEO lives, then, with the recommended \$1.6 billion maximum appropriation, it should strive to do so in good faith.

The fiscal situation of the U.S. demands some trimming of public expenditures. All the job training in the world would be useless in a country overrun by rampant inflation and headed for depression.

Within responsible fiscal limits and with sound administrative practices, the country should make every effort here and now to break the poverty cycle and rehabilitate people who can be producers. The record of public welfare is full of stories of families which have lived in idleness at great public expense over three generations.

The war on poverty cannot be won with political spending by vote minded politicians. But neither can it be won in the name of humanity and the national economy by political indifference. It's time to pass the ammunition—in the right size.

[From the Miami News, Nov. 2, 1967]

SHELLING THE POVERTY WAR

The effort among Republican and conservative Democratic congressmen to kill off the War on Poverty could, if successful, develop into an American tragedy.

Federal support for the poverty war is little enough as it stands. The bill under consideration would provide about \$2 billion for the fiscal year. Even when you add to this a few related housing and welfare measures, the total comes nowhere near the \$25-\$30 billion we are spending in Vietnam.

Now, the House Education and Labor Committee has tacked on a provision which, if it becomes law, could put many local programs out of business, including our own in Dade County. The provision would require local programs to come up with half rather than 20 per cent of the total budget. And the local contribution would have to be in cash instead of services.

Richard Weatherley, director of Dade's Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., doubts that the program could long continue under these provisions. In fact Mr. Weatherley, who is not given to alarmist statements, says the impact of such a law would be "devastating."

Reps. Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper must make it clear to the House when this measure reaches the floor that the poverty effort is essential in Florida, and especially in Dade County, where it has operated successfully for three years. We shudder to think of the state of our ghettos, bad as they are now, if it had not been for the EOPI.

Unfortunately, of the 12 representatives from our state, only Reps. Pepper, Fascell and Sam Gibbons (D., Tampa) have given the program much help.

We hope the House returns to reality when the time comes for a final vote on this measure.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the American people are demanding that Congress stop the wasteful spending which has forced us to the brink of disaster with a \$29-billion deficit. They want a good bargain for every dime we spend in their behalf.

So where do we cut, Mr. Chairman? The school lunch program? The highway construction program? The postal service?

No. We must cut where the waste is, with the OEO.

The Office of Economic Opportunity as it is constructed and operated today is a bad bargain for America. It is a bad bargain for the poor and a bad bargain for the taxpayer.

It has been infested with a cancer that cannot be cured. It has generated a philosophy that cannot be endured. It does not belong on the floor of this House as a subject to be debated.

The OEO and its web of agencies spinning off into every community in America under its leadership is rapidly becoming a creature of black power and roistering radicalism that will hurt this Nation for generations unless we stamp it out.

You would have difficulty getting a commission in the Army with a series of minor offenses, but you can have an arrest record as long as your right arm and still be on an OEO payroll at \$15,000 or more.

You cannot keep a job with a Government agency if your debt record is bad, but you can work for the OEO in a position of responsibility if you are a bad-check artist or an advocate of un-



trammelled illegitimate births by teenagers.

You cannot get a pay raise in the civil service unless your record is pristine with innocence and devotion to duty, but you can get on the OEO dole and agitate for higher salaries even if you are a narcotics addict or a refugee from a criminal asylum.

The Washington, D.C., poverty agency, UPO, has been for many months in the hands of men with long records of agitation for leftwing and black power causes.

Its employees have used their days at UPO to plan evening and weekend marches around Washington, threatening police in Washington and nearby jurisdictions, and defying local ordinances as if they did not exist.

Their youth program is being directed by an uneducated hoodlum, who is being paid nearly \$10,000 to lead 13- and 14-year-old boys through the alleys of Washington picking up trash. He is a paroled felon who came to their attention when he led sit-ins and protest marches against the District government after the shooting of another felon by a policeman. In the few short months since they found him, he has been involved in an incident in which a television set was thrown through a window; another during which his boys harassed the Washington Redskin Band at a home game forcing the band to leave the game under police guard. Then there was a fire at a dime store when he ran along the line of firemen yelling "burn, baby, burn, if you need more fire we will get for you." Just this weekend, he led his boys in an illegal march on the White House, and last week he just happened to be at the Coliseum with his boys when trouble broke out there.

I am not talking ifs, ands, or buts, Mr. Chairman. These are facts. The papers are full of them; the television screens livid with them.

We are not debating legislation here, Mr. Chairman, but a way of life.

Each evil and diseased mind, put in a position of trust and leadership by any branch of the Federal Government breeds and spawns a hundred more who will be on the street corners of America tomorrow unless we stop them.

What do you think we are breeding into the bloodstream and mentality of our nation when we continue to tolerate the hand-picking of criminals, crooks and radicals to fight the poverty war for decent Americans?

The answer is obvious. We are gutting our own future.

Some of my colleagues say lay off, let the police handle it, let the FBI investigate it, let the President's Commission ponder it. One of our most esteemed colleagues on my side of the aisle told me he hoped that we can revise this program so as to make it work, so we would not be charged with killing it.

My people in the 10th District do not feel this way, Mr. Chairman. They want me to echo their alarm, and I do with all that I have to offer in reason and concern.

We can cure poverty, and we will. But we can not cure the OEO by doctoring it,

pampering it, or ignoring it. We can eliminate it. And we should do so with the same dispatch with which it was created.

We must look at poverty and unemployment at the same time. We must look at the countless thousands of jobs going begging in this country—the Board of Trade estimates that we have 50,000 in the District of Columbia alone. Then we must help the unemployed find employment, and those who are unemployable learn skills.

OEO is a creature of this Congress, Mr. Chairman. So are its mistakes, its flaws, its dangers. The consequences of its risks will also be a creature of this Congress.

OEO has not and will not seek to cure poverty, except in its public utterances. It seeks to manipulate poverty and in the process the will and acts of this Congress and this Nation.

OEO is sinking into an abyss of radicalism as rapidly as it can close the basement doors where the planners gather.

It will only big deeper into the mainstream of America if we let it survive. And the deeper it goes, the more malicious its activities will become.

The OEO has made its own record so far. Let us conclude it while we have the monster that record reveals before us now

We know, Mr. Chairman, that permissiveness has allowed the radical and criminal element to be injected into the leadership of our antipoverty programs.

We are spending some \$35 billion for our State and Federal antipoverty programs overall, while stacking on top of this an annual crime debt costing each adult citizen an estimated \$574 in annual losses.

We ought to be getting more for our money, Mr. Chairman. Certainly those in dire need of help ought to be benefiting more from this vast sum being spent to alleviate their plight.

Far too often, Mr. Chairman, money from the OEO is wasted by agitators instead of finding its way into the pockets of the poor.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, in an internal report issued last March and commented on in at least one instance in the press, envisions, and I quote "more money—much more, beyond any current wild dreams."

Public decisions in the U.S., whether Federal, State or local—

It continues—

are arrived at in a large measure by a political bargaining process. And one reason for the lack of services of all sorts to the poor has been the weakness in this bargaining process. As the bureaucracy hardens with age the bargaining power of the clientele—the poor themselves—will increase.

Apparently some OEO officials consider the \$35 billion now being spent to help the poor little more than a temporary handout. Waste does not seem to concern them, nor is there to be any curtailment on the purse strings and radical and leftwing elements concentrate their efforts on pursuing their own programs within the OEO framework.

Saturation spending seems to be the goal of OEO, Mr. Chairman.

And the way to reach this goal, accord-

ing to the vision of the OEO officials, is to constantly demand more control of the funds by the poor.

This is a fiction, Mr. Chairman. It is not the poor who are constantly being given more control of poverty funds, but the radical and loud spokesmen for the poor.

We see this pattern unfolding in our streets and in our newspapers every day. If the Congress wants to deliberate and select a wise and equitable spending of the money it is accused of neglect of the poor and the very hallways of Congress are subjected to physical assaults disrupting the deliberations of elected officials.

If the objective is to let the poor run the show, why is there a need for a Sargent Shriver of the OEO? Why not just start the printing presses rolling, turning out millions of Government checks—OEO estimates there are 30 million who can qualify as being poor?

Why not pay off the noisy, the radicals, the rioters—buy their silence and eliminate the nuisance of their actions with cash?

The reason is, Mr. Chairman, that the American people do not want their money spent this way. They are tired and troubled with waste in the use of their funds.

If the goal is to make the poor rich and the rich poor, then the poverty warriors are asking us to adopt the goal of every socialistic government that has ever existed. And we stand about as much chance of accomplishing the goal as the record of socialist failures throughout the world indicates.

The decent people of America are concerned about the problems of poverty and are willing to make whatever sacrifices are really necessary to solve them. So are the decent Members of this Congress and the Federal and State governments.

But the job cannot be done with endless funding, endlessly wasted. It must be done by careful planning and consistent control of the funds allocated to the various programs. This would not include the use of funds either directly or indirectly by employing agitators and rioters on the OEO payroll, who then have access to cash and prestige in laying out policies in direct contravention of the wishes of Congress or the good sense of the American people.

It does not take a Phi Beta Kappa to discern what is taking place. One radical employed by OEO in a position to employ others will load the payroll with those who think and act as he does.

In the District of Columbia an almost endless roll can be called of those who are using OEO as a springboard for promoting radicalism and un-American standards to what they want to accomplish—not what needs to be done to alleviate the plight of the poor.

Rehabilitation of wayward citizens is a laudable goal. But giving them positions of influence and power far behind their means to handle it and influence others in the pursuit of equity for all Americans is not the way to get the job done.



The Washington Star on December 11, 1966, described the actions and organization of activists in opposition to a commonsense approach to antipoverty efforts in Washington as a militant underground. Included in the list of the so-called underground were almost every activist member of the UPO organization.

A deputy director of UPO has run the gamut of leftwing organizations from Fair Play for Cuba to close association with known members of the Communist Party. He has a police record.

One \$50-a-day consultant at UPO makes speeches to Communist Party groups. He, too, has a police record plus a record of agitation against policemen and enforcement agencies of the Government.

All of us know Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, whose antics and interests are interwoven with UPO activity here. Mr. Brown was a neighborhood worker for UPO just before taking over the SNCC chairmanship from Carmichael.

One UPO employee was quoted extensively in local papers advocating that teenagers not be dissuaded from engaging in sexual promiscuity.

Another advocated clemency for the atom spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

A number of others whose activities are funded by OEO have advocated doing away with public schools. One, a paid consultant, stated that what is needed in the Washington area is more violence.

The head of a UPO-financed school was arrested and indicted on 10 charges of violating the Narcotics Act. He was found not guilty by reason of insanity and after a short confinement in a mental hospital was freed to commit another offense which is still pending against him.

Many others, taking antipoverty funds in one form or another, spend much of their time arranging demonstrations, participating in demonstrations, and goading on the demonstrators to violate the law. They are almost too numerous to mention.

Collectively, however, they set a pattern for activity and favoritism of employment that is clear to anyone taking the time to look into the backgrounds of those in the forefront of agitation in this area.

It is not accidental. It is, instead, the direct consequence of intent and dedication to disrupt and destroy the peaceful activities we are undertaking as a government to help the poor.

No Federal funds, no State funds, nor local funds in any manner, shape or form should go to those dedicated to the destruction of this Nation, whether they are serious about the game they are playing or simply playing it for kicks. The same rule should apply and be enforced against those whose activities reveal a pattern of law violations.

We face enough hazards, Mr. Chairman, in our efforts today, without risking those which are spawned by irrational minds or from criminal intentions.

If we are to face a continuous long summer in seeking an equitable solution to our poverty programs, let us be armed

with an adequate leverage to enforce the standards of justice and decency for all of our people. The reduction of our way of life to the disorder and fear of riotous militance will solve nothing.

When a Government agency creates more problems than it solves it is high time the Congress has a long and introspective look at what is going on. The need was never more vital than it is concerning the problem we are deliberating today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a special sense of pride and satisfaction that I include in the RECORD an article about VISTA—the Office of Economic Opportunity's volunteer program—which appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal magazine, the Rhode Islander.

This article features the work of Miss Kathy Swan, who is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank H. Swan, Jr., of Barrington, R.I. Miss Swan is serving very effectively as a VISTA volunteer among the poor in Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Chairman, I commend to my colleagues attention this excellent article about the work Miss Swan and other dedicated young people are providing in the Office of Economic Opportunity's VISTA program.

[From the Providence Sunday Journal Rhode Islander magazine, Oct. 22, 1967]

#### A VIEW FROM VISTA

(By Kathy Zihlman)

Small refrigerators that leaked gas and didn't chill the food; rents that fluctuated from month to month, frequently above the advertised maximum; rats and roaches; a missing master key to every apartment; vandalism; no public transportation; small stores that charged 20 per cent more than inaccessible supermarkets....

These were the conditions that faced thousands of tenants in seven Kansas City, Missouri, public housing projects in the fall of 1966—and that also faced a newly-arrived young Rhode Island woman.

For Kathy Swan, 24, was a VISTA, a Volunteer In Service To America, assigned to work a year with the Human Resources Corporation, a social service agency. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank H. Swan, Jr., of Adams Point Road, Barrington.

She met the public housing tenants and learned of their problems shortly after her arrival. She discovered that the housing projects were managed by the city housing authority, a five-man board which held closed meetings to set housing policies for the projects.

"Five men were deciding how these people should live," said Miss Swan, "and only one of these five had ever been in a public housing project."

Complaints were handled in management-called meetings, she said, describing them as "regularly scheduled occurrences where people got up and made a lot of noise, let off some verbal steam, and left highly dissatisfied, knowing that nothing would happen."

Miss Swan and several other VISTAs began knocking on doors in one of the projects, discussing complaints with the residents and holding small meetings in apartments. One man invited her in and showed her a kitchen cupboard swarming with roaches. "He called it 'Their Room,'" said Miss Swan. "Only one apartment is exterminated at a time, so the roaches leave and then come back. Even in the very clean apartments, we saw roaches running up walls."

The smaller meetings led to a meeting of all the tenants in one of the seven projects. During the session, the VISTAs informed

them of results tenant organizations across the country had achieved. The tenants decided to form a similar organization, and elected officers at once.

Encouraged by Miss Swan and the other VISTAs, members of the tenant association decided to present their grievances directly to the housing authority, and contacted the six other housing projects for a joint meeting.

"It was the first time representatives from all the projects had gotten together," said Miss Swan. "They decided to form a council and elect a president to speak to the housing authority. Representatives from each project would accompany him."

Subsequently, the council took a survey of the tenants in all seven projects to determine the most prevalent grievances. Then, with the help of an attorney, the council drew up a new lease which provided for correction of the problems. The council elected a four-man team to negotiate with the housing authority.

Tenant associations also proved themselves in other ways, said Miss Swan. "One association took a petition to City Hall and succeeded in having stop signs put up on streets within their housing project. The housing authority replaced locks in a project where the master key was stolen. The tenants have obtained better security measures for their apartments. The housing authority went on an intensive rat control campaign and the rats were virtually eliminated in one project."

Two of the most common complaints—lack of public transportation and high grocery prices—have yet to be appreciably solved.

Though housing authority recognition of the council was slow in coming, the authority now corresponds regularly with the council, giving advance notice on policy changes. "This is unusual," said Miss Swan. "Before, the changes were announced after they had already been put into effect."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, no matter what it is called, no matter what fancy terms are applied to it by the social planners and economists, the Office of Economic Opportunity is just a fancy name for the biggest giveaway, welfare program ever foisted on the American taxpayer.

This seems to be the only thing the OEO can do better than any other agency—dream up fancy names for projects, not one of which is really new, just more expensive.

The latest one to come to my attention is something the OEO calls the "negative income tax." It is to be tested in New Jersey and is boomed by the social planners and economists as an incentive for the recipients to work. Now, let us cut out the fancy words and see just what will happen. It is very simple. Some 800 New Jersey families already on welfare will be handed about \$100 more a month in welfare payments for 3 years. It will cost the taxpayers over \$4 million, but only \$2.8 million will actually get into the hands of the poor. The rest will go to pay the expenses of travel, salaries, and evaluation of OEO officials and a private research firm. These figures mean simply that over 25 percent of the taxpayers money OEO claims is going to lick poverty will never reach the poverty-stricken, instead being siphoned off for high salaries and extensive expense accounts. And, I think I can give them the answer they seek without spending \$4 million. Anyone already on welfare who is given even more money without work-



ing for it, just will not seek employment. Why bother working if the Government will give you even more funds than you now receive for not working?

In my own district there are two agencies through which OEO funds are funneled. In Delaware County it is the Greater Chester Movement, with 1,018 people being paid \$1½ million during the year ending in August. In Chester County it is the Community Action Board, with 102 employees and funds totaling \$233,412 during the same period.

What have they accomplished that could not be done by another agency besides putting a total of 1,120 people on their own combined payrolls? I say nothing. And I base this on information supplied me by the professional staffs of the two organizations. Let us look at Chester County first. There only two programs have been operated, yet it takes five employees at a cost of \$77,308 to supervise them. One is called a "residential participation program" operated by six employees out of two offices. The other is Operation Headstart. While carried on the books as an OEO project, it has actually been operated during the past year by the county board of school directors. It did serve 400 children, but it could have served just as many had it been funded through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the high cost of administration at CAB would have been eliminated.

I cannot tell you what the residential participation program accomplished, or did not accomplish, since the two assistant directors of CAB my staff conferred with could not, or would not, I do not know which, provide the answers.

But, let us assume that it operated like the Neighborhood Action Centers maintained by the GCM. What did those four centers with a staff of 25 accomplish. GCM claims they helped 500 people obtain jobs. Very good, but the same sort of help, and on a higher professional basis, is already available through the Chester office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Office.

Make no mistake about it, GCM is a big business, with 25 full-time employees in central administration. Now here is what they administer, besides the fancy-named Neighborhood Action Centers: Neighborhood Youth Corps, 131 employed to provide work training for 577; Headstart, 112 employed to service 1,285 children; Opportunity Center, 50 employees, with 355 students in prevocational training, but not one trained well enough to be placed in the trade taught, and 577 in basic education classes, of which only 12 were given high school equivalency diplomas.

Let me pause here to discuss this part in more detail. The so-called GCM schools are not certified by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction and as such their diplomas are meaningless. At the same time, the Chester School District, which is certified, has available every course, plus many more, offered by GCM, and offers them day and night for everyone. It offers tuition-free adult evening classes in just about any subject you can mention, and it also operates vocational training courses under

the Manpower Retraining and Development Act. The latter program provided training during the last year for 443 students in 10 different trades and 358 obtained employment in private industry, while the rest were still undergoing training. Compare that record to the record of GCM.

Of the 1,018 GCM employees, some 200 were employed during the summer under another label, "summer impact program." This included such things as door-to-door distributors of OEO literature, some recreation workers, and something called area youth workers. The latter were simply teenage gang leaders who were paid \$60 weekly not to cause rumbles. And, what was offered in the way of programs for these gangs? On August 2, a GCM official said a course in karate was to start for these gangs. I do not know what was planned next—perhaps lessons in how to make zip guns.

There were another half dozen programs, but the ones I mentioned are typical examples and the principal programs offered by GCM.

I think there is a definite need for educational help for the underprivileged and job training for the unemployed and underemployed. But I do not think the answer lies with the Office of Economic Opportunity. These programs should be conducted through the appropriate existing Cabinet-level departments already in existence. The only jobs the OEO has actually provided are those on its own Federal payroll.

The OEO was born in haste as an expensive publicity effort to buy the support of the poor for the Johnson administration. I think it should now be buried in equal haste and let the Congress turn to constructive, well-thought-out programs to aid those who need help through already existing departments.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the prestigious New York Times published a classic editorial placing the blame squarely on Republicans and their reactionary allies in this Congress for the attempted mutilation of the national antipoverty program.

The Times said bluntly:

Because of Congressional irresponsibility the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized . . . and the unorganized poor are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Truer words were never written.

The leaders of the Republican Party and its so-called opportunity crusaders will have to bear a heavy responsibility if this program dies.

They will have to bear the responsibility for an end to Project Headstart and its help to 2 million poor children; for the dissolution of the Job Corps, whose thousands of enrollees will be denied training and education; for the end of VISTA; for the paralysis of day care centers, for the collapse of one of the most enlightened social programs ever put forward by any administration.

We must not let this happen to one of the finest Johnson programs ever conceived.

The Congress cannot stand by helpless as backward men try to undo what so many have worked so hard to create.

I hope the people of the cities, the poor, the minorities, and all those who seek justice and opportunity, keep this act of destruction in mind when November 1968 rolls around.

I think that the friends of justice should be rewarded and the enemies of progress punished at the ballot box.

We have not seen the end of this controversy. I hope it will result in a change of conscience in this House. But if it does not, let the blame rest with those who have shown their cold disdain for the poor and the needy.

I ask consent to insert in the RECORD the November 7 editorial from the New York Times entitled, "Whose Opportunity Crusade."

#### WHOSE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for preschool youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now underway in the House.

Representatives Goodell of New York and Quie of Minnesota, the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty bill, insist they are all for the aims of the program but just want to improve it. But their voting record makes their substitute "Opportunity Crusade bill" look suspect.

In every year since the antipoverty program started in 1964, Messrs. Goodell and Quie have voted against final passage, for recommitment, and for every crippling amendment. The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Con-



gress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, with the consideration of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 now before the House, I have occasion to call attention to the Members of this House a timely review of a community-developed summer school program which might well be compared with the Headstart program under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This program was initiated by the Westville, N.J., public schools, in cooperation with the Westville Borough Council, when it was felt that greater use should be made of the school facilities during the summer. Here is a town, which I proudly represent, with a population of approximately 6,000 people listing an elementary school enrollment of 435 students during the regular school year. The summer program is open to public and private school elementary students, grades 1 through 6, living in Westville. During its first summer of operation, 1967, 373 students were enrolled, or in other words, almost 86 percent of the total enrollment during the regular school year.

Under the 4-week summer school program, the students may choose two hour-long academic courses and two half-hour recreational courses to fill their 3-hour morning at the school. Among the academic classes offered are courses in reading, modern math, arts and crafts, and band. A remedial reading course is also offered.

Recreational courses include music, outdoor sports, library, gymnastics, music appreciation, and tennis. This portion of the program was previously administered as a separate activity by the borough council, which accounts for its 35-percent participation under the new program.

The school superintendent, Mr. Carl E. Sheetz, attributes the program's obvious success to the liberal mixture of academic and recreational experiences.

Fourteen teachers, not including helpers, worked on the program teaching graded classes of different sizes, ranging from six in a remedial reading class, for example, to an arts and crafts class of 25.

The pride of the program, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the ideas, the program, and the money came solely from the community.

With reference to costs, the figures for the 1967 summer school have been compiled showing a payroll of \$4,392.50 for teachers and helpers, and a cost for supplies of \$599.89 for a total expense of \$4,992.39. These figures, therefore, represent a cost of \$13.38 per enrollee.

Mr. Chairman, for the sake of a cost comparison, figures confirmed by OEO for the 1967 Headstart summer program, 8 weeks duration, showed an enrollment of 456,981 and a total program cost of \$101,311,630. This represents a cost per enrollee of \$221.70. If this figure were to be divided by 2 to arrive at an approximate cost per enrollee for 4 weeks, it would be \$110.85, although certain fixed costs could raise this figure higher.

I realize that Headstart is essentially a preschool program for disadvantaged children which is designed "to offset the 'progressive retardation' observed in deprived children during their years of schooling." I am also aware that the Headstart program may be somewhat broader in scope in that certain medical and dental services are provided.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Headstart program has demonstrated the greatest merit and potential of all the poverty programs. However, I commend communities such as Westville that have developed programs through their own initiative, and whose efforts bring to light a more fundamental question—How can the objectives of preschool and followup programs, both summer and full year, be most effectively realized?

It is already a fact that a number of preschool, followup, summer, and full year programs can be and are funded under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The appealing feature of funding under the Education Act is the fact that such programs remain under the administration and control of public educational agencies.

This, Mr. Chairman, I believe to be the heart of the matter. Thousands of communities are genuinely interested in these programs, but it is quite evident that a substantial number of communities could not implement preschool programs where they are most needed without Federal assistance. The Office of Education is unquestionably the most logical and professional agency to insure that maximum benefit is derived from the Federal Government's participation, and the most responsible approach to avoid the inherent wastefulness of duplicated resources and effort.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the initial success of the war on poverty is the one fact that cannot be overcome by those who would cut deeply into the poverty bill today. That success has cast an indelible mark on the face of America through a commitment to help those who by fate and circumstance have been overlooked in all of our past societal makeups. All of the insincere polemics and substitutions cannot obscure the very basic fact that the poverty program has worked in the past, is now working, even though severely strained by lack of funds, and it promises to work in the future with, perhaps, greater impact on the world in which we live.

The war on poverty is a commitment fostered by President John Kennedy and carried into visible truth by President Lyndon Johnson. The war on poverty brought promise to the promised land and some measure of hope to the hopeless. Our commitment has seen fruition in raising a Job Corpsman's average pay from a little over \$1 per hour to almost \$2 per hour, in bringing a Headstart child from the oblivion of the slum to some understanding of and care for the outside world, in training a man to work in dignity and self-respect to raise his children as decent, law-abiding citizens of this great land we are so fortunate to inhabit. The poverty programs have not

brought a miraculous end to the scourge of disease, slums, and crime. Perhaps, if anything, the war on poverty has shown us a deeper realization and recognition that these do exist in America today and many of our fellow citizens suffer because those circumstances do exist.

I would like to look for 1 minute to the very particularized impact of the war on poverty on the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey. Since early 1966, the 13th District has received over \$8.4 million in Federal funds for the war on poverty. Of this total, \$1.6 million was spent on Neighborhood Youth Corps projects involving almost 1,900 participants. The Office of Economic Opportunity ran Headstart programs in the 13th District which involved almost 1,000 pre-kindergarten children and their parents. Two hundred and seventy men and women benefited from a poverty grant of \$17,483 for adult basic education. Three hundred and forty-eight people participated in work-training programs at a cost to the Federal Government of \$318,663. The 13th District is fortunate in having a Women's Job Corps center involving, when completed, over 600 young women, at a cost of \$4,013,125. Over \$2 million is being used to run community action agencies in the 13th District.

Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty in the 13th District of New Jersey has a direct impact on almost 3,300 people in Headstart, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other direct action projects. In addition, the CAP agency centers throughout the district provide family services, job counseling, health services, day care centers, special educational programs, consumer education programs and miscellaneous services which cannot be adequately categorized because they are designed in response to local needs by the local CAP agency.

Mr. Chairman, the overwhelming evidence presented to the committee indicated that these services were reaching and helping the poor. The community action agencies in the 13th District reach additional thousands of poor people and families through these various indigenous programs and services.

Mr. Chairman, the programs of the OEO have had a tremendous impact on the 13th Congressional District. I have received over the last few days, hundreds of letters and postcards from poor people, from middle class people, and even from the well-to-do asking that I vote to continue the war on poverty. These are the people who know that the war on poverty programs are succeeding; these are the people who can see first hand the good these programs are doing.

Last summer and the summer before, this Nation saw many of its cities turned into battlegrounds of hate and fear, of lawlessness and frustration. The 13th District has seen the beginnings of riot, but has escaped because of the understanding and responsibility of the people who live in the district, and the public officials and police who serve on the local level. The people of the 13th District know what the ugly word "riot" means, because we are separated from the city



of Newark by only a short expanse of marsh.

Mr. Chairman, voices were quickly raised during the summer saying that we cannot tolerate violence and we should not reward those who would flout the law. And we cannot tolerate lawless violence, but neither can we tolerate the conditions that lead to violence in our streets. We cannot afford to tolerate the spark of discontent that lies now under the fabric of the society in the slums of America. It is a spark fanned by the slum landlord and the oppressive credit account. It is the discontent brought by the increasing realization that there are two standards of justice, health and convenience in America—one standard for the poor and one for the rest of America. The underlying discontent is just, and it brings with it a moral responsibility, wrought by political realism and economic necessity, to provide a lone standard for American society. It will only be through programs and intelligent policies, like the war on poverty, that we can have in America an equality of opportunity for all citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the Education and Labor Committee will tighten and streamline the OEO and its programs. The changes we are considering achieve this not by dismantling OEO, as many advocate, not by changing the original purpose of OEO, but by recognizing that no program is perfect, yet realizing that the basic philosophy and basic precepts are valid and valuable. The worst thing we could do today is to destroy the war on poverty by failing to see its successes and trying to drastically change the programs to eradicate a few shortcomings that affect only a small portion of the overall effort.

Mr. Chairman, Jersey City, N.J., is one of the 35 communities in which Community Action efforts will go broke this month unless we meet our clear responsibility with regard to this legislation and a corresponding appropriation. As the Washington Post, in its lead editorial, pointed out this morning, the Cando program in Jersey City is "completely out of money, with workers on a volunteer basis, and forced to borrow or beg to continue aid to some 10,000 families." So crucial to our city is the Cando program that the Jersey City Council, which, of course, already bears a maximum financial burden, has assumed the responsibility of temporarily supporting Cando until Federal action can be assured. But this extra burden simply cannot be borne by the city for more than a short time, and we must act without further delay if disaster is to be avoided in Jersey City and many other communities across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we accept the bill as reported by the committee. By our acceptance we will reaffirm our concern for our fellow men and we will assure to this Nation its continued health and prosperity. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### THE WAR AGAINST THE POVERTY WAR

Only because there are so many more rich people than poor people in this country, and

because the poor are clustered in small pockets of abject poverty, is it possible for so many members of the House of Representatives to mount so cruel and reckless an attack on the war against poverty. If their assault prevails in the voting that begins today, they may find some comfort in the damage this will do to President Johnson's Great Society. But it will be a cold kind of comfort. For, in the words of OEO Director Sargent Shriver, they will be engaging in both a "deduction . . . and a fraud."

It will be a cruel delusion for the poverty-stricken who had come to believe that help in increasing quantities was on the way. And it will be a highly dangerous fraud. For there is at home, as Adlai Stevenson once said of the less developed world, a "revolution of rising expectations" which will almost certainly be translated into wider violence and greater disorder if reasonable expectations are denied.

The Administration is seeking \$2 billion in poverty funds, an increase from the \$1.6 billion it received last year for such projects as the Job Corps, Community Action Programs, and Head Start. The Senate has approved this, and a bit more. But a motley coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in the House is trying to slash this year's appropriation down to \$1.2 billion, a figure that OEO believes would cripple its activities—cripple them in real terms and in terms of the psychological impact such a cut would have on the hopes and aspirations of the poor.

There was, at an earlier stage, some rational quality about the House attack on OEO, some sense that the program wasn't working well and ought to be overhauled or even scrapped, with its projects turned over to regular Government agencies.

A logical case can be made for conducting the poverty war differently; the art is not all that far advanced. But only three, of some 700 witnesses who have appeared before Senate and House hearings, were prepared to advocate dismantling of OEO. The vast majority recommended more funds, not less. None suggested the sort of senseless hacking which now threatens the poverty bill. Only the worst sort of partisan politics, on the part of many Republicans, and sheer indifference on the part of many Southern Democrats can explain the kind of irrationality which led the House to exempt OEO from Federal pay increases and which has left much of the poverty war without funds since Oct. 23 for failure to pass normally routine appropriations to maintain present programs until the larger appropriation question is resolved.

By Nov. 23, some 35 Community Action Programs will be in much the same shape as the project in Jersey City is in right now—completely out of money, with workers on a volunteer basis, and forced to borrow or beg to continue aid to some 10,000 families.

A belated move was made yesterday to appropriate money for the OEO payroll through Nov. 9, by tacking this on as a rider to the District Appropriation bill. But this is only a brief stop-gap. The point, very simply, is whether there is to be an effective poverty program, or not. A cut to the \$1.2 billion level would not be effective. In the District, for instance, it would mean \$20 million in poverty funds, compared with the \$35.8 million which would be provided under the President's request for this fiscal year, and almost \$30 million last year. This is not just robbing the poor of help. It is robbing them of hope. Those who conspire to do so may find political comfort. But they will deserve the country's condemnation and contempt.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, in a few days the House will act on the antipoverty bill. I rise to affirm my support for this bill, to urge the Members to support the bill as reported by the Committee on

Education and Labor, and to discuss my strong belief that the war on poverty has been effective and must be continued.

The original Economic Opportunity Act represented a daring and historically unprecedented attack on poverty. In that act, Congress acknowledged that the existence of widespread poverty in our rich land was wrong. The existence of this poverty was morally wrong, because this Nation had promised to the world that all Americans have an equal opportunity to better their lives. It was economically wrong, because 32 million poor Americans stunt our national economic growth and cause us to spend our resources to alleviate the effects of poverty. It was socially and politically wrong, because the existence of such widespread poverty taints the quality of all our lives and mocks our claims to greatness.

In 1964 the Congress faced up to these hard facts. It determined to wage a war not merely to palliate the effects of poverty, but to eradicate poverty itself.

No informed person thought this would be a quick or easy task. The size of the problem was staggering: An estimated 32 million Americans were desperately poor. The scope of the problem defied neat solutions, for poverty means many things besides not having money. Poor Americans live in inferior housing; they do not have the education or skills to get good jobs; their health care is inadequate; they do not get equal justice; their children get inferior educations; their neighborhoods are disintegrating. There are poor youngsters, poor adolescents, poor adults, poor older citizens. There is urban poverty and rural poverty. There are poor white Americans, poor Negro Americans, poor Puerto Rican Americans, poor Mexican Americans. The only common denominator among impoverished Americans is that they all face the future with little hope and little faith. The Congress realized that if the war against poverty was to be effective, it would have to attack the causes of all these different manifestations of poverty, and offer hope to all of the different impoverished groups. The original economic opportunity act wisely and bravely did just this.

In this legislation the Congress commissioned the Office of Economic Opportunity to attack poverty in all forms and on all fronts. The OEO has done just this, and has done it well.

Project Headstart was devised to provide poor children at an early age with supplemental education, so that these children would have a fighting chance to break the vicious poverty cycle which would otherwise surely claim them. This past summer some 500,000 poor children got a headstart through OEO summer programs; over 200,000 children will have a full year's headstart during fiscal 1968. This program has been universally acclaimed, even by persons critical of other OEO activities, because it is impossible to consign 4-year-olds to a wasted life and sleep easily at night. But let us not forget that an estimated 2.5 million poor children in this country would benefit from Project Headstart, but do not have the opportunity to participate in it.



Project Upward Bound seeks to help the deprived secondary school students in our cities. It seeks to salvage promising young people before it is too late. An estimated 25,000 young people have been touched by this program, but there are an estimated 760,000 poor youth who need this special attention. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has as its target disadvantaged 12- to 20-year-olds. It offers special counseling, supplementary and remedial education, and full- or part-time work experience. In its 2 years of operation over 900,000 young people have participated in Neighborhood Youth Corps activities. One mark of the success of this human reclamation project was the presence of these young people "cooling off" our troubled cities this past summer. But an estimated 2.7 million young poor could be helped by Neighborhood Youth Corps projects.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on documenting the record of these early antipoverty successes. Sixty-nine thousand three hundred and twelve enrollees in the Job Corps learning marketable skills; 675,000 people receiving medical attention from antipoverty health centers in fiscal 1967; 300,000 poor clients learning from legal services lawyers that the law is not always their enemy. But these statistics soon begin to numb the mind, and they obscure the very important fact that helping the poor to help themselves is not a numbers game. Whether 300,000 or 200,000 poor citizens were able to protect their legal rights through access to a legal services lawyer is not important; what is important is that until 1964 justice to many poor people was something only wealthy Americans enjoyed. Likewise, whether there are 2.7 or 2.5 or 1.5 million poor young people who could benefit from a Neighborhood Youth Corps project is not important: what we must remember is that even with the antipoverty program's auspicious beginning, there is much still to do. Each digit in these statistics represents a human being who, through no personal fault, has been forced to live desperately in a world he never made. We in this Congress must assume the responsibility for continuing the programs which now offer hope to these fellow citizens.

If the 32 million Americans who are poor cannot be provided with the opportunity to better their lives, then the other 165 million of us are sitting on a social powder keg with a short fuse. We may stave off an explosion by underwriting the social and economic costs of poverty—swollen welfare rolls, rising crime rates, close to 20 percent of our fellow citizens living unproductive lives and contributing nothing to our national strength. If we choose to live with this uneasy and wasteful condition, and if we succeed in preventing a massive social explosion, then we need only worry about our national conscience. But turning our backs on the desperate needs of so many Americans may lead to explosion. For let us be very clear about our present domestic situation. President Kennedy, in his first state of the Union message, put the issue bluntly:

We shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure.

There are now strident, often hateful, voices proclaiming that the American system, so carefully created and nurtured by our ancestors, cannot solve the urgent problems which confront many Americans today.

Traditional democratic tools have failed, these voices say, and, if change is to come, it must come violently. It is too easy and too dangerous to shrug off such voices as coming from misguided sources. Their message is falling on ears made receptive by lives of frustration, on ears which have heard America's promises. The purveyors of this message of violence often find ready audiences whose lives bear tragic witness to the unconscious betrayal of these sacred promises. And so, America must test anew whether its Government can meet these new challenges and retain its commitment to freedom. The antipoverty program is one of the most hopeful answers to this new challenge. Its message is both traditional and revolutionary. It is traditional because the antipoverty program provides an alternative to violence as it offers hope for the future. It is an attempt to redeem America's promises by helping the poor to help themselves. It is not a "handout," but rather a device to give the tools to the poor to better their own lives.

I am sure the Members are aware that during this summer's disorders in our cities the antipoverty workers often were instrumental in helping to restore law and order. In many cities Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen put on white hats and walked the streets all night cooling hot-heads. In Newark, the legal services lawyers played a key role as honest brokers between an angry citizenry and local officials. Such acts were totally unexpected but in retrospect were quite predictable. Those who have become involved in the antipoverty program recognize that the program offers a peaceful channel for high emotions, and those in the ghettos recognize that these neighbors can be trusted because they know the terrible conditions and frustrations which lead to violence.

The antipoverty program is also traditional because its essence is the involvement of local groups to solve local problems. Local industry, local church groups, local government authorities, local bar associations, local medical associations—all have joined with the local people to fashion antipoverty programs to meet the local problems. This strategy of local involvement, stimulated by the OEO, has insured that antipoverty projects will be truly responsive to local needs.

And yet the antipoverty program has also been revolutionary. As remarked earlier, the entire philosophy of the program is without historical precedent. No other society has ever committed itself to eradicate poverty itself. But the execution of this commitment has been as revolutionary as its philosophy. The OEO is, to my knowledge, the first national agency whose sole clientele is the poor. The existence of an independent agency to speak for the poor has been invaluable. Only such an independent agency could insure that the war on poverty is directed energetically and creatively. Only such an independent agency could serve

as America's undiluted conscience, to remind us constantly of the terrible needs of so many of our citizens. The hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor made clear that any move to break up the OEO and transfer its functions to other Government agencies had virtually no support among the many groups and organizations which are most concerned with our country's welfare. This consensus results from a realization that the OEO has done an effective job, and that the poor need an independent voice in the highest councils of our Government. I hope the House will again recognize the value of this independent advocacy, and will reject any move to break up the OEO.

Mr. Chairman, it is my fervent prayer that this House will not turn its back on the poor. The antipoverty bill which we will consider is not perfect, nor in my judgment is it adequate to meet the desperate needs of the poor. But it is basically a good bill because it reaffirms our national commitment to help the poor to help themselves. The OEO has in its brief existence effectively implemented its commission from Congress and has made measurable progress in solving the staggering problems of poverty. Millions of trapped Americans have felt its presence and have been helped out of their tragic plight. Many millions more remain to be helped. It would be a tragedy if partisan or parochial interests impaired the work of the OEO or stopped the war on poverty. The war on poverty offers the poor opportunity, to be sure. But it also offers the Nation the opportunity to redeem its pledge, made in 1776, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I urge this House to remember this pledge, and to enact the committee-reported antipoverty bill.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, it is most extraordinary that at a time when we still have huge pockets of poverty in our country certain forces are determined to kill or effectively dismember the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is the agency that has been in the forefront of conducting the war on poverty and to help the unfortunate among us, our own fellow Americans, who live in poverty and deprivation.

It is now the fifth month since the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1 and as yet the operating funds for this agency have not been provided. On October 23 the continuing resolution which provided temporary funds for OEO was allowed to expire and since then the agency has technically been deprived of funds to operate its various programs, pay the salaries of its employees, or meet its other commitments.

By withholding the necessary funds and attempting to dismantle the agency, those who are pursuing such a course of action are striking directly at the poor and the disadvantaged. It is a stab at the heart of our effort to combat poverty and to give the poor an opportunity to lift themselves out of the rut of impoverishment to which they seemed to be doomed.

While the antipoverty organization may have certain shortcomings, these can be corrected where there is serious



concern for the welfare of the poor. The American public by this time is well aware of the extent of poverty in many parts of the land and is eager to help in alleviating this situation. The poverty program has wide support in the country among all elements of the population and it should be continued with modifications where necessary. To cut it completely or to drastically decrease the funds required for this purpose is, to my mind, both shortsighted and detrimental to the welfare of our Nation.

I am deeply concerned over the efforts to kill or eliminate this program. The Congress has a responsibility and a commitment to the poor, and these must be fulfilled. Already vast damage has been done by delaying action and withholding the needed funds for the various anti-poverty programs, so that in many communities throughout the country today some of these programs are at a standstill and others are on the verge of being shut down completely.

In my own district of eastern Connecticut we had several very fine projects going, among them such programs as Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action, legal aid for the poor, foster grandparents, adult basic education, training for unemployed, and others which have become very popular and quite successful in numerous instances. Today the value of these programs are widely recognized by many civic groups, businessmen, educators, labor unions, church groups, and countless numbers of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite specifically one example of the suffering caused in my district by the failure of Congress to provide funds for the antipoverty program. The Seaside Regional Center at Waterford, Conn., provides residential and day-care services for the mentally retarded in New London and Middlesex Counties, regardless of age and severity of retardation. Among those benefiting from these services are some 200 retarded children. Through the Thames Valley Council for Community Action, which handles OEO funds for the area, a foster grandparents program was started at the center about a year and a half ago and this program proved most successful.

Last week the large number of elderly people who have been participating in this program by providing loving care for these 200 children were informed that the funds have been exhausted and the program would cease on November 1. There are about 115 elderly people who work with these children and provide them with individual care 5 days a week, 4 hours per day, at the rate of \$1.50 per hour. In most instances this is their only source of income for these elderly widows and grandmothers, outside of social security.

The cost of this program is about \$5,000 a week or approximately a quarter of a million dollars annually. This is certainly a most worthwhile program for all concerned, the children, the foster grandparents, the institution, and the community as a whole. Fortunately, some private sources and the State of Con-

necticut have made available some funds which will enable the program to continue for several weeks in the hope that by that time Congress will have provided the funds.

The fact remains, however, that this is a deplorable situation and that it should never have reached these proportions. We have an obligation to the poor and we should refrain at all times from exploiting their misery for political purposes. During the riots in our cities last summer many of us pledged to exert our best efforts to alleviate the conditions that breed frustration, despair and violence. By curtailing or eliminating the OEO and all its antipoverty programs we are not alleviating these conditions, but are only encouraging them to a greater extent.

Mr. Chairman, in the last few days I have received a large number of letters and telegrams from people in my district regarding the OEO program in general and the foster grandparents project in particular. From these I have selected only a few which represent a cross section of the views expressed. I am pleased to insert these at this point:

THAMES VALLEY COUNCIL FOR  
COMMUNITY ACTION, INC.,  
Norwich, Conn., November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: As a consequence of the present Congressional impasse regarding the anti-poverty program, Thames Valley Council will be forced to shut down its Foster Grandparents Program on or around November 17. As a consequence, 115 elderly persons with incomes below \$1,500 per year will lose a valuable employment opportunity. More importantly, the established relationship of a year's duration between Foster Grandparents and retarded children will be severed.

Our Council will attempt to secure all local funding and state funding for this program we can in order to continue it. In addition, our Council will ask the Foster Grandparents themselves to remain on the job on a volunteer basis with the hope of being repaid at a later date when and if the anti-poverty bill is passed. Our Council is well aware of the support you have given to the antipoverty program; nevertheless, we beseech you and your office to take whatever steps are within your power to secure the passage of this Bill and the continuation of the Foster Grandparents program.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD O. BROOKS.

NORWICH, CONN.,  
November 4, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As a foster grandparent I feel it my duty to write to you in hopes that the Foster Grandparent Plan will live on.

As you are well aware, this pilot program has a twofold purpose. This program is not only beneficial to a retarded child, but it makes me feel like a more useful and independent citizen. Where or how else could women my age find a fulfilling job such as this?

Please do not let a program such as this which is so beneficial to so many die. Anything that you can do in your capacity as U.S. Representative will be greatly appreciated by many.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LYDIA YERRINGTON.

WATERFORD, CONN.,  
November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Washington, D.C.:

The parents of retarded children in southeastern Connecticut are exceedingly distressed at the loss of the tender loving care provided by foster grandparents to their children at the Seaside Regional Center in Waterford, Conn., because of lack of funding to the Office of Economic Opportunity. We were notified that this very worthwhile program is to be terminated immediately and we seek your help. Please take whatever actions indicated to move the appropriations bill affecting this program to speedy and successful passage.

SEASIDE ASSOCIATION OF PARENTS AND  
FRIENDS.

NEW LONDON, CONN.,  
November 4, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing to urge you to exert every possible effort at your command toward restoring the fund for the Foster Grandparent Program of the Thames Valley Council for Community Action, Inc., Norwich, Connecticut, of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its cancellation will not only prevent the self-sustaining supplements to the inadequate monthly Social Security payments, but will result in irreparable setbacks to the very excellent progressive aid to the mentally retarded persons under the supervision and care of the now famous Seaside Regional Center for the Mentally Retarded at Waterford, Connecticut.

As an active citizen of seventy-two years of age, I know of no more valuable humanitarian service than that administered by this program.

Your prompt and sympathetic consideration will be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LEMPI RIMPILA.

NORWICH, CONN.,  
November 6, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

DEAR SIR: This is tragic news and we grandmothers are very upset. We shall miss the children very much and I am sure they will miss us. Also the loss of this financial help will leave us stranded.

Perhaps the greatest loss will be to the retarded children, whom we have learned to love.

I know you will use your influence in our behalf. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MAUDE GOODBODY,  
Foster Grandmother.

NEW LONDON, CONN.,  
November 3, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The news that our Foster Grandparents' program is threatened has come as a great shock.

We are gravely concerned because of the

We need not be modest about declaring sudden shift from an opportunity to earn what we receive without asking for charity relief, and above all, are concerned for the children under our care.

We have witnessed the amazing results of our presence among them, and glory in our achievements.

We need not be modest about declaring that there is no question of our beneficial influence.

The limited time in which we may contact you does not permit a lengthy description of "near miracle" accomplishments.



Suffice to say the program has been highly effective and it is our sincere wish that it be continued for the benefit of all concerned.

It has been an experience which has enriched our lives and without which we would indeed have been impoverished.

Your plea on our behalf will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ANNE M. SMITH.

NORWICH, CONN.,

November 4, 1967.

Hon. Mr. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to you in the interest of the Anti-Poverty Program, especially the Foster Grandparent Program. We foster grandparents have been with these children for over a year now and seen them grow much more normal and educable. When we took over some of these children couldn't walk or talk and didn't communicate with other people too well. We have grown to love these little children dearly and have seen them become very responsive to others, as well as starting to walk and talk.

It is love within my heart and tears in my eyes that I beg you to do all in your power to prevent this Foster Grandparent program from being abolished.

Thank you for your continued interest in our problems, and hoping for success in continuing the Program.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY G. PURDON,

Foster Grandparent.

NORWICH, CONN.,

November 3, 1967.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: This is in reference to the funding of the Anti-Poverty Program presently being held up in Congress.

As a foster grandparent I am particularly concerned with this part of the program. From experience with mentally retarded children I have witnessed a remarkable improvement in their well being. I feel it necessary to continue our efforts in helping these children learn to live a more useful and productive life.

Kindly do whatever possible to keep the program active.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NELIDA LANDRY,

Foster Grandparent.

NORWICH, CONN.,

November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. ONGE: Isn't there anything you can do to assist in the Foster Grandparents-Retarded Children Program at the Seaside Regional Center in Waterford, Connecticut?

This program is on the verge of being terminated and it is one of the most worthy programs ever undertaken in the State of Connecticut. Not only does it provide inspiration to the Foster Grandparents, filling up their lonely and empty days, providing an opportunity for them to earn a little money, but at this period of their lives, they need to be needed, and what greater way could they serve God and mankind but to help retarded children—children who desperately need all the love, help and understanding that honestly only these Foster Grandparents can give.

The great majority of the parents of these children tend to reject them—won't even admit to their relationship, and some never even pay them a visit.

Human lives are being considered here! Don't let these retarded children be deprived of the one thing that has brought a little happiness, love and, yes, hope, into their

lives—their Foster Grandparents. My mother is a Foster Grandmother (her picture is in the October 31, 1967 issue of Look Magazine, page 103) and she has told me many times how the children that she has worked with respond, how she has got them to say a few words when their speech is one of their many problems, how they hug her and call her "mama", how they look for her each day. I shudder to think what their lives will be if suddenly these Foster Grandparents are taken away. Put yourself in their position—how would you feel if something very important to you was snatched away?

If you have not already read the article in Look Magazine, I urge you to take a couple of minutes of your time and do so. And most important to do all you can to help restore this program at Seaside. Help them with all your heart. The Foster Grandparents need your help; the retarded children need it more! Please help!!

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDWIN R. KRODEL.

WATERFORD, CONN.,

November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: You have given your support to anti-poverty legislation in the past and have assisted us, locally, in funding problems that have occurred with OEO.

I ask now that you use your good and considerable influence on your colleagues in Congress to save the present legislation for the war on poverty, which you know has only just begun.

We cannot allow the hopes and aspirations of the disadvantaged to be scuttled. America must face up to its responsibilities and continue and expand programs that will assist the poor.

I know you can help.

Sincerely,

LESLIE SECORA.

MYSTIC, CONN.,

November 6, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: News reports of imminent House action on the poverty bill makes this letter overdue. Because of your fine record in support of OEO programs in our area and your hard work in behalf of the Thames Valley Council for Community Action, we in the Groton League feel secure in Second Congressional District representation of our human resources program goals. We are dismayed by the fact that members of the House of Representatives from many other areas lack confidence in anti-poverty efforts.

We are proud of the initiative and innovative courage of our regional anti-poverty group and, in spite of problems during the course of its operation, the League is firm in its conviction that TVCCA demonstrates a successful thrust in attacking the economic and social ills which confront the poor in our community.

Mrs. John Wedicka is chairman of the Groton League's human resources committee. She is also secretary of Groton Resources Organized, the local arm of TVCCA. She and the League are gratified by the successful initiation of a day care program in the Fort Hill section of Town and point to this accomplishment as a concrete example of the effectiveness of community action programs as provided for under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The League feels that the House Committee on Education and Labor amendments to Title II of H.R. 8311 are ill-advised and would seriously weaken the strength of community action programs. The specific changes we refer to are 1) the proposal to place commu-

nity action agencies under control of state or local, city or county governments and 2) the proposal to double the local contribution rate and require that one-half of it must be in cash.

The success of the Thames Valley Council for Community Action as a private non-profit organization speaks for our concern on the first change. The League considers it very unwise to force CAPs at this time to become an arm of government. An increase of the local share of funds to 20% would create a strain on CAPs which some programs might not be able to survive. The League believes community action nationwide has shown significant strides. We hope for a climate which will continue to nurture its health and development. We believe the Committee amendments are harrasing tactics which defeat this hope.

We know you share our anxiety for the Foster Grandparents program at Seaside. We know also that unsettled Congressional opinion is inextricably entwined with the problem of securing the necessary funds. The temper of Congress in regard to evaluation of the poverty bill concerns us deeply. Any effort on your part to influence your Congressional colleagues at this critical time will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EDITH FAIRGRIEVE,

President, League of Women Voters of Groton.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, there is a ghetto saying now popular, which asks:

Are you going to talk the talk, or walk the walk? We have been talking the talk so long on the poverty program that important elements of it are slowly dying.

More important, the sense of confidence is disappearing, among antipoverty workers and the citizens they work with, that this country is concerned about inequalities and means to act. Replacing it is an ugly mood in Congress and in the Nation which suggests the antipoverty program is the cause of poverty and if we abolish the agency we solve the problem. Actually this vital program serves rather to remind us that the poor do exist, that they exist, not from their own design, or from sloth or from simple inactivity, but rather from basic injustices for which we in Congress share responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, this is the week for us to walk the walk with the poor whom our society has disabled. This is the time for us to show we will do more than talk the talk.

I support this bill and the Education and Labor Committee which, under its able chairman, has worked out, in a difficult climate, a solid accomplishment. I recognize many areas of compromise, some of which are doubtful to my judgment.

The appearance, for example, of taking power from the poor to solve their own problems by limiting their representation to one-third of community action boards is a serious vote of a lack of confidence, even if the Committee did not intend this interpretation. A telegram from my district, on this point, said:

There would be strong community reaction to the proposed change, not only because it requires radical surgery in structures the community built with great effort, but because it would appear that Congress is taking power away from the poor only a few short years after it granted it. It can lead



only to cynicism, mistrust and bitterness among the poor who would see their independence curtailed just as they were developing new strengths.

Another amendment, approved by the committee, to require a doubling of the local contribution to community action programs, including Headstart, poses a different kind of problem. What do we prove by squeezing 87 million more dollars out of local sponsors of programs like Headstart, for this is the amount which this amendment would mean nationally and annually? Are we concerned about money or principle? In money, this \$87 million is what 21 hours of war costs. If principle, what do we prove by demanding a sticky dime from the poor before we give 90 cents?

Mr. Chairman, despite these reservations, I support this bill and will work to strengthen it by proposing an amendment to help the poor get more for their money and thus, help us get more for our OEO dollar.

This amendment will encourage the poor consumer to organize for better buying, comparative shopping, joint savings, and other self-help programs. It is based on my conviction, as chairman of the consumer inquiry of the Government Operations Committee, that the poor pay more for everything.

The text of this amendment, which I will present at the appropriate time, is printed below:

Amend title II, section 222(a) by adding thereto a new paragraph (10):

"(10) A 'comprehensive consumer action program' to develop and support projects which focus on the needs of poor people as consumers of goods, services and credit. The program shall emphasize the broadening of capabilities of existing institutions and the creation of new institutions to redress marketplace inequities and which will provide the poor consumer with means for proper economic judgments and consumer self-sufficiency."

Projects under this program shall—

"(a) provide the opportunity for the poor consumer to articulate his needs, assemble buying information, and compile comparative shopping data through the creation of a variety of consumer institutions and associations designed to meet these needs;

"(b) stimulate and develop the capability for capital accumulation among residents of low income areas, as well as attract outside capital from the private and independent sector; and promote the use of such capital in self-help enterprises which will develop leadership among low income residents while meeting their needs as consumers;

"(c) include programs of technical assistance, consumer and credit counseling, and training local consumer specialists to encourage imaginative use of collective buying power coupled with sound business practices, and which will help to develop the skills and expertise needed for personal and group financial success.

"The Director shall appoint for each of the OEO Regional Offices a Consumer Action Specialist whose role shall be to coordinate other OEO, State, and Federal programs within the Region with programs and projects developed under sub-paragraph (a), (b), and (c) above, and to provide assistance and support to consumer action activities within the region. Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need and the ability of applicants to secure the maximum involvement of low income residents in programs which

show promise of economic self-sufficiency. Funds may pay the full costs of programs of technical assistance and training, as provided in paragraph (c).

"With regard to other projects and programs under this paragraph, the requirement of non-Federal contribution in Sec. 223 (c) shall be waived wherever there is the investment or binding pledge of investment by private and independent sources in enterprises created or expanded as part of funded projects of an amount equivalent to that which would otherwise be required as the non-Federal contribution; or by the investment or pledge of investment of such an equivalent amount in shares of a credit union or other cooperative enterprise by its members."

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to encourage the poor to protect themselves and their limited dollars by group self-help. It will establish, as a national emphasis program, a system of organizing the poor consumer to both articulate his needs and satisfy them by acquiring the experience and practical education of a careful, trained and intelligent shopper.

This self-education will come, under this amendment, in multipurpose, local institutions which either exist already in some form, like credit unions or co-operatives, or which can be created to fill these needs. In addition to their original purposes, like encouraging thrift or assembling buying power, these multipurpose institutions will be able to offer credit counseling, comparative shopping information, compilation and presentation of price survey data and other important elements for a consumer to their members.

These organizations, as envisaged by this proposal, can also help finance other self-help community groups like buying cooperatives, consumer protection associations and other groups which will combine buying and credit power for mutual protection and assistance.

There is no single answer to any important social problem, including the poverty of our 40 million Americans. My amendment will not solve their problem. Even if it works, as I hope and believe it will, it only works in that small but important area of reassuring the poor consumer that he has a chance to win.

But at this point, Mr. Chairman, I believe that a vote for the self-confidence and self-respect of these victims of a system they never created may be the most important act of confidence we can make.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of the continuation of the economic opportunity program and the amendments which we consider today to strengthen and extend the life of this important program.

Many times during the brief life of this important program in my city, I have risen on the House floor to indicate the forthright support which the Office of Economic Opportunity has received from a broadly based group of grassroots and community leaders in my city of Cleveland, Ohio, and in Cuyahoga County in which Cleveland is located. Today, I wish to insert a telegram which reiterates clearly this broad case of sup-

port from the majority of community leaders in my city, including the chief representatives of the business and industrial community, educational and religious leaders, county and city officials, judges on the county and municipal benches, and grassroots leaders, as well as organized labor. Their telegram, which urges support of the Office of Economic Opportunity, requests funding at the \$2.06 billion level, urges defeat of the 10-percent cash requirement, as has been proposed, and urges that the Office of Economic Opportunity remain intact rather than be spun off to various Federal agencies, thus to diffuse the important work which National OEO has so well carried out during its brief 3-year history. The telegram and list of supporters is as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
November 7, 1967.

HON. CHARLES VANIK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

We, the following, from the greater Cleveland community know the local OEO programs as useful, necessary and vital to resolving Cleveland's critical urban problems.

We fully support the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and as amended in 1966.

We urge your support of the House bill's request of \$2.06 billion.

We urge defeat of the 10% local cash share which would seriously curtail and eliminate valuable local programs.

The serious urban problems facing greater Cleveland make mandatory OEO's continued assistance. Without spinning off its coordinating programs.

#### SIGNERS

Ralph S. Locher, mayor.

Ralph Besse, president, Illuminating Co.  
William O. Walker, director, Department of Industrial Relations, State of Ohio.

Rev. Bruce Whitemore, director, Council of Churches.

Lawrence Evert, director, Businessmen Interracial Committee.

John Kellogg, councilman, city of Cleveland.

Paul Briggs, superintendent, Cleveland Public Schools.

Judge Perry B. Jackson, common pleas court.

Dr. Robert H. Courtney, president, Council of Churches.

Charles H. Loeb, Call & Post.

Attorney Paul Walters, president, YMCA.

George Dobrea, president, Cleveland Board of Education.

Sherman Titens, president, Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Wendell Erwin, president, NAACP.

Dr. James Norton, director, Associated Foundation.

Robert Carr, president, Urban League.

David N. Myers, president, Jewish Community Federation.

Judge George McMonagle, common pleas court.

Mrs. Frank Zack, president, Cuyahoga County League of Women Voters.

Tom Boardman, editor, Cleveland Press.

Herman Sanford, executive director, Foreign Language Publications.

Judge Albert Woldman, juvenile court.

Judge John Toner, juvenile court.

Judge A. J. Gagliardo, juvenile court.

Judge Walter Whitlatch, juvenile court.

Sam Brooks, councilman, city of Cleveland.

Msgr. Richard McHale, Catholic Board of Education.

Mr. Sabastian Lupica, executive secretary, AFL-CIO.

Msgr. Casimir S. Ciolek, director, Catholic Charities.



Pat Day, president, county commissioners.  
Frank Gorman, county commissioner.  
Wm. Speeth, county commissioner.  
Eugene Burns, director, county welfare department.

Harold Boehm, vice president, Towmotor.  
Mr. Carl Fazio, Sr., chairman, Fisher-Fazio-Costa Foods.

Mr. Stuart Buchanan, vice president, Marschalk Co., Inc.

Mr. John S. Mills, chancellor, Case-Western Reserve University.

Mr. Arthur A. Watson, vice president and general manager, WKYZ TV.

Mr. Charles E. Chapman, president, Cuyahoga Community College.

Dr. Harold L. Enarson, president, Cleveland State University.

W. C. McCulloch, executive secretary, Cleveland Welfare Federation.

I wish to also insert a very strongly worded telegram of support for the legal aid program which has been operating with maximum effectiveness in the Cleveland area from Mr. James C. Davis, a highly respected attorney and president of the Cleveland Bar Association. The telegram is as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
November 7, 1967.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Cleveland Bar Association strongly supports the local legal aid program which is largely dependent upon current O.E.O. financing. I sincerely hope the Congress will take no action which will adversely affect the ability of our legal aid efforts to meet crucial Cleveland inner city problems.

JAMES C. DAVIS,  
President, the Cleveland Bar Association.

In addition, I wish to insert into the RECORD a telegram I received from the Cuyahoga County League of Women Voters presidents who add their support to the war on poverty and request full funding at the \$2.06 billion level. The telegram is as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
November 7, 1967.

HON. CHARLES VANIK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

The League of Women Voters county presidents strongly urge your support of war on poverty House bills request of 2.06 billion. We urge support of OEO as planning, coordinating and funding source without spinning off its programs.

We urge defeat of 10% local cash share. This would curtail and eliminate valuable local programs..

#### SIGNERS

Mrs. Frank Zack, president, Cuyahoga County.

Mrs. Charles Mealy, president, Fairview Park.

Mrs. Brent Martson, president, Bay Village.

Mrs. Fredick Lyman, president, Lakewood.

Mrs. R. J. Smith, president, Beria & Southwest Area.

Mrs. Clifford Moore, president, Parma.

Mrs. Richard Taylor, president, Cleveland.

Mrs. Philip Gibbs, president, Rocky River.

Mrs. Herbert Borstein, president, Cleveland University Heights.

Mrs. Alexander Orfleer, president, Shaker Heights.

Mrs. Alvin Hart, president, East Cleveland.

Mrs. Clifford Sobol, president, South Euclid Lyndhurst.

Mrs. David Garland, president, Euclid.

Mrs. Donald Cohrs, president, Westlake North Olmsted.

In addition, I wish to insert a telegram from Rev. J. Robert Sandman, Department of Public Affairs, Ohio Council of Churches, which also adds strong support of this religious organization representing churches throughout the State of Ohio. The telegram is as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO,  
November 7, 1967.

CHARLES A. VANIK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of anti-poverty bill retaining at least \$2.06 billion funding and preserving participation of the poor free from local political domination. We urge deletion of local funding requirement of 10% cash. From every indication in Ohio this is crucial to continued well-being of our society.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC  
AFFAIRS, OHIO COUN-  
CIL OF CHURCHES,  
Rev. J. ROBERT SANDMAN,  
Chairman.

These strong voices of support at this critical time are only a slight indication of the well of support which I have found throughout my community for the continuation of the important work being carried out by the people who live daily with the problems of poverty in my city of Cleveland.

The programs which we consider today are not expendable. We cannot overlook the millions of children and young people who have been given a ray of hope because of the Headstart program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, or a first-time experience in summer camp life.

The legal aid service has provided equal treatment under the law for many thousands not so privileged before this program was initiated throughout the country. Additionally, the implementation of the concept of "maximum feasible participation" in title II of the present law has provided the opportunity for so many people in the neighborhoods to realize the importance of community participation.

The antipoverty program has experienced some mistakes and errors. The program has operated on front stage-center—under the hostile klieg lights of criticism—criticism by many who never believed in its purpose—criticism by many who prayed for its demise. Under the face of this bitter attack, the good of the program and its high purposes cannot be overlooked.

The antipoverty program, established under President Johnson's leadership and ably administered by Sargent Shriver, may represent the greatest governmental development of this decade. Just as the Peace Corps remains as one of the permanent objectives of our Government, so must the antipoverty program remain as an instrument of necessary service to a large and needy segment of our population. The antipoverty program is no longer an experimental program. It can take its place in the governmental fabric of essential public service.

I stand by the antipoverty program as an essential public service which cannot be suspended or reduced. I hope that this body will stand firm to preserve it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I submit today the minority views of myself and my colleague, Representative JAMES GARDNER, on the war on poverty. These views are in addition to those presented by other Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee.

The important area of helping the poor of our Nation must not be left in the hands of those who take three times as much for themselves as they allocate to actually help the poor. There must be a realistic, serious appraisal of the poverty program so the good may be continued, the bad improved, the waste cut, and the unnecessary totally eliminated.

The politically motivated war on poverty may be the tragedy of the decade unless severe measures are taken to insure that stop the cheating of both the poor and the taxpayers.

The views follow:

SEPARATE MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JOHN M. ASHBROOK AND JAMES C. GARDNER

Although we agree with much of the analysis and many of the recommendations expressed in the foregoing minority views, we feel that additional points must be made concerning the entire operation of the so-called war on poverty.

#### A POLITICAL WAR FROM THE BEGINNING

The Johnson administration initiated this ill-conceived mess as a political move for the 1964 election; the "war on poverty" was to be a dominant theme and slogan for that campaign. The original legislation was hastily and badly drafted at the White House, virtually without the participation and at times almost over the dead bodies of responsible Cabinet officials. It was then rammed down the throat of a Congress which exercised so little legislative function that scarcely a line was changed in the White House draft. Minority members of this committee at that time forcefully and fully pointed out the grave mistakes in the legislation and accurately predicted that it would be a colossal failure.

The partisan political use of the "war on poverty" has been unrelenting since 1964. In community after community, all across this Nation, the list of highly paid officials of the poverty war reads like a rollcall of professional Democratic politicians. The political use to which this program has been devoted is acknowledged even in the majority report of this committee—although the majority will do nothing effective to prohibit such use.

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

At the heart of this political boondoggle is OEO, which might best be named the "office of economic opportunists." It is the highest paid, worst managed, most incompetently staffed agency in the history of the Federal Government. One out of every 42.3 of its employees is paid over \$20,000 a year; nearly one-half are paid \$10,000 a year or more. The budget of the United States lists 416 positions in OEO with pay in excess of \$15,000 a year.

The budget also estimates that 2,800 permanent Federal employees are required to run OEO, and that another 4,772 other permanent positions are required in other Federal agencies to run programs funded through OEO. These 7,572 permanent Federal positions required to run the war on poverty from Washington—according to the budget estimate—cost the hard-pressed American taxpayers a cool \$60 million for salaries alone this year.



That is only the cream skimmed off the top. At least 75 percent of the community action funds go for "administrative costs"—almost entirely in high salaries. "Community Action," according to the majority report, "employs" 95,000 persons and has cost \$1,800 million to date. It is interesting to note that less than half of the people employed by CAP are classified as poor persons—that even in this activity, the poor come off second best.

The unbelievably high costs of the Job Corps has been covered in the other minority views, but here again we note that a very large part of these costs are for administrative salaries—and that these salaries notoriously run far higher than the public schools can pay instructors and administrators of vocational education.

We do not believe that the American people—including millions of poor people who work at hard jobs for a small income from which Federal taxes are deducted—should be asked to continue to support this bloated bonanza for bureaucrats.

#### COMMUNITY ACTION FOR WHAT?

There are thousands of good citizens who serve on CAP boards, teach Headstart classes, or otherwise attempt in good faith to assist the antipoverty programs. But in city after city across this Nation such selfless efforts are lost in the welter of politics, factionalism, and radical intrigue which is being passed off as "community action." In city after city "community action" has been little more than radical agitation, including, as in Newark, N.J., the organization of demonstrations, protest meetings, and inflammatory incitements which led directly to a tragic riot and the mindless destruction of property and human life.

We ask "community action for what?" It is not been action to produce jobs (except for paid employees of the program), or to train unemployed people for jobs, or to make any difference in the environment of poverty. In terms of having any real effect upon the condition of poverty, community action has been a \$1.8 billion bust.

Even the Democratic members of our committee acknowledge the excesses of this program publicly. Here are just two of the many remarks made in the open sessions to mark up the bill.

Mr. Pucinski, for example, said of the community action program:

"It has not worked in many communities of America, and I tell you that in many communities it has been a catastrophic flop \* \* \*."

He also observed of Community Action that:

"This program is in disrepute today because fly-by-night outfits formed overnight have come down here to Washington and because they had friends in the OEO got millions of dollars to carry on all sorts of programs and the legitimate organizations in your communities \* \* \* (were by-passed)."

Mr. Carey had this observation:

"If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies \* \* \*. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation."

We respectfully disagree with our colleague, Mr. Carey, that disclosing the true operation of this program is an act of "vandalism." We think it is a matter of public duty. For example, he gave a vivid account of a group of "Peaceniks" getting into one com-

munity action program and, in the course of their demonstrations, financed by decent American wage earners, desecrating a church. When brought into court, according to the account of Mr. Carey, they were defended by community action neighborhood legal services—again at the expense of the taxpayer. We agree with our colleague that Congress never intended so bizarre a use of tax funds. But this sort of thing runs rampant through the poverty program.

#### LET'S ACT INTELLIGENTLY AGAINST POVERTY

It is time to call a halt to this whole business, and turn our attention to serious efforts to assist the unemployed poor to find jobs, to strengthen our system of vocational education, and to help our schools overcome the educational handicaps of children from a background of poverty.

According to former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, the Federal Government alone in 1964 was spending over \$30 billion a year to combat poverty. Since then we have committed hundreds of millions. If these billions are not doing the job, we should find out why and redirect the programs to reach the hard-core unemployed poor. This would have been the sensible approach in the beginning. This would have been the approach of a rational administration intent upon anything other than politics.

The poor—to say nothing of the taxpayers—deserve something better than the "war on poverty."

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday and today the House has debated the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. This debate as well as previous actions of the House earlier in this session demonstrate that the antipoverty program is in jeopardy. It is threatened by the prospect of inadequate funding. All over the country present programs are coming to a standstill because of the refusal of the House to approve a continuing resolution until funds for the fiscal year 1968 have been authorized and appropriated. It is threatened by the prospect of domination by local governments, many of which are hostile to its purpose.

The Green amendment makes community action agencies a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a public or private nonprofit agency which has been designated by a State or a political subdivision. In other words, another State or local veto is proposed. In addition, the composition of community action boards and community action governing boards will result in control by local public officials who shall have one-third of the representation and undoubtedly will be in a position to strongly influence the designation of the balance of the board.

In my opinion the Green amendment will adversely affect the involvement of the indigenous poor in planning programs for their own communities. This is the unique feature of community action, and it should not be scuttled. I hope that sections 210 and 211 will be amended, and I intend to support the amendment to be offered by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], which will strike the Green amendment.

I think it would be useful for all Members of the House to consider the effect of the Green amendment on communities

which have already set up their community action programs. Yesterday members of the New York City congressional delegation met with representatives of New York City and representatives of the various communities where community action has created new hope. They expressed understandable dismay at the idea of being required to restructure local community action boards.

The Reverend H. Carl McCall, chairman of the New York City Council Against Poverty, and George Nicolau, commissioner of the New York City Community Development Agency, presented the following statement which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

#### STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL AGAINST POVERTY TO THE NEW YORK CITY CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, NOVEMBER 8

We have come today to talk with you about the critical effect the anti-poverty legislation now before the House of Representatives could have on our city's community action program.

As members of the Council Against Poverty and representatives of local community groups and city-wide civic, business, religious and social welfare organizations, we are involved daily with New York's anti-poverty projects and the people they serve.

We want to discuss both the likely results of a cut in funds and the effects of Section 211(c) which would radically alter the nature and structure of the community action program.

Unless additional funds are made available immediately through a continuing resolution or a new appropriation, New York City will be unable to continue its community action programs past the third week in November. Such a shut-down would affect hundreds of thousands of people served by over 250 agencies.

Even if an appropriation is approved, unless Congress votes for at least the \$2.06 billion appropriation approved by the House Committee rather than the \$1.2 billion many House members appear to favor, New York City will be faced with a drastic cutback of up to 30 or 40 percent.

This would gut our program. Community action programs now operating at a level of \$17.5 million could be cut by as much as \$6 or \$7 million, affecting many thousands of people involved in neighborhood service center programs, remedial and tutorial education, training and employment programs and a host of others.

Section 211 (c) could throw New York City's community action structure into chaos. For over a year, people in fifteen poverty areas have worked to establish Community Corporations to plan, approve and coordinate anti-poverty programs, and they have elected the governing boards for all but one of them.

None of the boards meets the requirements of Section 211 (c). In each case, members were selected in community-wide, democratic elections open to all residents, and a ruling that the boards must now be scrapped would lead to cynicism and disillusionment among the people who have worked to make the Corporations a success.

We are not alone in our attempts to preserve an anti-poverty program that is more than an empty shell. A group of twenty-four business, civic and religious leaders, including Time-Life Publisher Andrew Heiskell, Central Labor Council Chairman Harry Van Arsdale, Board of Education President Alfred Giardino and New York's Episcopal Bishop Horace Donegan, joined in a statement this week calling on the House to pass a bill "which deals honestly with the poor and gives them a significant role in shaping



their own destiny." They said, "We implore the House to act courageously and in its best traditions."

We came here today to make that same plea. The New York City delegation is probably the most enlightened one in the country, and we appreciate the support its members have given to many pieces of social legislation through the years. We are calling upon you now not only to continue in that tradition, but to do everything in your power to convince your colleagues that the future of our cities and of our nation depends on our ability to solve the problems of poverty that have been built into the birthright of millions of our citizens. If we fail in this task, the costs will be far, far greater in the economic and human waste we will be condemned to suffer.

Mr. Chairman, I also include a statement issued November 6 by New York City business, labor, civic, and religious leaders in support of the antipoverty program.

**STATEMENT BY NEW YORK CITY BUSINESS, LABOR, CIVIC AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS IN SUPPORT OF THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM**

This week the House of Representatives weighs the fate of millions of Americans; indeed, of us all. Its actions on the Anti-Poverty bill can determine the course of our society for years to come—whether there will be continued hope or renewed despair, a growing belief in the credibility of America or rekindled frustration, made more bitter by what may seem and may well be a vengeful abandonment of concern.

For the Congress to refuse to commit resources equal to the task is to postpone to a time perhaps too late those issues which we must face now. For the Congress to now cut anti-poverty funds, given the urgent need in our cities, would be most unwise. For the Congress to reduce the participation of the poor in the institutions they have created to deal with their own problems is to turn its back on the bright beginnings of the last three years.

America needs an Anti-Poverty Act which deals honestly with the gathering crisis of our urban centers. It needs an act which deals honestly with the poor and gives them a significant role in shaping their own destiny. We implore the House to act courageously and in its best traditions.

It is not resources that limit America's decisions; it is our decisions that make resources. America has the capacity to deal with its problems. It must have the will. Simple justice requires no less.

**SIGNERS OF STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM**

Rev. Eugene Callender, executive director of the New York City Urban League.

Bishop Terrence J. Cooke, vicar general of the Archdiocese of New York.

Bishop Horace Donegan, Episcopal Bishop of New York.

James Fogarty, executive director of the Community Council of Greater New York.

Alfred Giardino, president of the New York City Board of Education.

Mrs. Milton Gordon, president of the Citizens Committee for Children.

Victor Gotbaum, president of District Council 37, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

Mrs. Helen Harris, executive director of the United Neighborhood Houses.

Andrew Heiskell, publisher of Time, Inc.  
Christian Herter, Jr., chairman of the New York City Urban Coalition.

Mrs. Minneola Ingersoll, president of the Women's City Club.

Floyd McKissick, chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Rev. Leo McLaughlin, president of Fordham University.

John H. Niemeyer, president of the Bank Street College of Education.

Dr. David Salten, executive director of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Mrs. Irwin Toback, president of the League of Women Voters.

Harry Van Arsdale, chairman of the New York City Central Trades and Labor Council.

Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP.

Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League.

Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman, Episcopal Bishop of Brooklyn and Long Island.

Dr. Gardner Taylor, pastor of the Concord Baptist Church in Brooklyn.

Bishop Richard B. Martin, suffragan bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Brooklyn and Long Island.

Msgr. Francis Mugavero, secretary to the bishop for charity of the Archdiocese of Brooklyn.

Rabbi Harold Gordon, executive vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1968**

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8569) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, GLAIMO, PATTEN, PRYOR, MAHON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, McDADE, RIEGLE, and Bow.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RYAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

**PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday, November 11, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the expected conference report on the District of Columbia?

Mr. ALBERT. No, these are bills to be reported out of the District of Columbia Committee which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] asked me to request permission that they might have until Saturday night to file.

Mr. HALL. Does the distinguished majority leader know if action has been completed and the reports are available to the Members?

Mr. ALBERT. On these bills?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. I am not able to advise the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. When does the distinguished gentleman intend to program them?

Mr. ALBERT. Perhaps next week, but not during the first part of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**CORRECTION OF VOTE**

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I understand that on rollcall No. 374 this afternoon, I was recorded as voting "no."

Mr. Speaker, I was not present and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder how many other votes are erroneously recorded—this being a five-vote margin with respect to motion to recommit. I wonder how many other votes may have been entered erroneously one way or the other in the voting record?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]?

There was no objection.

**MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT**

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Members should be present to hear the message, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:



The bipartisan election reform bill, H.R. 11233, that has been reported by the subcommittee of the House Administration Committee is sound legislation. Through the incorporation of the following major Republican provisions, honest reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures and streamlined enforcement procedures would be insured:

First. A five-member bipartisan Federal Election Commission is established to receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures.

Second. The Commission has been granted full and complete authority to enforce the provisions of the act. It is also authorized to make reports and statements available for public inspection and to prepare and publish summaries and reports.

Third. Candidates for Federal office and political committees supporting such candidates that accept contributions or make expenditures exceeding \$1,000 in any calendar year, are required to report contributions and expenditures.

Fourth. Donations by an individual of more than \$5,000 to any candidate or any committee supporting such candidate in any calendar year are prohibited.

Fifth. Campaign contributions by political action committees financially supported by a corporation, trade association or labor organization are regulated.

Sixth. Conventions, primaries, and party caucuses have been placed under the reporting and disclosure provisions of the bill.

Seventh. The disclosure of gifts or honorariums of more than \$100 is required of candidates for the House and Senate, as well as incumbents.

In view of the urgency of this legislation and the President's early support, we are surprised and dismayed that the election reform bill does not now appear on the administration's list of must legislation. To be enacted this year, the election reform bill must have the continued and enthusiastic support of President Johnson. The American public demands and deserves an election process that commands respect and confidence. Moreover, clean elections must be practiced at home as well as preached abroad.

(Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### HUNT-WESSON CONTRACTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I asked Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in a telegram dated November 2, 1967, to investigate the possibility that the Department of Defense may inadvertently be purchasing Soviet vegetable oil for shipment to U.S. and allied forces in Southeast Asia.

The Hunt-Wesson Foods Co., of Fullerton, Calif.—manufacturers of Wesson Oil—have received 13,575,143 pounds of Soviet vegetable oil since last March.

Although Hunt-Wesson canceled an additional shipment of 20 million pounds which was scheduled to dock in New Orleans on or about Friday, November 3, the possibility of commingling Soviet and domestic vegetable oil supplies still remains.

The problem is clearly seen when one reviews the extent of Defense Department contracts for vegetable oil with Hunt-Wesson since that firm began receiving Soviet vegetable oil supplies. The following table illustrates the enormous volume of refined vegetable oil contracts awarded by the Defense Department to the Hunt-Wesson Co. since April 6, 1967:

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY CONTRACT AWARDS TO HUNT-WESSON FOODS FOR SALAD OIL, "TYPE B" FROM APR. 6 TO NOV. 8, 1967

[Federal Specification JJJ-S-30b, dated May 4, 1964, and amendment 2]

Date awarded	Contract number	Quantity (gallons)	Dollar value
Apr. 6.....	DSA1307C540A1	142,560	\$220,963.60
Apr. 11.....	DSA1307C504A3	36,432	56,469.60
Apr. 20.....	DSA1307C33231	39,600	61,578.00
May 4.....	DSA1307C529A5	135,168	209,902.88
May 9.....	DSA1307C529A7	62,304	97,028.80
May 11.....	DSA1307C33261	34,848	55,834.24
May 19.....	DSA1307C33283	64,416	100,867.36
May 26.....	DSA1307C529A8	147,840	235,319.92
June 14.....	DSA1307C33811	17,424	27,733.20
June 19.....	DSA1307C33820	71,442	136,374.84
June 26.....	DSA1307C33835	286,884	497,637.12
Aug. 10.....	DSA1307C039A4	80,154	126,830.64
Aug. 11.....	DSA1307C23006	71,442	133,675.92
Sept. 8.....	DSA1307C23008	19,008	30,191.04
Sept. 22.....	DSA1307C23014	42,282	80,241.84
Total, 15 contracts.....		1,251,804	2,070,649.00

I have asked Secretary McNamara, in light of this new information, to redouble his demands for complete proof that none of the 13 million pounds of Soviet vegetable oil already received by Hunt-Wesson has been commingled with domestic supplies in the fulfillment of Defense Supply Agency contracts.

It would be ironic indeed if U.S. soldiers in Vietnam wounded by Soviet weapons were fed Soviet vegetable oil purchased, in effect, by U.S. taxpayers.

The text of my letter to Secretary McNamara follows:

NOVEMBER 8, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY McNAMARA: In further reference to contracts which Hunt-Wesson Foods Company has with the Defense Supply Agency for vegetable oils, I have received today a listing of all vegetable oil contracts with Hunt-Wesson since April 6, 1967—about the time Hunt-Wesson received its first shipment of vegetable oil from the Soviet Union.

I find that the Department of Defense has contracted with the firm in fifteen awards for 1,251,804 gallons of vegetable oil at a cost of \$2,070,649.00.

The Hunt-Wesson Company has cancelled delivery of 20 million pounds of Soviet cottonseed oil, which had been expected to arrive at New Orleans Friday, November 3. How-

ever, in view of the size of these contracts, the provisions that products supplied must be U.S. end products, and the statements of Hunt-Wesson that it used "no supplies of foreign origin", it is even more reasonable for the Department of Defense to demand complete proof that none of the 13 million pounds of Soviet vegetable oil has been commingled with domestic supplies in the fulfillment of Defense Supply Agency contracts.

Specifically, the Defense Department should ask the Hunt-Wesson Company what specific actions it undertook to prevent commingling of Soviet and domestic vegetable oil supplies, and if that company can prove the absence of commingling.

I am sure that you share my concern in this matter. Thanks for the response of November 6 from Mr. Thomas D. Morris, your Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics. Looking forward to a further report.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,  
Member of Congress.

Text of letter of Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1967.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. FINDLEY: Secretary McNamara has asked that I reply to your telegram of 2 November 1967, concerning the use of Soviet vegetable oil for our U.S. military forces in Vietnam. This is an interim reply to acknowledge your inquiry and to provide some preliminary information.

The Defense Contracts Administration Services Regional Office (DCASR) in Los Angeles is charged with the responsibility for administering the terms of this specific contract. As you stated, the Hunt-Wesson Company did furnish a written statement that no supply of foreign origin oil was used. This was confirmed by telephone conversation with the Hunt-Wesson Quality Representative on 3 November 1967, during which DCASR, Los Angeles, was advised that the oils used to fill DSA contracts were made from seeds grown in the United States, which were processed into crude oil and finally processed by the Fullerton, California, plant.

Although I have no reason to believe otherwise, I have requested DCASR, Los Angeles, to physically verify the above information and to provide satisfactory evidence to that effect. This evidence will be forwarded to you as soon as it is received.

As I anticipate that this information will be provided prior to November 15th, I do not consider it prudent to suspend the contracts on the basis of current information.

I appreciate your interest in the procurements of food products for U.S. military forces.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D. MORRIS,  
Assistant Secretary of Defense,  
Installations and Logistics.

#### SUPREME COURT ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 4 the U.S. Supreme Court rejected a writ of certiorari in the case of Mora and others against McNamara and others, in which three soldiers had challenged the legality of the U.S. participation in the Vietnam war.



The press reported extracts from dissenting opinions of Justices Stewart and Douglas. Because they deal with the war-making responsibility of the Congress, and raise grave questions about the scope and effect of the SEATO Treaty and the Tonkin Gulf resolution, I present in full the texts:

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 401, October term, 1967]

MORA ET AL. v. McNAMARA, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

[Decided November 6, 1967]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART, with whom MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS joins, dissenting.

The petitioners were drafted into the United States Army in late 1965, and six months later were ordered to a West Coast replacement station for shipment to Vietnam. They brought this suit to prevent the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army from carrying out those orders, and requested a declaratory judgment that the present United States military activity in Vietnam is "illegal." The District Court dismissed the suit,<sup>1</sup> and the Court of Appeals affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

There exist in this case questions of great magnitude. Some are akin to those referred to by MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS in *Mitchell v. United States*, 386 U.S. 972. But there are others:

I. Is the present United States military activity in Vietnam a "war" within the meaning of Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution?

II. If so, may the Executive constitutionally order the petitioners to participate in that military activity, when no war has been declared by the Congress?

III. Of what relevance to Question II are the present treaty obligations of the United States?

IV. Of what relevance to Question II is the joint Congressional ("Tonkin Bay") Resolution of August 10, 1964?

(a) Do present United States military operations fall within the terms of the Joint Resolution?

(b) If the Joint Resolution purports to give the Chief Executive authority to commit United States forces to armed conflict limited in scope only by his own absolute discretion, is the Resolution a constitutionally impermissible delegation of all or part of Congress' power to declare war?

These are large and deeply troubling questions. Whether the Court would ultimately reach them depends, of course, upon the resolution of serious preliminary issues of justiciability. We cannot make these problems go away simply by refusing to hear the case of three obscure Army privates. I intimate not even tentative views upon any of these matters, but I think the Court should squarely face them by granting certiorari and setting this case for oral argument.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 401, October term, 1967]

MORA ET AL. v. McNAMARA, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

[Decided November 6, 1967]

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, with whom MR. JUSTICE STEWART concurs, dissenting.

The questions posed by MR. JUSTICE STEWART cover the wide range of problems which the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

recently explored,<sup>1</sup> in connection with the SEATO Treaty of February 19, 1955,<sup>2</sup> and the Tonkin Gulf Resolution.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Katzenbach, representing the Administration, testified that he did not regard the Tonkin Gulf Resolution to be "a declaration of war" and that while the Resolution was not "constitutionally necessary" it was "politically, from an international viewpoint and from a domestic viewpoint, extremely important." He added:<sup>4</sup>

"The use of the phrase 'to declare war' as it was used in the Constitution of the United States had a particular meaning in terms of the events and the practices which existed at the time it was adopted . . . .

"[I]t was recognized by the Founding Fathers that the President might have to take emergency action to protect the security of the United States, but that if there was going to be another use of the armed forces of the United States, that was a decision which Congress should check the Executive on, which Congress should support. It was for that reason that the phrase was inserted in the Constitution.

"Now, over a long period of time . . . there have been many uses of the military forces of the United States for a variety of purposes without a congressional declaration of war. But it would be fair to say that most of these were relatively minor uses of force. . . .

"A declaration of war would not, I think, correctly reflect the very limited objectives of the United States with respect to Vietnam. It would not correctly reflect our effort there, what we are trying to do, the reasons why we are there, to use an outmoded phraseology, to declare war."

The view that Congress was intended to play a more active role in the initiation and conduct of war than the above statements might suggest has been espoused by Senator Fulbright (Con. Rec. Oct. 11, 1967, p. 14683-14690), quoting Thomas Jefferson who said:<sup>5</sup>

"The President is to be Commander in Chief of the army and navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and Admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies; all which by the Constitution under consideration would appertain to the Legislature."

"We have already given in example one effectual check to the Dog of war by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay."

These opposed views are reflected in the *Prize Cases*, 2 Black 635, a five-to-four decision rendered in 1863. Mr. Justice Grier, writing for the majority, emphasized the arguments for strong presidential powers. Justice Nelson, writing for the minority of four, read the Constitution more strictly, emphasizing that what is war in actuality may not constitute war in the constitutional sense. During all subsequent periods in our history—through the Spanish-American War, the Boxed Rebellion, two World Wars, Korea, and now Vietnam—the two points of

view urged in the *Prize Cases* have continued to be voiced.

A host of problems is raised. Does the President's authority to repel invasions and quiet insurrections, his powers in foreign relations and his duty to execute faithfully the laws of the United States, including its treaties, justify what has been threatened of petitioners? What is the relevancy of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the yearly appropriations in support of the Vietnam effort?

The London Treaty (59 Stat. 1546), the SEATO Treaty (6 U.S.T. 81, 1955), the Kellogg-Briand Pact (46 Stat. 2343), and Article 39 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter deal with various aspects of wars of "aggression."

Do any of them embrace hostilities in Vietnam, or give rights to individuals affected to complain, or in other respects give rise to justiciable controversies?

There are other treaties or declarations that could be cited. Perhaps all of them are wide of the mark. There are sentences in our opinions which, detached from their context, indicate that what is happening is none of our business:

"Certainly it is not the function of the Judiciary to entertain private litigation—even by a citizen—which challenges the legality, the wisdom, or the propriety of the Commander-in-Chief in sending our armed forces abroad or to any particular region." *Johnson v. Eisentrager*, 339 U.S. 763, 789.

We do not, of course, sit as a committee of oversight or supervision. What resolutions the President asks and what the Congress provides are not our concern. With respect to the Federal Government, we sit only to decide actual cases or controversies within judicial cognizance that arise as a result of what the Congress or the President or a judge does or attempts to do to a person or his property.

In *Ex parte Milligan*, 4 Wall. 1, the Court relieved a person of the death penalty imposed by a military tribunal, holding that only a civilian court had power to try him for the offense charged. Speaking of the purpose of the Founders in providing constitutional guarantees, the Court said:

"They knew . . . the nation they were founding, be its existence short or long, would be involved in war; how often or how long continued, human foresight could not tell; and that unlimited power, wherever lodged at such a time, was especially hazardous to freemen. For this, and other equally weighty reasons, they secured the inheritance they had fought to maintain, by incorporating in a written constitution the safeguards which time had proved were essential to its preservation. Not one of these safeguards can the President, or Congress, or the Judiciary disturb, except the one concerning the writ of habeas corpus." *Id.*, 125.

The fact that the political branches are responsible for the threat to petitioners' liberty is not decisive. As Mr. Justice Holmes said in *Nixon v. Herndon*, 273 U.S. 536, 540:

"The objection that the subject matter of the suit is political is little more than a play upon words. Of course the petition concerns political action but it alleges and seeks to recover for private damage. That private damage may be caused by such political action and may be recovered for in a suit at law hardly has been doubted for over two hundred years, since *Ashby v. White*, 2 Ld. Raym. 938, 3 *id.* 320, and has been recognized by this Court."

These petitioners should be told whether their case is beyond judicial cognizance. If it is not, we should then reach the merits of their claims, on which I intimate no views whatsoever.

#### BUSINESSMEN START HELP FOR JOBLESS

(Mr. ESCH (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted per-

<sup>1</sup> F. Supp. — (D. D. C. 1966).

<sup>2</sup> U.S. App. D. C. —. — F. 2d —.

<sup>1</sup> Hearings on S. Res. No. 151, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

<sup>2</sup> [1955] 6 U.S.T. 81, T.I.A.S. No. 3170.

<sup>3</sup> 78 Stat. 384.

<sup>4</sup> Hearings, on S. Res. 151, *supra*, n. 1, at 145.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, at 145.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, at 80-81.

<sup>7</sup> 15 papers of Jefferson 397 (Boyd ed., Princeton 1955). In the *Federalist* No. 69, at 465 (Cooke ed. 1961), Hamilton stated:



mission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the debate in this body during the past 2 days on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 has highlighted once again the tremendous problems faced by our Nation in combating poverty. Surely the difficulties caused by unemployment are among the most immediate and pressing and deserve our greatest concentration.

It is clear that the efforts to find jobs for unemployed workers cannot, and must not, be solely a Government function. Indeed, the most encouraging signs in our Nation today are the evidences of great interest on the part of the industrial and business community in assisting the unemployed and the untrained to acquire gainful employment. Such action on their part obviously redounds to the benefits of not only the individuals who are enabled to find employment and their families but to the business community and the economy as a whole.

It is therefore with a great deal of pride that I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the efforts of the Ypsilanti, Mich., businessmen to aid persons in finding jobs. Their job opportunity committee has just started its work and I am confident that it will be a most successful effort. I insert the Ypsilanti Press description of this important initiative at this point in the RECORD:

#### BUSINESSMEN START HELP FOR JOBLESS

A program by businessmen to find jobs for hard-core unemployed in Ypsilanti was launched today.

A Job Opportunity Committee modeled after Detroit's recent successful anti-poverty campaign, has been formed to study local unemployment and aid persons in getting jobs, it was announced.

Officers of the Business and Professional League, a local Negro organization, and the Chamber of Commerce jointly announced the formation of the group and appointment of eight members today.

The committee plans first to conduct a survey of unemployed persons in the Ypsilanti area—bounded by the US-23 Freeway on the west, the Wayne County line on the east and including the city and Augusta, Ypsilanti and Superior Townships.

A questionnaire available at the C of C office and appearing in The Press today on Page 5 should be filled out by persons desiring either full or part-time employment, the committee said.

The questionnaires ask the job seeker to state his or her name, address, telephone number, sex, age and special skills, and ask whether transportation is available and whether full or part-time work is desired.

The committee also plans to conduct a survey of unfilled jobs, asking employers to notify the committee at the Chamber office of vacant positions.

Committee members also have agreed to meet with other community groups with the hope of channeling job placement in one direction, a committee spokesman said.

Chairman of the employment group is Dan T. Quirk, president of the Peninsula Paper Co.

Other members are Jesse A. Rutherford, assistant director of the city parks and recreation department; Vanzetti M. Hamilton, attorney; Joseph A. Butcko, president of the Chamber and president of the Crescive

Die & Tool, Inc.; C. Eugene Beatty, director of the Ypsilanti School District's community school program; Herbert W. Francols, real estate dealer; Dr. Ray B. Loeschner, vice president for academic affairs at Eastern Michigan University, and Thomas H. Brooks of Brooks Food Market.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the present provisions of section 406 of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 which we will be debating today in the Committee of the Whole.

I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to keep the provisions of section 406 under the jurisdiction of the Small Business Administration.

Section 406 is an attempt to foist upon the Department of Commerce the procurement and management assistance functions now exercised by the Small Business Administration.

This is not to say that the Department of Commerce needs this legislation for it already has most of the powers set forth in section 406 by virtue of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-136, 79 Stat. 552; 42 United States Code 3121. Under this act, the Economic Development Agency of the Department of Commerce has both loan functions and management assistance functions. In fact, Mr. Rodney L. Borum, Administrator, Business and Defense Services of the Department of Commerce, conceded during hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, held only a few months ago, on April 13, 1967, that in organizing "entrepreneurial training for the young people in the minority groups, the Department of Commerce is duplicating the activities of the Small Business Administration." See "Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives," 90th Congress, first session, part III, page 435.

Thus, section 406 of the bill herein under discussion is not needed by the Department of Commerce. All the proponents of section 406 are attempting to accomplish is to add, via section 406, a great many more dollars to the half billion dollars EDA has requested for fiscal year 1968.

If you want to see how effectively EDA carries out its functions with the half billion dollars it had during fiscal year 1967, look at the twelve and a half million dollars it poured into a Maine cane sugar refinery which has not the slightest chances of success and was characterized by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS] as "an adventure in fantasy land." See "Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives," 90th Congress, first session, part III, page 248.

Or, look at the \$127,000 EDA has poured into a fishmeal plant in the inland State of Tennessee, a venture classed under the heading "Recreation and tourism."

The proponents of section 406 are claiming, in justification of this authorization to EDA to duplicate SBA functions, that "SBA is not equipped to handle this kind of program." Yet, EDA itself has demonstrated that it does not have the necessary capability. For EDA has gone to SBA to get the following assistance and expertise:

Assistance in the preapplication counseling of business loan projects by performing such technical services as financial, aviation, engineering, and legal;

Field investigation;

Support in loan closing through fact-finding and furnishing advice in areas of technical services;

Support in loan disbursements by furnishing financial, engineering, and legal services;

Principal-agent relationship basis for the loan servicing functions, including billing accounts and collection of repayments; and

Liquidation of loans upon referral from EDA. See "Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives," 90th Congress, second session, part III, page 336.

This shows a lack of capability and competence, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that EDA is spending close to \$23 million a year for administrative costs alone. See "Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives," 90th Congress, second session, part III, page 185.

I am not alone concerned with what EDA will do with the funds which are about to be handed to it by the proponents of this bill. The entire business community, both large and small, is equally concerned.

Allow me to read to you what one of the country's most prestigious business publications has to say about the effect which this bill will have upon this Nation. I quote from *Communicate* dated October 30, 1967:

An out and out grab for power has been launched by "war on poverty" forces that may have far-reaching effects on all prime and subcontractors—toss a monkey wrench into the gears of existing procurement machinery.

The adverse impact on contractor dealings with Government arises out of provisions contained in little-noted sections of legislative proposals that are touted as making improvements in the basic Economic Opportunities Act (poverty war).

The version (S. 2388) sponsored by Senator Jacob K. Javits (R-NY) already has cleared the Senate. The companion bill (H.R. 8311) has been reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee and, after clearing the Rules Committee, is expected to go to the House floor for a vote in early November.

"We've taken an analytical look at the sections of the proposed legislation which are supposed to induce prime and subcontractors to provide employment for residents of slum and depressed areas. After cutting through the legal verbiage, all we find is a plan to create confusion, dissension and waste.

The proposal would tear the guts out of the Small Business Administration (SBA) by setting up *duplicating and overlapping programs* in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration (EDA). Both OEO and EDA would be



able to dangle bundles of lucre before the eyes of "cooperative" contractors who agree to locate plants in areas of unemployment. Well, you say, that doesn't sound so bad! OK, let's take a closer look—see how it would work out in practice.

In the first place, SBA—within the limits of its budget—is doing just the sort of work some solons want to see turned over to OEO and Commerce. SBA *already* has an Office of Procurement Assistance and administers a number of programs specifically designed to funnel business into distressed locales.

Now comes OEO with cash sticking out of its hip pocket. "Here's the deal," OEO says to a contractor, "You build a plant in such and such a place and hire people from our neighborhood and we'll give you this and that." "Hang on a minute," says EDA sidling up and pulling out its wallet, "We've got a nice little project we're working on that we think you'll be interested in." SBA walks up. The group notes its lean look and moves on down the street.

If that little vignette seems a little far-fetched, consider this. Both OEO and EDA, under the proposed ground rules, will have authority and cash with which to *out-bid each other for furtherance of their own pet projects*. SBA has no authority to offer financial "rewards" to firms that play ball.

In short, sections 151, 153, and 406 embodied in H.R. 8311, *undercut* the work now being performed by SBA—allow OEO and EDA to "bribe" primes and subs away from programs SBA has developed out of 15 years of expertise.

It seems ironic to us that the proposal to booby trap paths leading to SBA follows so closely recent congressional action which restored procurement center representatives (see 67-15 CQE 4) to make certain that small firms received a fair share of defense contracts. *Question:* How will OEO and EDA handle this? Will government contractors be required to deal with three separate sets of PCR's? That certainly wouldn't be advantageous to any businessman.

*Another point:* SBA now issues certificates of competency after a review of a firm's background and records. Neither OEO or EDA have the authority to issue them. Is it to be assumed that the proposed new "SBA's" will let contracts to Tom, Dick, and Harry who just seem to be pretty nice fellows?

Most surely, two new "SBA's" would pose problems for government co's as "clients" from the rival groups start submitting their bids. Who would have what priority? Primes too would be in a pickle—have to sort out all sorts of bids from the new competitive "SBA's". Each side may well get irritated whenever a prime "cooperated" too extensively with the "opposition."

It could develop into a real dilemma for primes as the factions struggle for predominance. There's no doubt in our mind at all that *factionalism* will be the end result, as the second and third "SBA's" vie for power.

At the outset, OEO (and to a lesser extent EDA) starts off with two strikes against it. It has neither the background or people with experience to deal with contracting matters—has to build up its organization from scratch.

For it goes without saying that if OEO is going to get into the contracting arena, it will have to have *qualified personnel* who understand the language. And it also goes without saying that *time* will be needed to assemble a group that is versed in the ramifications of contract work. An extended period of time will be essential to recruit and train those who'll administer programs.

Most surely, a competent staff couldn't be gathered together and trained in less than a year—unless men are pirated from other agencies. Strikes us that the hue and cry

raised by some legislators for swift enactment of this proposal doesn't merit hasty consideration. On the one hand, they cite the urgent need to beef up the war on poverty, and on the other hand turn away from the agency (SBA) which has the experience to marshal the troops now.

Legislation *already* on the books in the Small Business Act could be used to do the very things that are called for in the proposed legislation—instead of that, the proposal would nullify efforts of S.B.A. which currently is giving priority to programs aimed at assisting ghetto areas.

At the time S.B.A. was established by Congress, section 12 of the enabling act provided that all the functions, duties, and powers of any (then) existing Government departments bearing on small business should be transferred to S.B.A.—including records, property, and necessary personnel. Now we seem to have a reversal of this in the making—a conflict in the law and the proposal.

From where we sit, we see the makings of a *hodgepodge program*—each new group striving for dominance—uncoordinated, working at cross-purposes.

Consequently, when the proponents of section 406 state that "what is now proposed in title IV is the creation of an entirely new program, a program now currently in existence" I must say that they are right.

If I were to sum up what EDA has done with the half billion dollars which it received in fiscal year 1967, expressly for the purpose of attacking the "problems of low income and unemployment in those areas which lag behind the rest of the United States in economic growth," I would have to say that EDA has woefully failed. If EDA, with its expenditure of \$23 million for administration had done its job properly, or at all, we would not be faced now with emergency legislation.

If, as the facts indicate, EDA must come to the SBA for the services I just enumerated, how, I ask, will EDA, without the know-how in procurement or management assistance, and without experienced personnel carry out the additional functions which section 406 seeks to bestow upon it?

If this legislation is indeed, as necessary and urgent as it is made out to be, how will the poor, the unemployed, bridge the protracted period EDA will require for organization, recruitment, and training of personnel necessary to carry out the purposes and intent of section 406?

By assigning these additional functions to the doc we would, I submit, deliberately frustrate the programs with which we claim to be so greatly concerned.

Logic, therefore, requires that the functions described in section 406 be carried out by SBA, which is already carrying them out pursuant to its existing statutory authority, and with limited funds.

Yes, let us help the unemployed and the poor. But let SBA do the job.

Give SBA the authority and the moneys it needs to utilize its know-how and its expertise, acquired over a period of 15 years, and the job will be done.

To do so, let section 406 be amended by substituting for the words "Secretary of Commerce," the words "the Small Business Administration."

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. BURTON of Utah (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade now, the Small Business Administration has created and nurtured a partnership with the Nation's small business community.

In towns and cities across the Nation—in large urban areas and in small rural areas, small businessmen look to the SBA not only as a source of help in maintaining their competitive position in our rapidly changing economy but also as an advocate in the Halls of Congress.

The SBA which Congress created to "aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise" has been executing its congressional mandate with increasing vigor and effectiveness. Today it is meeting the needs of small business and also meeting its responsibility to Congress.

The programs which SBA is undertaking and operating today are clearly pointed at community involvement—in enlisting the cooperation and support of the chambers of commerce, the banks, the business organizations, the planners, and the civic groups in cities large and small in an effort to develop the economic potential of these communities through upgrading and strengthening small firms.

The people and the organizations in these communities recognize the SBA as an increasingly effective force in community economic development. They know of SBA's programs, know its employees who have been directed by the Administrator to go into the community and learn what the needs are, and to determine what SBA can do to mesh its programs and efforts with those of the community in creating job opportunities, in revitalizing struggling businesses, in helping establish new industry and new businesses. They recognize and they respect SBA and its people.

I can think of no organization whether it be local, State, or Federal that is more intimately concerned, more directly involved, nor more readily recognized by the small business community as a partner in its effort to preserve our free enterprise system, than the Small Business Administration.

Now we are about to endanger a good relationship by throwing other agencies at the small businessman. Section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill, which we will soon be considering on the floor, would transfer from SBA to the Department of Commerce some of the most vital functions now being carried out by SBA. That this section would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to compete against SBA with monetary incentives could prove to be a most dangerous innovation, not to mention a costly one at a time when the cry for Government economy is heard from all directions. Such an innovation could leave lasting scars upon the small business commu-



nity, and upon the Small Business Administration, if permitted to become operative even for a short time. In the light of the above, I would recommend that a forceful stand be made for a substitution of the words "the Secretary of Commerce" with the words "the Small Business Administrator," throughout section 406.

If we are to provide additional help to small business, let us keep it in the right channel, which is SBA.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. SCHERLE (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, following my earlier remarks concerning proposals to amend the Economic Opportunity Act, a Member of this body suggested that my comments were based upon secondhand sources, as opposed to personal observations.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that at the time the antipoverty hearings were commenced, and throughout the entire period that our committee was evaluating this program, minority members requested that the Committee on Education and Labor conduct a series of onsite inspections to see if the poor were receiving their rightful benefits under this program. Time after time, our requests were denied. Why, I do not know, but I was forced to conclude that those in a position to authorize such inspections did not wish us to look too closely at the program.

These refusals did not prevent us from making personal visits on our own time and spending our own money. On my own part, I have visited the Omaha Job Corps Center several times, and I have visited Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, self-help centers, Headstart programs, and various CAP programs.

In doing so, I have seen many situations which demand correction. However, a Member of Congress cannot evaluate such a vast far-reaching program as the one we are discussing here today without also reviewing the problems which have developed and will continue to develop in other parts of the country. We do this in many ways, sometimes through the news media.

In my previous remarks I made several references to situations in which the poverty program had failed. Because of the number of requests from my colleagues for additional information I wish to further develop that aspect of our evaluation. The Job Corps has all too frequently found itself in a position of embarrassment. For example:

The McCook, Nebr., Job Corps Center had a race riot of its own. As a consequence, 63 corpsmen will leave the camp out of a total enrollment of 158. The center has a staff of 48.

The battle which featured razor blades, mopsticks, and pool cues caused several enrollees who escaped the camp to ask that they not be forced to return. Some even asked to be permitted to spend the night in jail.

When the county attorney and the State OEO director went to the camp to investigate, they were told that they were on Government property and were not allowed to investigate.

Secrecy and attempts to cover up mistakes in the program are not going to help anyone.

An 18-year-old enrollee at the Albuquerque Women's Job Corps Center was stabbed to death in a parking lot fight. At the time the incident was reported, police were holding a former Job Corps center enrollee.

This is not the only problem that has been uncovered at the Albuquerque center.

The following eye openers were charged by a resigning staff member at that center: That among 320 enrollees, 13 pregnancies were discovered during a single week in February; that some of the girls are using narcotics but center officials are doing nothing about it; that a staff member is pushing heroine in the center; and that an enrollee's pregnancy was created by a staff member.

In Clinton, Iowa, a Job Corps center guard was bitten on the hand during a disturbance and a Clinton policeman was hit over the head. Things are so bad in Clinton that one of the candidates for mayor in that community said:

If I am elected mayor, my first duty will be to provide adequate police protection in the Lyons area around the Job Corps Center. The girls at the Job Corps have attracted a lawless, undesirable element to the north end.

These same Clinton center girls have been going to dinner at the taxpayers' expense, in some of the fanciest supper clubs in the area. The excuse given for this type of programing is that these girls need this "learning experience." I suspect that there are many other so-called learning experiences they could use that would be a lot more worthwhile and less expensive than lobster tail or steak.

Three enrollees at the Omaha Women's Job Corps Center were arrested for stealing 18 checks from the center, totaling \$275. Most of them were cashed through the use of forged signatures. The Job Corps has refused to press charges.

One of the favorite pastimes of the girls at the Omaha Job Corps Center appears to be that of roaming the streets. These girls, and the males they attract, have become such a problem that the mayor of that city was recently forced to concede that it "was probably a mistake" to locate the center downtown. Personally, I think "probably" is the understatement of the year. I have seen this parade myself. As long as this type of thing continues, the war on poverty cannot hope to have the support of the people.

With the OEO as directionless as it appears to be, I suppose it is understandable that others outside the program also have difficulty keeping it in proper perspective. A prime example was the referral by the District of Columbia juvenile court probationary department of teenage delinquent cases to the Job Corps for rehabilitation work. If the Job

Corps is to be a glorified reform school of some sort, it seems to me we will destroy what chance we have to help those who are in the program for reasons other than as an alternative to "punishment" of some type.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has had difficulties keeping personnel in line other than at Job Corps centers. But in each case, it seems to me, one is left with this unavoidable impression: The OEO, from top to bottom, has failed to impress the program leaders of the responsibility that accompanies official connection with this effort.

If this job had been done, I do not think we would today find the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee trying to determine the extent of involvement of antipoverty officials in this summer's tragic riots. I do not feel we would have a situation like that which occurred in Newark, where, shortly after the riot there, a militant member of the United Community Corporation Board, urged slumdwellers to arm themselves. Similarly, we would not have had to read about the arrest of a city board counselor and four employees of Government-funded antipoverty groups on charges of burglarly and possession of stolen goods in New York City.

Although there have been countless examples of this type, I will conclude with this one additional reference. If poverty program officials had the proper direction, the property-control manager of the Harris County Community Action Association in Houston would probably not have placed his requisition for seven telescopic rifle sights during the peak of last summer's rioting.

Only this week, as we meet here to decide whether to increase the authorization for the war on poverty, the mayor of Nashville, Tenn., has informed investigators from the other body that applicants for posts with the Federal antipoverty agency in his city had been advised to fabricate experience records to justify hiring them for jobs and salaries for which they could not qualify.

Mr. Speaker, I do not recount these abuses in an attempt to "wreck a good thing," as some would suggest. I do so, in the hope that it will help point the way to "correcting a program whose faults outnumber its contributions."

The poor and the underprivileged in this country need help. I believe that as sincerely as any man. But, I cannot go along with any old scheme which is served on a platter labeled "take it or leave it, but don't alter it."

This Nation's poor need an equal opportunity to earn a living for themselves, and to acquire the human dignity which accompanies success—in each man's own eyes.

What this Nation must do to aid the poor is to see that each person has the opportunity to receive an education. This is especially true of the young people. This is basic. For those who are older and can no longer spend their time in the classrooms we should provide job training or retraining; for the incapacitated we should provide rehabilitation and encourage maximum possible participation.



Finally, we should not train a person for a job that does not exist; or a field which is already overcrowded. We must not provide false hope for individuals. We must concentrate on meaningful jobs that will provide the personal satisfaction of accomplishment. Anything less will provide the causes for hopelessness, despair and frustration.

If that simple guide had been used when this program was initiated, we would not be engaged in this debate today. I cannot support legislation that "promises" but fails to "deliver."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. BRAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### SOCIAL SECURITY VALUE WEIGHED FOR WORKER

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. HALEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends has asked me to put the attached Sylvia Porter column on social security in the RECORD.

After reading the item, I agree with Robert Baron, coordinator for the United Steelworkers of America Pensioners Association, District 15.

It will be helpful to Members who are not always able to keep abreast of all changes in administration and rules and regulations of this important subject.

The column entitled "Your Money's Worth" follows:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY VALUE WEIGHED FOR WORKER (By Sylvia Porter)

Will you, the young American worker who is now contributing the maximum Social Security tax, get back your money's worth in Social Security benefits when you retire?

Or, as has been charged repeatedly in the past few months, will you lose on the deal by paying a bigger tax total than your expected future benefits?

Take, for instance, a young worker who began working last year at age 21. Assume he has been paying and will continue to pay, the maximum Social Security tax until he retires at age 65 in the year 2010. Under today's law, the total value of this worker's contributions over his working lifetime, including interest on the contributions accumulating at the rate of 3½ per cent, would amount to \$31,692. Yet the total "value" of his retirement benefits over his expected lifetime would be only \$19,761—\$11,931 less than the total value of his contributions.

This worker, who is typical of millions now pouring into the labor force, is on the surface getting an abominable deal in Social Security.

#### DISABILITY PROTECTION

But consider the fact that in addition to his retirement benefits, he will be protected against disability throughout all but five of his 44 working years. Consider also that his wife and children will be eligible for survivors' benefits in the event of his death before he retires. The value of this additional protection is estimated by chief Social Security actuary Robert J. Myers at many thousands of dollars.

Moreover, today, a man retiring at age 65 has an 81 per cent chance of having a wife and the total value of a retired worker and wife's combined benefits, including widow's benefits, is figured at \$34,023. This is in addition to disability benefits and to benefits payable to survivors if the breadwinner dies before 65.

If this worker became totally disabled sometime in the next few years, he would get back many times the amount of his Social Security tax contributions in disability benefits alone. If this worker died at a young age, leaving a widow and several young children, his survivors might get as much as \$30,000 to \$40,000 in survivors' benefits.

On average, says Myers, today's young worker will contribute 80-85 per cent of the total value of his benefit protection, counting the interest that would accumulate on his contributions. The average young worker just entering the labor force could not possibly buy, for his Social Security contributions, a private annuity that would pay as much as his expected Social Security benefits.

Myers concedes that the higher income worker who begins working in 1973 or later, when maximum Social Security contribution rates under present law take effect, will "no more than just about pay for the value of his protection." But this, he adds, does not take into account the certainty that Social Security benefits will continue to be increased in the years ahead.

#### DIFFERENT FOR ELDERLY

Far different is the situation of the elderly worker who reached retirement age at the beginning of 1967 and who had paid maximum Social Security taxes since they were first deducted from his paycheck in January 1937. He is way ahead. He has contributed a total of \$3,355, including interest, his benefits will amount to many times this.

In sum, you, the young American worker, will get at least your money's worth in protection before and after you retire.

You, the older worker who is due to retire soon, will get a lot more than your money's worth.

And you, the employer, are by your contributions, helping to make it possible for millions of older Americans to avoid dependency and destitution, and you are thereby guaranteeing a huge and stable market for your production of goods and services.

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. HALEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DENT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS HAILS MAYOR WILLIAM V. MUSTO OF UNION CITY, N.J.

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. HALEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, because I believe strongly in the concept of creative federalism, which rests basically upon the effectiveness of government at the local level, I think it is well for Members of this House to be made aware of contributions being made at this level of government.

For many years, one of the truly dynamic figures in the political life of

the State of New Jersey has been the Honorable William V. Musto, who serves brilliantly as both mayor of Union City and as a member of the Senate of the State of New Jersey.

Union City is a small city in area but it has all of the problems which face other American cities, small and large alike. The problems which Mayor Musto handles daily would cause almost any other mayor of a city to throw up his hands and say, What is the use? Mayor Musto, however, is not that kind of man and he apparently thrives on solving problems. His tenure in city hall has seen a renaissance for the city and I think all Members of the House should be made aware of what one man with vision, courage, and energy can do to revitalize his city.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the respected Jersey Journal which was published on November 4, 1967. It points out just one of the many things that the mayor is doing to make a better Union City.

The editorial follows:

#### GETTING ON ITS FEET

Union City business is on the upswing.

The good news was reported at a meeting of the city's energetic Operation Rehabilitation Committee. According to Mayor William V. Musto, all stores in major business districts are occupied and doing business.

This has been accomplished through an admirable partnership of city officials and merchant groups, all deeply concerned about the future of the community. Many factors have brought about the much-needed shot in the arm for business.

The rehabilitation of areas off Bergenline and Summit Avenues, the city's two principal shopping districts, certainly is among the reasons. New homes and apartments on once rundown city blocks have brought quick occupancy.

Gradual disappearance of "eyesores" in business areas has helped the city in its business resurgence. Yet much remains to be done, to be sure.

Probably Union City's biggest challenge will be the development of its air rights over the Lincoln Tunnel highway cut. With the continued cooperative spirit among those who are deeply interested in the city's future, that challenge can be met successfully too.

#### FISK BOARD CHOSE WISELY

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. HALEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1967, the board of trust of Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., elected Dr. James Raymond Lawson president of that important institution. Dr. Lawson had been serving as acting president of the university for the past 18 months, since the resignation of his eminent predecessor, Dr. Stephen J. Wright, who left Fisk to head the United Negro College Fund.

Dr. Lawson's appointment has been widely acclaimed by our community. He has served in a difficult capacity over the last year and a half and served with distinction during some difficult times.









202-9, 1967

HOUSE

5. APPROPRIATIONS. By a 118-263, rejected a motion to agree to the Senate amendment to H. R. 11641, the public works appropriation bill, which would have included funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School dam and reservoir project in Me. (pp. H14950-4, H14956-9). The Senate then receded from the amendment (pp. S16253-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- Both Houses adopted the conference report (H. Rept. 903) on H. R. 8569, the D. C. appropriation bill, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. H14959-61, H14982-90, S16261-64). The House concurred in the Senate amendment to continue appropriations through Nov. 9 for agencies whose regular appropriation--bills have not yet been enacted (p. H14991). This bill will now be sent to the President.
6. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill. pp. H14962-82, H14949-50, H15000-1, H15010-12, H15020-21, H15025-27, H15031-32, H15037-40
7. WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee approved workplans for several watershed projects. p. D1018
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Price, Ill., commended and inserted a speech by REA Administrator Clapp in which he discussed "rural electrification's broad potential for the diversified economic development of Rural America." pp. H15013-15
9. YEARBOOK. Rep. Taft criticized the 1967 Yearbook of Agriculture, "Outdoors USA." p. H14950
10. IMPORT CONTROLS. Rep. Wyman urged action on the orderly marketing bills and criticized the administration's "complacent attitude" regarding this "problem." pp. H16001-2
11. OPINION POLL. Rep. Schadeberg discussed the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. pp. H15015-16
12. CORPORATE FARMERS. Rep. Zwach inserted an article, "What 'Outsiders' Say About Agriculture--Corporate Units Are No Answer to Farm Crisis," which is a reply to a Wall Street Journal article "extolling the virtues of corporation farming." p. H15017
13. COFFEE. Rep. Morse, Mass., discussed the "problem of instant coffee imports from Brazil." p. H15018
14. INFORMATION. Rep. Howard inserted the remarks of the President at the signing of the public broadcasting bill. p. H15033
- Rep. Ottinger inserted an editorial containing "a paragraph of warning for groups interested in the future of the Public Broadcasting Act." p. H15038
15. HEMISFAIR. Rep. Gonzalez announced that the theme of the Hemisfair 1968 to be held in San Antonio from April to Oct. next year will be "The Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas." p. H15037
16. ECONOMY. Rep. Carey inserted an article, "U. S. Boom Equals 80-Month Record--Recession-Free Expansion Is Expected To Continue." p. H15051

27. PERSONNEL. Rep. Henderson discussed a report of the Manpower and Civil Service Sub-committee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, "covering the effectiveness of implementation of the Government Employees' Incentive Awards Act of 1954" (H. Rept. 885). pp. H15036-7
28. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Mon. and the balance of the week the House will consider the poverty bill and the foreign aid appropriation bill. p. H14991
29. ADJOURNED until Mon., Nov. 13. p. H14991

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. POVERTY. Speech in the House by Rep. Gardner during debate on the poverty bill. pp. A5520-2  
Rep. Resnick inserted an article, "Callous to Rural Poverty", critical of the House Agriculture Committee's failure to act on the emergency food and health measure. p. A5524  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Evins, Tenn., reviewing the history of the antipoverty loan program. pp. A5522-3
31. TAXES. Rep. Rumsfeld inserted an article, "Taxes and Inflation--Economic Crisis." p. A5523  
Rep. Dorn inserted an article analyzing the issues involved in the current tax debate. pp. A5540-2
32. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Reuss inserting an article which supports the "administration's attempts to secure free trade." pp. A5539-40

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

33. SHIPPING. S. 2650 by Sen. Magnuson and others, H. R. 13940 by Rep. Garmatz and others, H. R. 13941 by Rep. Lennon, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of Sen. Magnuson, pp. S16151-9
34. LANDS. S. 2646 by Sen. Holland, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such lands; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
35. CENSUS. H. R. 13935 by Rep. Bush, to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Remarks of author p. H15016
36. PATENTS. H. R. 13951 by Rep. Poff, for the promotion of the progress of the useful arts by the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author p. H15001





United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1967

No. 183

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Excellency Most Reverend Torkom Manoogian, D.D., primate of the Armenian Church of America, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

O Lord, Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting and whose power is infinite; we humbly beseech you for the peace of the world and stability of your people. Most Gracious Father, from whom comes every good and perfect gift, have mercy upon the people of the United States, and in your love look upon their Representatives here assembled.

Fill them with Your Holy Spirit that in these times of crisis and confusion they may speak boldly and act courageously, to secure life, liberty, and happiness for all citizens of this land.

May they continue united in the democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded that they may uphold a sense of moral responsibility and a vision of peace and brotherhood to the American people.

So rule their hearts that their work may brighten the beacon of freedom and diminish the shadows of evil everywhere. Direct and prosper all their deliberations that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors that peace and happiness, truth and justice, beauty and love may be established firmly among all peoples whereby men everywhere may come to bless and praise You, now and forever.

Blessed is the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6692. An act declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2. An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, and  
H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes"; request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. THURMOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1872) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution amending title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee certain loans made to the National Maritime Historical Society for the purpose of restoring and returning to the United States the last surviving American square-rigged merchant ship, the *Kaiulani*, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of

certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68-6.

### FINANCING FOR ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, immediate action in funding antipoverty programs is essential to prevent a serious crisis and militant revolution in our country. Yesterday, 1,000 antipoverty workers and their friends began picketing our Federal building in Los Angeles. They are but a small number of concerned people in this country of ours who protest the failure of this Congress to act on legislation vital to the welfare and survival of our people.

Although this session of Congress is almost 11 months old we have not yet passed a bill to continue the war against poverty, the major issue facing the Nation.

Instead there is under consideration a resolution which, if passed, will result in my own city of Los Angeles, for example, suffering a 40-percent cut in the antipoverty program which already is critically underfinanced.

Perhaps some of us can wait for our paychecks, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, millions of our fellow citizens face days of suffering, starvation, and misery because of our failure to pass an adequate antipoverty program. And why?

Because there are those among us who refuse to vote the appropriate funds for this vital program under the false slogan of "economy" and the "malicious charge of maladministration."

These wreckers would have us beat a panicky retreat to 17th-century welfare practices and the economy days of the Harding-Hoover era merely to help them take over control of this Congress in 1968.

In the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, we made a com-



mitment to the American people—more solemn than any made in Vietnam—that we would seek to end poverty. We wisely built into that legislation the machinery for the poor themselves to participate in self-help programs as well as the decisions that affected their own destiny. All of this was in the best American tradition of individual initiative and self-determination.

But that now seems a long time ago. In this session, there are those Members who, while voting \$2½ billion a month to fight the war in Vietnam, refuse to spend \$2 billion a year to fight poverty in America. In holding back the much-needed money, they seek to force us into deals that will make meaningless such ideas as the poor on community action boards, operation of programs by the residents of poverty areas, community action, legal services for indigents, or the participation of parents and volunteers in neighborhood projects.

But, Mr. Speaker, the voices of the poor and those of us who really care will not be silenced. Those Members of Congress who use this crisis to play politics will eventually be exposed. It is, however, our immediate responsibility to break the terrible delay in antipoverty funds. To that end, I urge that we stay in session without recess until we can report a workable and adequate program to the American people. Surely the inconvenience we suffer is small as compared with those who wait on us to act.

#### ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the man whom many Republicans would like to have as the next President of the United States. The message reads as follows:

I am deeply concerned regarding the uncertainty and confusion which now exist because of failure to fund the Federal anti-poverty program. Since July 1, 1967, this program has been operating under continuing resolution authority which expired October 23, 1967.

Both those responsible for operating anti-poverty programs and those serviced by them are being penalized by this uncertain and demoralizing situation.

I urgently request that the Steering Committee with the support of the New York State congressional delegation take prompt action to seek to resolve this situation and to assure that present programs can continue pending congressional action on the basic legislation.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

I have responded as follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1967.

HON. NELSON ROCKEFELLER,  
Governor,  
Albany, N.Y.

As senior New York member of the Education and Labor Committee charged with poverty legislation I appreciate your interest and concern for this vital program. Must advise there is no need for Steering Committee meeting to undo mischief of cutting and crippling action of House Republicans. F.Y. 1967-68 poverty authorization bill now before the House all New York Democrats now and throughout its history have supported this bill. Only two or three of sixteen Republicans have given any aid. Suggest you advise as

soon as possible how many members of New York State and other Republican delegations can be counted on to support committee bill and vote down Republican substitutes aimed at maiming or killing President Johnson's program.

HUGH L. CAREY,  
Member of Congress.

#### LEGISLATION BY INTIMIDATION

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if Martin Luther King thinks he can intimidate the Congress of the United States into voting billions of dollars, at his bidding, under threat of winter riots and increased-intensity summer riots, he is more irresponsible than previously believed.

This Nation will not be blackmailed into hurriedly and frantically doling out billions of U.S. taxpayers dollars, to satisfy the mouthings of demagogues, dedicated to self-perpetuation, adulation, and fundraising publicity.

In some recent election contests, there were veiled suggestions, if not direct threats, that unless the Negro candidates were elected, unrest and riots would result.

Riots are unlawful, and criminal syndicalism is unlawful. Those who promote anarchy and insurrection, under whatever name, violate the law. Trying to shift the blame of responsibility to Congress because it refuses to be stampeded under threats of violence is shallow subterfuge.

I call upon the Attorney General of the United States to take official notice of the publicly televised threat of King and others, to determine whether there has been a violation of the Federal statutes and take appropriate action.

#### VIETNAM TRIP TO EVALUATE PROBLEMS THERE

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman WILLIAM COWGER, and I are leaving on a trip to inspect and evaluate the programs and problems of Vietnam Thursday afternoon, November 16. We will be returning the end of the month. Because we are going as Members of Congress who desire to enhance our understanding of the situation and to gather the hard facts of our involvement and to confirm our successes and failures in this war-torn area, I wish to be excused from the Congress during that period.

Mr. Speaker, we are going at nontaxpayer's expense. Mr. Cowger and myself are paying our own traveling expenses and from funds that have been donated, we are paying part of the expenses of all members and all of the expenses of some of our group who will be traveling with us. These people are private citizens of high caliber and are specialists in areas we think need probing and more consideration. With us will be Allan Schim-

mel, Dr. Ernest Griffith, Mrs. Harold Day, Rev. Heinz Grabia, Vernon Shephard, John Baccarini, and Rev. Louis H. Valbracht. There may be one or two others who may join us. They are being considered now.

Mr. Speaker, upon our return, we will make a report to the President, State Department, the House of Representatives, and all others who share our concern and interest in the challenge that is presented in that area. Hopefully, we can point to some other and better answers to the problems of our involvement there.

#### YEARBOOK OF AGRICULTURE

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, do we have a new type of crop being planted by the Agriculture Department, at public expense? That thought occurs as one thumbs through the 1967 Yearbook of Agriculture, "Outdoors USA."

If you care to, you can find a photo of Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson, planting a tree on page 3; daughter Lynda Bird Johnson, admiring a Great Northern Pike on page 19, and in a bid for bicanine support, Lassie, the Capitol, and a "Keep America Beautiful" sign appear on page 252.

Of course, 1968 is a year with special "yield" problems. The 1966 Yearbook of Agriculture, contained neither photo nor mention of any of the President's family.

[Mr. BUCHANAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

(Mr. HATHAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Dickey-Lincoln School project is coming up for consideration again, and I understand that the previous question will be ordered immediately after the motions in regard to this project are made, which will not give any of us any time for debate.

Therefore I take this opportunity to briefly reiterate the arguments in favor of this worthwhile project, and urge my colleagues to support my preferential motion to recede and concur with the other body.

This project has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1. This certainly establishes it on its merits. The amount of money requested is \$875,000. The total amount is \$4.7 billion. The Dickey-Lincoln appropriation does not even amount to one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the total. So there is no real economy in deleting this appropriation.

I call the attention of the Members to the map which I have displayed in the Speaker's lobby which shows there are 170 Federal power projects in the United States, 75 percent of these have a lower



## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 51—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the proposal of the Senate prohibiting the use of appropriations for the assignment or transportation of students to public schools in the District of Columbia in order to overcome racial imbalance.

Amendment No. 52—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the proposal of the Senate regarding welfare assistance payments.

Amendment No. 53—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the proposal of the Senate to amend the joint resolution of October 5, 1967 (Public Law 90-102) by striking out "October 23, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 9, 1967".

## TRANSFER OF ACTIVITIES

The conferees reiterate the directive in the Senate report that before any transfers of activities or funds in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1968 are effected, prior approval of the Appropriations Committees shall be obtained as heretofore the practice.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
ROBERT N. GIALMO,  
EDWARD J. PATTEN,  
DAVID PRYOR,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
GLENN R. DAVIS,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,  
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8569) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of the said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I must say that the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has been most cooperative in providing information and even the rough-draft copy of the conference report which has just now been filed for printing.

It is understood and admitted by all concerned that this could not be available for the various Members to study and to consider, as to how they might work their will, until tomorrow at the earliest, in view of the big load as we "rush" toward final adjournment. This maneuver is a perennial.

However, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is \$79,141,400 over the appropriation for 1967, I do object.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that objection for a moment?

Mr. HALL. Gladly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that this bill, as he has stated, is larger than the bill presented for the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill the Senate provided for the amount of \$504,960,100. The bill which the committee

brings back is \$500,954,000. At the time we had the bill up in the House for final passage, April 18 of this year, the legislative bill from the District of Columbia Committee in the House and in the Senate had not cleared. At that time the budget exceeded the revenue estimates by \$62 million. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri knows that the House Committee on Appropriations had to reduce the bill \$62 million to bring receipts in line with expenditures. Subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House, Mr. Speaker, the legislative committees in the House and in the Senate brought in the legislative bill. The Commissioners raised the real estate tax \$8 million. The Federal payment ceiling was raised. Borrowing authority was raised. Now we put in some additional items. I say to the gentleman that we did right. The gentleman is correct as far as the amount is concerned, but we did reduce the Federal payment. Neither the Senate nor the House recommended this bill up to the top amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1968. I would like to say to my friend from Missouri—and he is my friend—that your committee in the House and the committee in the Senate have done a good job on this bill. I wish the gentleman would withhold his objection and let us bring up this conference report.

Mr. HALL. I certainly appreciate the pleading of my distinguished friend. It rends my heart. I understand the pressure of his eloquence. I understand the panoply and the charade that was played on the floor earlier this afternoon concerning this. I also understand that we have increased the House-passed version, perhaps, because of the additional legislation since that time, by \$37,616,600, which is said to be for good and sufficient purpose. I would trust the Lord above and I would trust the Speaker and I would trust the members of this committee, but the fact remains that the Members of the House individually elected have a right to see this report and to see the areas in disagreement and in technical disagreement, before by unanimous consent they cast this vote and allow this to happen. The odium for not passing it is not on this body but on those who are holding up the continuing resolution for appropriations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I just want to suggest to him the proposition that the gentleman does not insist on his point of order or, rather, his disagreement or objection to the unanimous-consent request, because as a practical matter—and, of course, the gentleman has been around here for a long time—the Committee on Rules will be convened and the votes are there to bring out a rule.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to get out of this House and get this Congress adjourned. This, I say to my friends, will contribute to that end.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Missouri, as the gentleman well knows. It is my

opinion that the gentleman serves a wonderful purpose in this House of Representatives. However, as a practical matter, I just feel that there really will not be much gained by this maneuver, if anything is gained.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, those articulate and charming words stated by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman from the South, again rend my heart. I, again, submit that there are certain provisions of this bill which should be considered by the House. For instance, we might insist upon a position opposed to the "busing" amendment as contained in this bill, as well as other things, in which the gentleman from Mississippi has particular interest and which are in technical disagreement.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us truly let the House of Representatives work its will under the rules of the House, subject to any points of order which may be raised on the part of the House of Representatives, other than the expedition of the consideration of this conference report by the various Members of this body who have not even seen the report. Expediting the business of the Congress is one thing in an emergency, to be sure; doing it blindly is another.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. NATCHER], in bringing in what I consider to be a very fair report on the District of Columbia legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee will recall that when the Committee on Appropriations was considering the problems of the District of Columbia, legislation authorizing adequate funds for the District of Columbia had not passed. Present authorization would not adequately meet the needs of the District.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] and I met with Mr. Hansen of the School Board, and were in full agreement that adequate funds were not available.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in the last session passed a "liberal arts college bill." We passed the "technical school bill," also. These items will require \$4 million to \$5 million. Therefore, I know the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has examined this thoroughly as I know he has, I am willing to accept his good judgment to the effect that this represents a fair appropriation with which to meet the needs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make that observation, because in my judgment it is fully justified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, but I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.



## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] had 16 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] had 4 minutes remaining.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I take just a moment to state that I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], on the conscientious effort which the gentleman has put into this bill, on the patience he has shown, on his untiring efforts to bring this matter before the House of Representatives in a form that would be acceptable to the House. Mr. Chairman, I also commend all the members of the committee for the long weeks of work and effort which they have put into this measure.

I commend all the members of the committee and others who have joined in the debate on this bill and who are responsible for its high quality.

Mr. Chairman, about 3 years ago the Congress began vigorous and determined action to improve the lot of the poor. We believed then—and I think we believe now—that this Nation is big enough and strong enough and rich enough to give some 30 million of our fellow citizens an opportunity to share in our unprecedented prosperity. I believe they should have the right to share as independent, contributing, weight-lifting equals, and not as perpetual recipients of handouts and relief.

Now, what is the situation today? We have heard criticisms of this program. Some of these criticisms undoubtedly are just. It is human to err, but the gentleman from Oregon gave my answer to this argument early in the debate when she said that we did not stop the Apollo program after a mistake that cost the lives of three of our most heroic and valuable citizens.

Mistakes have been made by military commanders in the field that have cost thousands of lives, but no one has suggested that, as a consequence, we should abolish the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps.

This program should not be judged by its mistakes alone. This program should be judged mainly, in my opinion, by the overall, immeasurable contributions it has made, and will make, in bringing new opportunities to the impoverished citizens of our land.

In my judgment, the benefits of this program outnumber the mistakes a thousandfold. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have had a new start in life because of this program; 109,000 young men and women have been funneled into the Job Corps in an effort to upgrade their skills, and many of them have moved into the labor market; 7,600 have been upgraded to the point where they have been able to pass the induction tests of our military services. Tens of thousands of little children 3 to 5 years of age have benefited, both figuratively and literally, from the Headstart program. Over 1.3 million poor boys and girls have been given jobs to help them stay in school, or to return to school.

In the Upward Bound program 27,000 young people are now on their way to a college education.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, there are many people who are opposed to this program. There are some who are opposed to the very concept of this program.

But, Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans in every walk of life favor this program. Scores of mayors from cities in practically every section of this country favor this program. Great religious organizations support this program because they believe that it activates the golden rule, and the doctrine of the brotherhood of man.

Above all, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that this program has the overwhelming support of the inarticulate masses of this country.

A few months ago I received a number of letters criticizing this program. During the Labor Day recess I went into one of the poorest counties in my congressional district, and I saw young people at work in the National Youth Corps.

I saw them in schools and in offices. They were from some of the poorest families in my district—but they were proud. They were neatly dressed. They were grateful that their country had given them a new opportunity. Had it not been for the help they received under the National Youth Corps, they would not have been, as they told me, neatly or decently dressed, and they would have been ashamed to go to school. People who do not know what abject poverty means to a child cannot begin to comprehend its effect upon that child.

I told some of these youngsters that all the mail I had received up to that time had been against this program. They were amazed. They thought it was one of the finest programs our Government had ever inaugurated.

Word got out that I had made that statement—and the mail started pouring in. When I returned to Washington I re-

ceived letters favorable to the program. These letters were not manufactured letters—written on mimeograph machines or typewriters—they were letters written with a pencil on ruled paper, by people who know what this program has done for them. They were letters written in the language of people who have benefited from this program and who appreciate its opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a fight on behalf of the poorest people in our land. This, in reality, is the age-old battle that America has fought over and over again—the fight to improve the lot of the downtrodden and the oppressed. It is the age-old struggle between need and greed.

What is our choice? What is America's choice? I think we have answered that question repeatedly in the glorious history of this great Republic.

We answered it in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States.

We answered it when slavery was abolished.

We answered it when we eliminated child labor.

We answered it when we enacted the social security laws and the wage-and-hour laws.

We are answering it in our fight against disease and discrimination.

We are called upon today to answer it again in a war against poverty.

Some people may say that we cannot afford this program. I say we cannot afford not to continue this program.

Let us not put the dollar sign on the conscience of America.

Many people are involved here, but the biggest issue involved, is a child—an American child—a hungry, helpless, hopeless American child.

This is the issue. This is our choice. Will we choose the dollar—or will we choose the child?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma yields back 4 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has 6 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, since we have only one speaker on this side, I defer to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], if he wishes to yield time on his side now.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTAIN].

(Mr. FARBSTAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today what I believe to be perhaps the most important piece of legislation of the session. I use those words carefully, without seeking to exaggerate or to shock. I say it because they involve a commitment. We hear a great deal about commitment these days. The committee has recommended that we expend some \$2 billion in the coming year for the war on poverty. Did we not



make a commitment to our own people? Did we as a nation not tell our fellow Americans that we would not rest until we abolished poverty? Did we not tell Americans that they could replace despair with hope, because we were determined to end poverty in our midst? We, in this Congress, take commitments to our fellow Americans very seriously, Mr. Chairman. So how dare we treat this legislation to which our credibility and our honor are attached in cavalier fashion? We have a duty to redeem our pledge to the Nation's poor. That pledge is in this bill. That is why I consider its passage so vital.

I have seen in my own district, Mr. Chairman, among my own constituents, what the war on poverty can do. It has taken young people who might be pressed into lives of crime and given them a chance to make themselves into decent citizens. It has taken illiterates and enabled them to read. It has given responsibility to those who have never before made decisions, and it has demonstrated that the poor can plan for themselves. It has prepared the chronically unemployed for jobs and made them productive members of our society. I do not claim that this vast program has been without fault. But, I do claim that, given its brief period of trial, it has been a great success. I grieve at the possibility that it may be reduced to an empty shell.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with every provision of this bill. I object very strenuously to the provision which requires that antipoverty boards, both at the community and the neighborhood levels, be composed of one-third city officials, at least one-third representatives of the poor, and the remainder prominent citizens. I regard that formula as unduly rigid. More important, there are communities throughout the country that have established satisfactory antipoverty machinery, using the looser formula of the 1966 Economic Opportunity Act. New York, for instance, has an elected antipoverty structure that functions well. Are we in this body going to demand that New York—and dozens of other communities throughout the country—dismantle their antipoverty machinery and rebuild it on the basis of an arbitrary formula we devise here? The Members of this body who decry Federal regimentation have never, I am sure, encountered a more egregious proposal for Federal control. But, Mr. Chairman, it is possible that some communities will like the new formula.

I object, Mr. Chairman, to the provision of this bill which requires the localities to double their contributions to the antipoverty program and which requires at the same time, that they pay this added exaction in cash, not in services or kind. This provision will burden only poor communities. Is it not senseless for an antipoverty program to put added burdens on poor communities, while rich communities will scarcely feel the change? By definition, the communities with the most extensive antipoverty programs are poor. The Economic Opportunity Act was designed to help them. Now, in this amendment, we are taxing them cruelly. I cannot support this provision of the bill before us.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am aware of the plans of the minority, in league with some Members on this side of the aisle, to cut the authorization for this measure in drastic fashion. We are told the Nation cannot afford some \$2 billion for the war on poverty. Mr. Chairman, I say cut out the tax loopholes, eliminate the supersonic transport subsidy, cut down the space budget. These are the dispensible programs. But leave the war on poverty alone. Do not make the poor pay the price for our current financial crisis. It is unjust. We Americans are seeking to give peoples all over the world an example of a just society. We are trying to show that a democracy can conduct its affairs with compassion. We are saying that a nation must conduct its affairs with compassion if it is to survive. Mr. Chairman, the challenge is before us. I entreat my colleagues to press on with the war on poverty. There is nothing, I believe, more important to our country.

Unless we pass the committee bill calling for an authorization of \$2,060,000,000, we will rekindle the frustrations existing among our underprivileged, now perhaps somewhat dormant in some areas because of our efforts to aid these poverty stricken.

For the Congress to refuse to commit resources equal to the task before us is to postpone to a time perhaps too late those issues which we must face now.

Even if an appropriation is approved, unless Congress votes for at least the \$2.06 billion appropriation approved by the House committee rather than the \$1.2 billion many House Members appear to favor, New York City will be faced with a drastic cutback of up to 30 or 40 percent.

This would gut our program. Community action programs now operating at a level of \$17.5 million could be cut by as much as \$6 or \$7 million, affecting many thousands of people involved in neighborhood service center programs, remedial and tutorial education, training and employment programs, and a host of others.

Let us hope that we will not deny the prayers of those throughout the Nation who have come to us for assistance by passing this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago President Johnson summoned America to an "unconditional war on poverty." He said, "It will not be a short or easy struggle." But he expressed the determination to rescue from the outskirts of hope those Americans, some 35 million Americans—of whatever race or color—who live in poverty in the midst of plenty.

Today, after kindling hope, arousing aspirations, providing dignity, and, yes, involving the invisible poor in shaping their own destiny, there are those who would dash hope, sink aspirations, deny dignity, and lock the poor out of the decisionmaking process.

This attitude has been reflected in actions on the floor of the House in

recent weeks—in the amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, in the deliberate exclusion of employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from the pay increase bill, in the astounding refusal to pass a continuing resolution which has brought the antipoverty program to the verge of starvation.

What has happened to America? Are our priorities so out of order that \$73 billion for the military, \$4.5 billion for space are almost routinely approved, and yet \$2 billion for human renewal, for rescuing people from the despair of deprivation produces a reaction in tune with a bygone century—not in harmony with modern America?

How long, Mr. Chairman, will ignorance, poverty, and disease be permitted to persist?

How long will the unmet needs of our cities be ignored?

Overcoming poverty in America is an enormous task, because, as was so widely remarked 3 years ago, the poor in the United States are a minority. Politically as well as economically, they tend to be "invisible." For these reasons, the declaration of the war on poverty was an achievement—one which stands to President Johnson's everlasting credit.

Adopting a program to redeem the American ideal of equal opportunity took political courage. There was no powerful interest group waiting to become the beneficiary of the new program, only the unheard, the unrepresented and the conscience of America. The Office of Economic Opportunity is a political first. It has no politically powerful constituency backing up its programs. Not surprisingly, with the unique absence of a powerful lobby and the growing voice of the poor disturbing traditional comfortable patterns of local politics, the poverty program has come under increasing attack.

A growing chorus of voices calls for its dismantling. First, because it has not been effective enough. It is hardly astounding that the meager expenditure of \$3.8 billion over 3 years has not wiped out the effects of generations of poverty—nor can it. Second, the poverty program has been criticized because it has been too effective. It has, for the first time, given the poor a small voice. Poverty action groups have taken their place along side of labor, business, and religious groups as voices in the community. This is essential to dispel the apathy and hopelessness that accompanies grinding poverty, and to provide the political basis for overcoming poverty.

The status quo is unnerved—not because OEO has failed to eliminate poverty overnight, but because it has stimulated a new consciousness—as well it had to do. The voices of complacency which so consistently opposed any poverty program from the very outset, which so willingly supported weakening amendments and recommitment motions, would now substitute their own opportunity crusade, the heart of which would eliminate OEO as a focal point for the concerns of the poor. These same voices, which are so outraged at the urban unrest in America, would frustrate the hopes which have been raised, and



thereby make themselves the surest accomplices in further unrest. What could be more cynical than complaining when a program does not work wonders, and screaming in pain when it does?

Mr. Chairman, when Congress decided 3 years ago to open opportunity which has been denied for generations to groups of Americans, we raised hopes, and we made a commitment to follow through, and we must keep faith with that commitment.

A program with the ambitious goal of eradicating poverty must inevitably cause some disruption. Persons who have lived their lives in degrading and frustrating poverty are not going to be smoothly amalgamated into the middle class overnight. Can we possibly ease these conditions, can we possibly expect less disruption if we turn our backs on the promise that was made 3 years ago?

The first stage of a revolution involves the awareness that one's condition is not inevitably ordained, but is capable of change. We encouraged this revolution 3 years ago when we pledged to eradicate poverty in the United States. Perhaps we now find that this task is harder than we anticipated, but the revolution is here. We have a choice: we can welcome it and continue our efforts to bring the American dream to all Americans, or we can witness the nightmare, as it tears America apart.

The accomplishments of the poverty program have not been inconsequential. Thirty-five million Americans are poor. Nearly 12 million have in one way or another benefited from OEO programs. Twelve months ago that figure was 8 million.

As the committee report states, Job Corps enrollees are making an outstanding contribution in the work they perform. Their educational levels increase while they are members of the Corps more than twice as fast as comparable youths who are in school. After they leave the Corps, their average wage is one third higher than when they entered.

Of course, there have been incidents and individual cases of failure. Given the background of the Corpsmen, there would be something wrong if there were not. The Job Corps should not be compared to a summer camp. Critics should consider where these youths would be, what problems they would be creating for themselves and society if they were back on the streets.

The educational programs of OEO have made a major contribution, which must be continued and expanded. 2,014,412 children have benefited from Headstart. "Followthrough" must be expanded so that children who are aided in their earliest years are not lost. Upward Bound, which has assisted students from poverty backgrounds in going to college, should be enlarged.

The other "special emphasis" programs, which S. 2388 more closely ties to the community action programs, have also had noted success.

In my district the comprehensive health services program should make a significant contribution to the welfare of the community.

The legal services program helps bridge the gap between constitutional

rights and social realities. Poor people are frequently unable to secure the little which is rightfully theirs because they cannot afford legal assistance. The celebrated and criticized "California rural legal assistance" program, which has managed to step on a lot of privileged toes in the process of defending the rights of migrant farm workers, is another example of how the poverty program is damned if it does and damned if it does not.

The achievements of VISTA in bringing the talents of Americans from all social backgrounds to bear in the fight against poverty are also noteworthy.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided in-school and out-of-school job opportunities—1,318,829 poor youths have benefited. The existing limitation on funds means that many students who had summer jobs through the Neighborhood Youth Corps are unable to get needed part time jobs during the school year. Some of the pay scales for part time jobs are below minimum wage.

While there have been criticisms of performance in specific instances, these programs have generally been acclaimed. Clearly, help for children from deprived backgrounds must not end with Headstart or Headstart will be a failure. The Job Corps must not be a 2-year interval for youths who return to their slums with low level skills to find opportunities closed to them, or the Job Corps will be a failure. But these programs have made a beginning, and we owe it to the American promise of opportunity limited only by a man's capacity that they be continued and expanded.

The community action program is another story. The idea of providing a mechanism to involve directly poor people in the solution of their problems through community action was a revolutionary one—perhaps more revolutionary than its sponsors realized. Contemporary poverty is based on hopelessness and powerlessness. The bureaucracy, be it in Washington or city hall, is distant and immovable. Community action helps overcome this. Community action is the heart of the war on poverty. Embodied in over one thousand urban and rural antipoverty agencies, reaching 10 million persons, it has become the catalyst of community renewal.

The guiding spirit of the community action program is faith in the idea of community—that people can work together to serve common problems.

There are currently 1,050 community action agencies. Over 80 percent of these are private, nonprofit groups. These agencies are organized in a variety of ways to meet a variety of local problems. As the committee report states:

The 1,000-plus organizations have created an awareness and a concern for the 30 million Americans who live in poverty, and a commitment to do something about their plight. They are helping to create opportunities for millions of the disadvantaged who are leaving the ranks of taxconsumers to become taxpayers.

In requiring that community action agencies either be State or local governmental bodies or a public or private nonprofit agency designated by them, the report states that:

An unwholesome situation has arisen in many communities where responsible public officials have not actively participated in the decision-making process with regard to community action programs in their communities.

I would ask, unwholesome to whom? This is a polite way of saying that these community action groups have not been beholden to city hall, and this is as it should be. To give control of these efforts to city and State governments, many of which have never had the interests of the poor at heart, would make a travesty of the program. In any situation of conflict, the city government would be expected to favor those interests to which it has been traditionally responsive, and the poor would be left out in the cold, as usual. The uniqueness of community action is the concept of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor through independent agencies which are not controlled by powerful local interests—either the established political group or the established social welfare agencies.

In most cases, these programs represent the first direct involvement of the poor in responsible projects to improve the lot of their community. Certainly, much more than community action programs will be required to alleviate many of the conditions—inadequate housing, poor health, unemployment, and lack of education. Nevertheless, there is a growing faith among poor people that the community action programs represent one of the most important vehicles through which they can take action and be heard.

It is precisely the failure of city governments that necessitated the community action programs in the first place. The importance of the community action programs is that they have given poor people, for the first time, the capacity to "fight city hall" where necessary, and to pursue their own programs of community renewal.

Mr. Chairman, since the inception of the antipoverty program there has been a basic difference in philosophy between those who believe that it should be simply another social welfare program under local governmental control and those who believe that it should be an innovative, fresh approach to the problem of poverty which neither local government nor established welfare agencies have been able to solve.

This difference in philosophy was reflected in the effort to provide in the legislation that representatives of the poor selected by the poor serve on community action boards in order to involve the poor in a meaningful way in the decisionmaking process and in the administration of local community action programs.

In 1965 I offered an amendment which was intended to accomplish this purpose. It was then opposed by the committee. A year later an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] was accepted, and we wrote into the law a requirement that at least one-third of a community action board be representative of the poor selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty.



What I said on July 21, 1965, in offering my amendment is still appropriate:

I believe very strongly that there should be a real involvement of people in the area affected, that what we are concerned with as much as poverty, in terms of economic poverty, is also the poverty of power. People in the ghetto communities are powerless. One way to overcome this poverty of power is to provide a process whereby representatives of the community are elected to local Community Action boards.

This difference in philosophy is reflected in the debate over the so-called Green amendment, sections 210 and 211 of the bill before us. Since the inception of the antipoverty program, I have been concerned that city hall domination would stifle the program. Therefore, I urged the Office of Economic Opportunity, as early as April 1965, when the effect of city hall domination was apparent in New York City, to provide a substantial amount of direct Federal funding to local community action programs in order to achieve diversity as well as a balance between the city and private nonprofit agencies.

In 1966 we wrote into the bill a new section to make 20 percent of the funds available to carry out community action programs independently of an overall umbrella agency. I believe that is sound policy. The Green amendment makes independent funding almost impossible by creating another local government veto.

The Green amendment also—sections 210 and 211—places effective control in the local government by the composition of the boards.

One-third are to be public officials who either are automatically members or are in some way designated by the chief elected official.

One-third are to be members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education or other groups. The bill is deliberately silent on how they are to be selected, but it is reasonable to assume that either the chief elected official or the one-third public officials will strongly influence their selection.

The remaining one-third are to be "persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served."

It is certainly not clear how they will be selected. However, since the committee has abandoned the requirement of the present law—section 202(c)(3)—that "the representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty with special emphasis in participation by the residents of the area who are poor," it is safe to assume that it will not be necessary for them to be elected by the poor.

This all adds up to stacking the community action board or community governing board against the very people who should in the language of the present law "have maximum feasible participation" in the planning and administration of local community action programs. Moreover, this requirement for board composition applies not only to an overall umbrella agency but to delegate or subsidiary neighborhood agencies. See section 211(c).

Then there is the question of the extent of the powers of the community action board through which a State or local governmental community action agency administers its program.

The committee report on page 47 states that the bill "does not specify the powers to be delegated to 'community action boards' when the State or political subdivision itself has been designated as the community action agency." On the other hand, section 211(e) specifies administrative and fiscal powers for community action governing boards of designated public or private nonprofit community action agencies.

If the involvement of the poor in helping themselves is to be a meaningful concept, then the poor should not be denied an effective voice in the decisionmaking process. I hope that the House will agree to the amendment which will be offered by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] to retain the language of the present law.

Many of the committee's amendments are useful and necessary. I refer to the addition of day care programs and new ways to involve the elderly. A tightening of auditing procedures is also useful.

I regret, however, that the committee has altered the unique character of the community action program.

I also regret the addition of the requirement that 50 percent of the local contribution be in cash. The committee give no justification of this action; it will only hurt the very areas that need assistance most.

Expenditures for the war on poverty are well below those projected when the program began. The committee has recommended the minimum necessary for the continuation of these efforts. Every dollar cut from the poverty budget means the denial of jobs for needy youth, loss of legal and medical services to poor families, denial of education to deprived children and, concomitantly, new frustrations to those whose hopes have been raised.

This is not the time to turn our backs on the needs of the poor. The very existence of OEO as a distinct agency is a symbol of our concern. It must be retained. The availability of funds for independent community action programs is a means to turn the apathy and hopelessness of poverty into self-help for the community. Independent community action programs need to be continued.

The whole range of antipoverty efforts are now running on borrowed time and borrowed funds. We owe it to not only the Nation's poor, but to the Nation's promise that the poverty program be continued with maximum funding and a sense of urgency.

President Kennedy was fond of quoting lines by Robert Frost, "For I have promises to keep and miles to go before I sleep." We also have promises to keep.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, we are about to begin the process of amending

the bill. I must take one moment to answer the remarks of the majority leader, with most of which I have no dispute, and most of which the Members on both sides of the aisle would not dispute.

The question before us is not a question of dollar signs or money. The question is how we can enact an effective, realistic program that will truly help the less fortunate in our society.

We intend on this side—and we hope we will have bipartisan support—to offer throughout the reading of this bill constructive amendments that will begin to make the Job Corps effective, which will put the Job Corps under the administration of the experienced people in the Office of Vocational Education, which will not destroy the Job Corps itself, which will keep all of the Job Corps centers in operation which, in the opinion of the Director of Vocational Education, are necessary and useful and are working. The Director will have full authority to keep them all open if he so desires.

But we will begin to move in a phase-over to put the Job Corps centers into integrated facilities, community facilities with existing technical institutions and vocational education, so we will not drop the Job Corps youngsters at the end of their time in a Job Corps center, as now occurs.

We will offer amendments to place Headstart in the Office of Education, administered in Washington, but the money will not go into the public school systems as such. It will go through a State commission, broadly representative, and be allocated to local community action boards, who, in turn, can contract with private or public schools or handle Headstart themselves.

We would place the early years program in combination with Headstart. Why transfer Headstart? Because we already have an existing program in the Office of Education that overlaps and, in some instances, conflicts with the Headstart program, the preschool and early school years program of the ESE Act.

We will offer an amendment that puts proper controls in community action, which brings the States in as partners, but which also brings local government in partnership without making community action boards subservient to these governments. It would preserve the true concept of involvement of the poor with proper balance of community action boards, and an independent community action board.

We would institute a variety of programs to get private enterprise involved in providing jobs for these poor and in helping to train them.

The Industry Youth Corps would help by subsidizing wages for up to a year and provide training while these people, 16 to 22 years of age, are employed in private employment, with most of the wages paid by private employers. We would encourage private enterprise jobs, bringing States and local governments into a balanced partnership in an opportunity crusade.

Our total figure of expenditure by Federal Government would be \$1.4 billion, but that \$1.4 billion would, by involving all elements of our society,



generate over \$3 billion going to the poor. This is the kind of program we need to help the poor. The majority leader talked about our long experience in helping the poor. It is time we did something truly effective to help the poor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee for yielding to me. I shall be very brief. It is my opinion that there are many Members who do not have their mind made up irrevocably over what they intend to do, either in support of or in opposition to S. 2388. In my judgment, the decision of many Members will not be made until all of the amendments have been considered and acted upon, and when the bill has been finally read in its entirety for amendment and the House has worked its will, then, and only then, will the decision be made for many. I can assure you and my colleagues that such is my position at this time.

Three years ago, in 1964, when the program was first proposed, I supported the first authorization and appropriations. In the months and years that have followed there has been such a deluge of complaints that unless I remained deaf and oblivious to these hundreds of serious complaints from my constituents—which I am glad to report concerned conditions mostly outside of our congressional district—I had no recourse either in 1965 or in 1966 but to oppose the program.

As I have repeatedly stated to my correspondents and my constituents, this year I am trying to keep an open mind. I am not going to prejudge this measure until I can see its final form after all amendments have been introduced and acted upon.

It has been asked whether I happen to be opposed to the concept of the war on poverty. Certainly no one can oppose the principle of the elimination of poverty. On the other hand, one certainly has a right to be critical if there has been poor administration of the program and if costs of particular projects have been far out of proportion to the results produced. I am sure there are few Members who oppose the program in its entirety. While it has been expensive, Headstart has been a novel approach in education that has been of great assistance to our 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children who might otherwise have been without this opportunity. On the other side of the coin there have been quite a few less praiseworthy projects, particularly at some Job Corps installations. Also questions have been raised about the activities of many community action programs.

As I mentioned earlier, complaints against the operation of the program have been numerous and frequent over the last 3 years from our constituents who write to our office. As I also mentioned earlier, I am glad to be able to report most of these complaints concern projects not in our congressional district.

As I discussed this bill the other day with a fellow Member, he asked me how could it be possible that complaints against the operation of the program can continue to be received uninterrupted month after month and week after week for 3 years and then all at once, everything seems to be all right, and it is a good program without any faults or failures. To a somewhat lesser extent than was my friend's question, is the situation in our office. There was a long dry spell in which there seemed to be little or no mail in support or praise of the program and now when debate is underway, there is a deluge of correspondence as well as a big batch of telegrams and a considerable number of long distance telephone calls that assure me all has been well all along.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had any reason to inquire into the interest of those who have been writing lately, but in some instance I know that they are either employees of the program or are recipients, directly or indirectly. Of course, there is nothing wrong with these people expressing their viewpoint. I am glad to have it, but it would be more persuasive if some of those who had written in complaint in the months gone by would write and say that they had changed their viewpoint and believe the program should continue.

Before I neglect to make the point, once again, as in former years, I wish to compliment and praise the work of the regional office of Economic Opportunity in Kansas City, Mo., and in particular its fine director, Don Thomason, as well as the excellent staff. This office covers a wide area of several States and from my own personal knowledge I know that it is not topheavy in numbers of personnel. There are not a lot of unneeded employees in this regional headquarters. His is a big job over a wide area to answer the countless complaints of the misdoings of all of the thousands of individuals projects within this wide area. So far as I can determine, he and his staff have done a heroic job to try to improve or better the program. I mention this only to point out that all is not bad about the poverty program. There are those in the program who are working sincerely to improve its overall operation.

Mr. Chairman, before I can make up my mind to support this bill there must be some better assurance that rural areas will get a more equitable share of community action programs. I think it should be made clear there have been very few complaints against the operation of the poverty program in the rural areas of our district. Those complaining against it are in the cities or our populated areas.

At the appropriate time I intend to seek recognition to offer an amendment which will assure the rural areas of the equitable treatment that the law is now supposed to provide for them. I am not a member of the Education and Labor Committee and it may well be some member of the committee may be entitled under the rules to earlier recognition and in effect preempt my proposed amendment or render it unnecessary and surplusage. If some member on the committee beats me to this improvement then I

shall be happy as long as the purpose or objective has been accomplished.

It is my considered opinion that rural America has been short changed in the poverty program and frankly unless there are stronger directives, rural areas will continue to have to be satisfied with less than 25 percent of the program.

The intention was clear in 1965, but apparently there is quite considerable question whether Congress' intent has been followed by the Office of Economic Opportunity and it would seem therefore there must be some enforced equitable distribution between urban and rural areas.

My amendment will simply provide that when the proper ratio of assistance is determined on the basis of need in the rural areas to lag behind by 10 percent or more of the equitable distribution provided in the present law, then the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall have the discretion to reduce the matching or non-Federal assistance in order to encourage the continued and increased participation in rural programs.

Before I conclude my remarks, I must point out the combined effect of the Green amendment which would require representation in the management of certain programs by the political subdivisions of local government, and also the Gibbons amendment which would require a 20-percent contribution, with half of it in cash, will have the effect of putting out of business a number of community action agencies in the rural areas which I represent. It may be possible for an urban area to make a contribution, part of it in cash, but it is quite another story for four or five counties in the rural areas as well as a number of smaller towns to negotiate an agreement to commingle their tax moneys into a non-profit community action program, particularly if some of these counties have a problem to raise cash because they themselves are at the limit of their taxable levy. While the pooling of this money is difficult, the politics is even more difficult. Why is it we cannot go ahead with an "in-kind" contribution such as to contribute the use of public buildings, public equipment and public personnel and services? If this kind of contribution can continue, then a real joint effort can be continued in the rural areas. If not, I submit that many of the rural programs will be killed because of the cash contribution provision.

When the appropriate time comes I hope to be able to make some comments about the importance of arresting the present trend of movement of our population from the rural areas to the cities. The problems of our cities can never be solved by making them more congested. If we are able to prevent further movement of rural migrants to urban areas by an equitable distribution of the funds under this program, then we will have accomplished quite a lot by providing the options for rural citizens to remain in rural America.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, recently I received from their Southeast Regional office one of OEO's many public relations documents entitled, "Myths and Facts About OEO." Appropriately enough the article began by stating:



Myths tend to grow around any great undertaking like parasitic vines on a tree. It may be useful to strip off a few parasitic myths to see what the Office of Economic Opportunity is really doing.

To be sure, I would welcome a complete demythologization of the OEO to enable us to see what the Office of Economic Opportunity is really doing. With the recurring reports pouring in from all parts of this country, there can be little about that parasitic vines have wrapped themselves around the antipoverty program. Charges linking OEO personnel with riots, partisan politics, subversive activity, "hate schools," school boycotts have been of grave concern to many of us.

In the wake of this past summer's riots, police and municipal officials have complained in city after city that poverty war money and personnel have been used to produce a climate of hatred leading to the most serious race riots in this Nation's history.

The mayor and three other officials of Newark, N.J., testified that antipoverty workers made significant contributions to the riots, that a left wing group known as Students for a Democratic Society controls two of the city's eight war-on-poverty areas, and that another possible new left group, the Newark Community Union Project, also controls an antipoverty program and holds that the United States is a "warmongering, racist society."<sup>1</sup>

In an appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee in August, Newark jailer Leonard F. Kowalewski, president of a policemen's fraternal order, charged that "antipoverty workers helped bring about the riots in the city."<sup>2</sup> In his statement Mr. Kowalewski cited Robert Curvin of CORE as one of the riot leaders and charged that he was also a director in the United Community Corporation, a Newark agency funded by OEO.

Another official in the United Community Corporation, Newark's antipoverty agency, one Willie Wright urged slum dwellers to arm themselves and keep their arms until rioting started again. Even though Wright was ordered suspended temporarily, the OEO in Washington said that, as a board member and an elected official, he could not be fired. A spokesman for Sargent Shriver said, "Mr. Shriver was . . . resigned to the fact that he was 'legally powerless' to force Mr. Wright's suspension because he was an elected official."<sup>3</sup>

The mayor of Jersey City said:

We have a man—whom I could name to a Congressional Committee—who . . . invited to an Episcopal church on the night of Monday, July 17, a man by the name of Rap Brown. And that night—the Newark riot was still going on—Brown told the congregation that they should . . . go out and burn Jersey City down. In the case I have cited, the man is on an antipoverty program payroll.<sup>4</sup>

According to Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina,<sup>5</sup> still another

Newark official, Jesse Allen, a member of an area antipoverty liaison, travelled this past spring to Puerto Rico to participate in Communist-led agitation for Puerto Rican independence. It is reported that Allen's trip was financed by the Tricontinental Information Center of New York, a revolutionary propaganda center sponsored by U.S. Communists.

Last August I called for an investigation into the recurring reports of involvement of antipoverty workers paid with Federal funds in the civil disorders in our cities. I would still like to know how much Federal money granted through OEO is being used by pressure groups advocating civil disorders and anarchy in this country. It would appear that through OEO the American taxpayer may well have found a way to finance his own destruction.

It has become increasingly apparent that parasites like Rap Brown, Stokeley Carmichael, and Leroy Jones have exploited the ghetto residents of the country and the programs of the Great Society itself as a means to accomplish their revolutionary ends.

One of the most shocking incidents to hit the news in this Nation was the revelation that an OEO program in Nashville, Tenn., was sponsoring a liberation hate school in a local church. Nashville police Capt. John A. Sarace testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that OEO funds had been issued to support this liberation school connected with the north Nashville summer project at St. Anselm's Episcopal Church at which, under the direction of SNCC, children were being taught to "hate whitey." The leader was identified as Fred Brooks, chairman of the Nashville unit of SNCC.

According to the Washington Post,<sup>6</sup> Brooks was driving a 1967 white Ford station wagon leased by OEO. The charges were denied both by OEO here in Washington and the Rev. J. Paschall Davis, chairman of the Nashville Metropolitan Action Commission, in an appearance before Senate Judiciary. However, once arriving back in Nashville, Rev. Davis admitted in a telegram to Senator EASTLAND that his testimony was not exactly correct. He reported that even though the grant from OEO for \$5,846 had been approved but not finalized his agency was committed to pay \$20 per week to house four young women working at the liberation school, one of whom was a member of SNCC.

On August 11, the Liberation School was suspended by the Metropolitan Action Commission of Nashville and the Right Reverend John W. Vander Horst, Episcopal bishop of Tennessee, ordered the school ousted from St. Anselm's Chapel Episcopal Center and denounced the school as teaching a concept "quite contrary to our Christian heritage."<sup>7</sup>

Last spring a riot occurred on the campus of Texas Southern University in Houston in which one policeman was killed and two were wounded in a gun battle that broke out on the campus May 16. James B. Jones, former dean of the

college, estimated that 125 of the university's 4,500 students supported the shooting in his testimony before the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

Houston Mayor Louie Welsh testified that he complained last May to the Office of Economic Opportunity that local antipoverty workers were fomenting racial unrest.<sup>8</sup> The mayor said he received no answer until July 21, 2 months after the riot.

Or consider the southwest Alabama Farmer's Cooperative—SWAFCA—of Selma, Ala., which the OEO recently funded in the amount of a \$400,000 demonstration grant after overriding the Governor's veto and turning a deaf ear to the pleas of the entire Alabama delegation, local officials, local and regional OEO agencies, and the report by OEO investigators that the project was economically unfeasible. Among the leaders of this unlikely enterprise were Shirley Mesher and John Zippert. According to those who have investigated<sup>9</sup> the personalities involved in the project, Shirley Mesher, the coordinator, first appeared on the Alabama scene in early 1965 to join the Selma-Montgomery civil rights march. She participated in that march as a "marshal" for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and is a close associate of one Dian Bevel, who recently returned from an unauthorized trip to Hanoi, and is wife of Black Panther advocate James Bevel of Chicago.

John Zippert, former president of the student body at City College of New York, was a fieldworker for CORE. In 1965 Zippert was a member of the American Youth Festival Committee in New York and assisted in involving participants in the Ninth Communist World Youth Festival in Algiers. A writeup of Zippert and his activities with the Youth Festival group appeared in the Worker, April 11, 1965, page 4. Among his other "credentials" Zippert can claim participation in a "teach-in" at City College of New York on April 13, 1965, along with Herbert Aptheker. The purpose of the teach-in was to oppose American efforts in Vietnam.

As though this were not enough, our colleague, Mr. FINO, of New York, on September 27, charged that a man who was named by the Federal Government and the then Attorney General, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, in 1962 as a card-carrying Communist, is the head of a war on poverty agency in New York City. Mr. FINO quite understandably demanded that Robert Schrank be removed from his post as director of work experience programs under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In a description of Schrank's record of subversion, he said:

During the late 1940's, he was an official of the International Association of Machinists, but he was expelled from the union in 1948 for parroting the Communist line. The Machinists, like most American labor unions, have an excellent record of cleaning out subversives the moment they show themselves. I wish we could say the same for

<sup>1</sup> "Subsidized Riots?" The Chicago Tribune, August 10, 1967.

<sup>2</sup> New York Times, August 8, 1967.

<sup>3</sup> New York Times, August 18, 1967, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Chicago Tribune, August 10, 1967.

<sup>5</sup> "Poverty In Perspective," Strom Thurmond Reports to the People, October 9, 1967.

<sup>6</sup> The Washington Post, August 9, 1967, pp. A1, A4.

<sup>7</sup> New York Times, August 12, 1967, p. 20.

<sup>8</sup> The Washington Post, November 4, 1967, p. A4.

<sup>9</sup> Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace, Montgomery.



the antipoverty program, where coddling of leftwingers has been made into an ideology.

In 1952, according to the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. Schrank was the chairman of a conference held in New York City to repeal the Smith Act. He was then employed as an international representative of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, which had been expelled by the AFL-CIO in 1950 as a Communist-dominated front. By this time, it was apparent that Mr. Schrank was a hardcore Communist sympathizer—and presumably a card-carrying Communist. He stayed with the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers until 1955, at which time House Un-American Activities Committee records lose track of him.

Later in 1962, Mr. Schrank was listed among those former officials of the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union who were shown to have been members of the Communist Party. He was so cited by the Federal Subversive Activities Control Board in 1962. The case in question is *Kennedy v. International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers*, May 4, 1962, Docket No. 116-56.

In July 1966 Mr. Schrank was hired as director of work experience for the New York City Neighborhood Youth Corps. He has received several salary hikes, and is now a full-fledged over-paid poverty commissar to the tune of \$20,500 a year.<sup>10</sup>

Mr. Chairman, evidence would indicate that OEO is also involved in financing activities in three other areas outside its legal jurisdiction. I refer to school boycotts, voter registration, and unionizing.

In Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of May 8, 1967, it was reported that Mobilization for Youth employees aided community organizations which conducted the school boycott of 1964 in New York and made MFY facilities and equipment available to them. The Rev. Milton A. Galamison, a member of the New York City Poverty Board, was the leader of the boycott.

Another boycott leader, according to Barron's, was Preston Wilcox, Assistant Professor at the School of Social Work at Columbia University which is the recipient of \$300,000 from OEO to train VISTA workers and an additional \$93,000 to evaluate the effectiveness of the workers it has trained. Besides his association with Columbia University, Mr. Wilcox is on the antipoverty payroll as a paid consultant to OEO for the upward bound program and a consultant to the Community Association of East Harlem Triangle, Inc.—CAEHT—which receives Federal antipoverty funds.

viewer:

I wish we had more Stokely Carmichaels.<sup>11</sup>

A quick glance at others involved in the New York boycotts turns up one antipoverty worker after another. Says one official who has been intimately concerned because of the involvement of antipoverty workers in the boycotts:

I am sure that the boycotts never would have occurred without the war on poverty.<sup>12</sup>

Another interesting use of poverty funds is for federally financed union or-

ganizers. On May 30, the General Accounting Office reported that it had found "extensive evidence that Federal antipoverty funds were used in efforts to unionize farm workers in Florida last year."<sup>13</sup>

The GAO advised the OEO to recover the funds from Community Action Fund, Inc. and the American Friends Service Committee which administered two migrant projects financed by OEO. The GAO charged that Community Action Fund, Inc. officials met last June with AFL-CIO officials and discussed CAF's role in the efforts to organize farm workers. GAO further charged that the wife of the CAF president was an AFL-CIO employee under her maiden name. According to GAO employees of CAF and AFSC engaged in political and union activities and received Federal funds as reimbursement for travel expenses.

In a similar charge, Representative GUBSER, of California, on February 27 and March 22 pointed out the possibility that the California Self-Help Service Corps, financed by poverty funds, could be using their funds for the training of labor organizers.<sup>14</sup>

There is even evidence that OEO funds may be used to train pickets. Nation's Business reports that in Fresno, Calif., 50 pickets showed up at all four entrances of a Fresno store carrying signs proclaiming, "Black Power says, 'Strike, Baby, Strike,'" while their leaders, paid from Federal funds, egged them on with "Let's hear it! Sound off!"<sup>15</sup>

These pickets, it seems, were trying to get the department store to take some items off its shelves—listed on an AFL-CIO boycott list. Sixteen of the pickets had come up from a federally-supported training center in the Watts section of Los Angeles and joined hands with union members as a part of their official "war on poverty" training.

The California Center of Community Development—CCCD—which cosponsors the Watts Social Action Training Center—SATC said that the Fresno picketing was part of the trainees instruction in "nonviolent means to make economic gains."<sup>16</sup> Six SATC staffers are supplied by the CCCD which, in turn, is supported by \$280,000 in war on poverty money and located in Del Ray, Calif.

In an interview with Rich Freeland, reporter for Fresno's KFRE radio and TV stations, CCCD director, Edward P. Dulton admitted:

We work with people to get unionized if that is what they decide they need. Our first commitment is with people; a smaller commitment is with the funding agency.<sup>17</sup>

Other implications have been made that OEO is involved in partisan politics. Representative FLETCHER THOMPSON, of Georgia, charged on Tuesday, October 17, that Atlantans were forced to register to vote before they could participate in certain antipoverty activities. He further charged the Office of Economic Opportunity—Atlanta, which administers Fed-

eral antipoverty funds, admitted organizing voters on a block-by-block basis and the requiring of voter registration for all participants in the antipoverty programs.<sup>18</sup>

On June 8, Mr. GUBSER, of California, called the attention of the House to a voter registration drive among the poor by the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission.<sup>19</sup>

On June 14 and 22, Mr. GARDNER, of North Carolina, speaking on the floor of the House advised us of the political involvement of OEO through "Operation Breakthrough," a community action program in Durham, N.C.

In his remarks, the gentleman from North Carolina said:

Operation Breakthrough employees, for a period of 3 months from December to March 28, 1967, 5 days per week during working hours, researched registration and voters lists for 10 precincts in Durham. In addition, their same employees contacted unregistered voters and persuaded them to register and used Operation Breakthrough automobiles to transport them to the polls to register. Then on election day Operation Breakthrough employees using their own cars, contacted and delivered voters to the polls and furnished them with sample ballots telling them how to vote.<sup>20</sup>

The foregoing evidence to the contrary notwithstanding the OEO document referred to at the beginning of my remarks classifies as a myth the statement that "Poverty funds for Community Action are often used to cause troubles in the community" and classifies as a fact its own rebuttal as follows:

The administration proposed 1967 legislation prohibits the use of funds for illegal "picketing, protest, or other direct action." OEO funds have never been used to train pickets or to conduct classes in how to strike . . . It is only those who take the unfair and unlawful advantage of the poor that need to be threatened by Community Action programs.<sup>21</sup>

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that OEO may be having difficulty differentiating between myth and fact.

On Monday of this week I received a letter from a constituent, a former assistant to the director of a community action agency and a former assistant director of a VISTA project. She is a college graduate with majors in psychology and sociology. She wrote, in part:

I resigned from the job with the local community agency because I was convinced that the bright, new, shiny words that had been used to describe the antipoverty program had become tarnished. The program had become a "hot bed" for political and civil rights activities. Helping the poor became secondary to other objectives and purposes . . . I believe the seeds of the 1966 riots were planted by ill-conceived concepts without the vision to see and plan for the results of frustrated people with too high expectations being led to believe the road up would be easy. . . And we wonder who is to blame. I admit my part and would like to see a change.

And in view of the conflicting, contrasting, and contradictory evidence, I

<sup>10</sup> Paul A. Fino, Congressional Record, September 27, 1967, H12604.

<sup>11</sup> Shirley Scheiba, "Suffer Little Children," Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, May 8, 1967.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> The Washington Post, May 30, p. A5.

<sup>14</sup> Congressional Record, February 27, 1967; March 22, 1967.

<sup>15</sup> Nation's Business, March, 1967.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> United Press International—188, October 17, 1967.

<sup>19</sup> Congressional Record, June 8, 1967.

<sup>20</sup> Congressional Record, June 22, 1967.

<sup>21</sup> Myths and Facts About OEO, p. 3.



should like to make this proposal: Will the real OEO please stand up?

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I was privileged today to transmit to my colleagues a message from representatives of agencies and organizations with millions of members in all sections of the country. I want to read the message at this point so that it may become a part of the record of the debate on this important legislation:

#### A MESSAGE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

As representatives of agencies and organizations with millions of members in all sections of the country, we call upon the House of Representatives to reject any efforts to cripple the anti-poverty program by cutting the authorization below \$2.06 billion annually or by accepting disabling amendments or substitutions.

The debate now going on in the House of Representatives must not result in abandonment or emasculation of the anti-poverty program.

By enacting the Economic Opportunity Act, our government and the American people gave its citizen poor a solid basis for hope and opportunity. Today we stand at the crossroads of our moral commitment to eliminate poverty from our society. Our nation has the resources. We call upon Congress to keep faith with its past commitments.

Failure to move forward vigorously will bring disenchantment and despair to the poor and will lead to further agitation and social unrest.

With this appeal we pledge our continuing support to an aggressive national effort to achieve full opportunity and social justice for all our people.

The above statement was adopted by the following national agencies and organizations November 9, 1967 at a meeting in the Hotel America, Washington, D.C.

Interreligious Committee Against Poverty; League of Women Voters; United Church Women; National Council of Catholic Women; National Association for Community Development; American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations; Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty; Industrial Union Division-AFL-CIO.

Mr. Chairman, the message I have just read is the combined voice of the representatives of the three great religious faiths in America—the League of Women Voters—and the AFL-CIO. It is a united cry for justice on behalf of the poor and appeal for full opportunity and social justice for all people.

The Members of Congress should not be found wanting in answering this appeal to conscience. The cry for justice in behalf of the poor, the underprivileged, the undereducated, the socially deprived must not go unanswered.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago this Nation declared war on poverty. With that declaration came a commitment, a commitment which pledged the resources of this Nation to lift 35 million persons into the mainstream of American life. Three years ago, affluent America was called upon to take a searching look at the "other America," the one which did not share in its abundance. It is indeed our shame that in a country of such wealth we have children who today will still go hungry, who today will still sleep in substandard housing, and who perhaps still will not be able to attend school because they lack adequate clothing.

With the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, we served notice

to the other America. We sorrowfully, but trustfully, recognized the existence of poverty in our midst, and organized ourselves to attack the problem.

The American people mandated the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide the central thrust in this attack. It was to be, and rightfully is, the focus of all efforts on the Federal level aimed at hard core poverty. The Office of Economic Opportunity was not only to operate new programs for the poor, but it was also to survey the fabric of Federal Government and devise a plan which would encompass all Government programs, as well as private efforts.

Through the poverty program, the poor acquired a voice. No longer would they stand indicted as immoral, shiftless, or lazy. Over and over they have demonstrated their willingness, and their capacity to become full participants in this society, and not just its wards.

Three years ago, Mr. Chairman, we asked the Office of Economic Opportunity to innovate, and it did. It demonstrated to the whole country the benefits of its imaginative and successful programs: Headstart, Upward Bound, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Neighborhood Health Centers, and Legal Services. It can now claim almost unanimous support of school systems, and medical and bar associations.

Statistics and computers cannot measure the hope provided by a second chance. For the first time, a high school dropout does not have to be lost to society, but has the option of combining school with work experience. For the first time, a head of the family can recapture his sense of dignity as well as provide economic security for himself and his family. This is what job training programs are all about. For the first time, many Americans have access to a doctor in their neighborhoods, or they may have the chance to partake in our legal process and discover that justice does not apply to the rich alone.

In New York, through Headstart, the poverty program has narrowed the gap for 83,000 pre-school youngsters. It has made it possible for over 108,500 enrollees of the Neighborhood Youth Corps to either stay in school, and get that high school diploma, or to gain a job skill. It has encouraged small businesses with over 500 loans. It has made it possible for over 24,000 adults to participate in adult basic education courses. Over 600 rural families have been granted loans to improve their agricultural techniques.

This is the promise of the poverty program. It has given meaning to this Nation's assertion of equal opportunity for every citizen.

Today we are at a crossroads in this search for equal opportunity. There are many paths before us, each offering something of merit. There are, obviously, many differences of opinion as to which path will most effectively lead to the realization of the goals we set for ourselves in 1964.

The choosing is difficult, but not impossible. I can only urge my colleagues to choose with wisdom and discretion. A too hasty or emotional choice might do serious damage to some of the delicately balanced coalitions which have been

erected in many areas, and in my own city of New York in particular. The Nation, from the crowded corners of the city ghettos to the general stores of the farming communities, must have confidence in what we do. We must continue to provide a viable framework for innovative measures while guarding constantly against signs of directionless change. We must continue to provide both the material and nonmaterial tools to the poor to enable them to stake out a meaningful share in this society while guarding against mere condescending charity. And when, as it has now, a crisis arises, we must continue to employ to the fullest the wisdom of this body in order to reconcile the differences which might appear in the search for the most meaningful path to these goals.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we must continue to provide the framework for innovation. We must give the weightiest consideration to such imaginative proposals as day care centers which might enable mothers who are heads of households to break out of the welfare cycle by becoming self-supporting while giving their children the social and educational background which will permit them to achieve for themselves, as they grow, the personal integrity necessary for a meaningful involvement in this society's benefits.

We must also give the weightiest consideration to an area in which I have had a special interest—the plight of our older citizens. The experience and the wisdom of these people must not be allowed to dissipate because they can think only of subsistence. A program to identify and meet the needs of deserving persons over 55 I feel is most necessary. We must provide these senior opportunities and services in order to reintegrate these valuable human resources into our increasing youthful society.

In order to provide economic opportunity for all, Mr. Chairman, sound community-based organizations must be constructed. As I mentioned previously, my own city of New York has labored for over a year to create these viable, valuable organizations. In a letter to me concerning the amendments before us, Mayor Lindsay of New York said that "to require a juggling in mid-stream of the delicately balanced coalitions, which were often so difficult to create, can only invite a major disruption in much of what is now being achieved. Community confidence is not easily obtained. The reorganization of community corporations required in the bill as reported can only serve to imperil that confidence." I must share Mayor Lindsay's sense of foreboding if we rashly destroy these fragile, yet workable, structures.

It is my fervent wish, Mr. Chairman, that this body produce a bill on which we can all agree. The issues, as is obvious, are most vital. Both parties agree that we need a bill and these problems must be solved as soon as practicable. A promise was made with the inception of the poverty program. To now renege on this promise to a group of Americans, until so recently without hope, would reflect the belief that nothing further can be done. Surely our experience in the past 3 years belies this conclusion. We must continue



to strive for successes, however small—for even small successes can grow large if they are nurtured by our continuing support for the ideas and programs which make them possible.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to rise in support of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, and in support of the fine work being done by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Some 2,500 years ago, the prophet warned his people that their destruction would surely come not from an alien foe, but from within their very gates. I am no prophet but as a reasonable man of long experience in public affairs, I would transmit that prophetic warning to my colleagues in this Chamber. Economic and social inequities have bred alienation and discontent throughout America; if we do not undertake to remedy the seemingly hopeless plight of one-sixth of our population, the ancient prophecy may, alas, be fulfilled in our time.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 is our opportunity to be humane, compassionate, intelligent, responsible, and in some way, responsive to the sorest needs of this body politic. Three years ago we became the trustees of America's disinherited because we recognized that their disinheritance was our disgrace. We took, as President Kennedy would have it, the first step in our thousand-mile journey toward the achievement of equal opportunity in employment and education; with modest means, we lit a small candle to illumine the darkness of the urban ghettos and the rural wastelands. For the most part, our efforts in this area have borne good fruit; therefore, as President Johnson urges, "let us continue"; let us not desert our trust; let us not flee before the craven bookkeepers whose cries of "extravagance" would, if heeded, punish the disadvantaged for being disadvantaged, the poor for being poor.

As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am deeply concerned, as you all know, with the preservation of law and order, with the maintenance of a balance between individual liberties and social cohesion under the standard of due process as announced in our Constitution; but today, that very balance hangs in the balance; it is idle to speak of equal justice before the law if there is no justice in the hiring halls, in the marketplaces, in the classrooms of America.

I have often gone on record as an ardent supporter of responsible dissent, but I recognize that responsibility depends upon education in the concept of responsibility; by the same token, respect for law and order depends largely upon self-respect; how, I ask, can a man who is systematically deprived of equal opportunities in education and employment begin to comprehend the values which have made America great?

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat late in the day for anyone to defend the ethos of compassion against the attacks of social Darwinism, but I do not blush to do so. Our existence as a nation is at stake. Only if we are good, can we exist.

Now I do not suppose that the legislation before us is a panacea for all the ills to which it is addressed, but it does represent a continuation of the enlightened approach already taken. It will give the poor, through maximum feasible participation at the local level, a chance to contribute to the national life and to share in the national dream; the extremists and demagogues, who pander to their anguish, will in time be banished from their midst. In view of such great gain, who would oppose this bill? Some point self-righteously to a history of administrative error as an excuse for their opposition. There is a fly in every ointment, but the fly and the ointment are not inseparable; the part does not vitiate the whole. Small mistakes in a new venture may be inevitable, but the venture itself is not therefore mistaken. On the whole, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been highly commendable and it should be encouraged to persevere by our mandate, namely, the enactment of S. 2388.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD a statement by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights issued on November 7, 1967. The statement, entitled "America Cannot Afford To Lose the War on Poverty" and signed by such prominent leaders as A. Phillip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young, Jr., documents the extreme urgency of the legislation before us today:

AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE THE WAR ON POVERTY: A JOINT STATEMENT BY NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS, ISSUED NOVEMBER 7, 1967

America is a Nation in crisis.

This crisis is rooted in the despair and growing anger of more than 30 million of our fellow Americans—black and white, in the city slums and on the eroded back countryside—who are still trapped in poverty which does not give them the opportunity to help themselves.

There has been much talk of a revolution of rising expectations. That revolution exists. Its growth is inevitable. But its demand is simple. The demand is for the equality of opportunity that is at the core of the American tradition and is spelled out in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The demand is to participate—to be allowed to compete—in the mainstream of American life.

In 1964 the President and the Congress of the United States declared an unconditional war on poverty. They made a solemn promise to all Americans, and especially to those trapped in poverty that the conditions which condemn the poor to inequality of economic opportunity and which deny them any chance to participate in American life would not be allowed to prevail.

As a result of that commitment the first faint signs of progress are appearing in the slums of our cities, in the bleak valleys of Appalachia, in migrant camps, and on Indian Reservations.

But now, only three years after this National commitment was made, there are those who hope to discard or break it. This National crisis is being used by some as grist for partisan mills and treated by others as a mere political annoyance.

We, the undersigned give solemn warning now that to break the National promise of three years ago would be to invite National disaster. Doubt, discontent, sickness and cynicism are all integral elements of the life of the poor. They will grow in volume if Congress should tell the poor: "Forget it. We didn't mean it. Stop bothering us."

The President's budget for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 is minimal. If an

amount less than the budget is appropriated, the poor will interpret it as Congress saying "We didn't mean it,"—and they will be right.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is central to the War on Poverty. It is the only Federal agency solely concerned with the problems of the poor. It is the only agency that has given the poor National visibility and has championed their plea for the opportunity to become Americans as the rest of us know the word. If OEO programs are scattered to the bureaucratic winds, the poor will interpret it as Congress saying "We didn't mean it," and they will be right.

The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 and the appropriation of the minimal funds to carry it out are vital if a National crisis is not to become a National disaster. We urge our Congressmen to put aside partisanship and to come to grips and with one of the most urgent problems in America today.

A. Phillip Randolph, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Roy Wilkins, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney Young, Jr., National Urban League; Dorothy Height, National Council of Negro Women; Clarence Mitchell, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; Jack Wood, National Committee on Discrimination in Housing; Berkeley Burrell, National Business League; Bayard Rustin, A. Phillip Randolph Institute; John Murphy, National Publishers Association; Marvin Caplan, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the following telegrams, supporting the Office of Economic Opportunity, that have been sent to the mayor of Providence, R.I., Joseph Doorley. Mayor Doorley, on learning of the opposition confronting the passage of the OEO legislation, took it upon himself to come to Washington and urge other mayors from throughout the country to join him in support of this legislation so vital to the future of our Nation. Among the cities that Mayor Doorley has thus far received responses from, are the mayors of: Kansas City, Mo.; Yuma, Ariz.; St. Louis, Mo.; Chicopee, Mass.; Rutland, Vt.; Butte, Mont.; Glasgow, Ky.; Jackson, Mich.; Worcester, Mass.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Portland, Oreg.; Yonkers, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Monroe, Mich.; and Woonsocket, R.I.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point in the RECORD copies of telegrams from these mayors throughout the country strongly endorsing the OEO legislation. I congratulate Mayor Doorley upon his initiative and commend the mayors from throughout the country who have joined him in urging the Congress to promptly enact meaningful legislation to help the poor people of not only our cities, but indeed of all America.

The telegrams follow:

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,  
November 8, 1967.

MAYOR JOSEPH DOORLEY,  
Washington, D.C.:

In my opinion, the poverty program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been of major assistance in Kansas City in alleviating need in the worst areas of our city. Its Headstart programs, its recreation programs, its programs for young people and people in need of employment have been received well and are in the finest spirit of America in helping the helpless to help themselves. It would be a major calamity at this time in our history for Congress to turn its back on the needs of the poor in this country.



I urge you as part of the conference of mayors and on behalf of this city to take such steps as you can to see to it that the basic programs initiated by OEO are continued and enlarged. This is no time for the Congress of the United States to tell the poor of the United States that they can "eat cake," while it cuts off the basic programs which could help the poor help themselves.

ILUS V. DAVIS,  
Mayor of Kansas City, Mo.

YUMA, ARIZ.,  
November 8, 1967.  
Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Washington, D.C.

Sorry I can't be with you at the bullfights, but will be backing you all the way. Have strongly urged our congressional delegations support.

THOMAS F. ALT,  
Mayor of the City of Yuma, Ariz.

St. Louis, Mo.,  
November 8, 1967.  
Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Providence, R.I.:

Members of Congress who represent St. Louis have given me their personal assurance that they will support the authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Their previous support of this legislation would indicate favorable action on their part. A telegram has been sent to Congressman Hungate who represents an area immediately north of St. Louis. He has been asked to give the authorization bill his complete support.

ALFONSO J. CERVANTES,  
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

CHICOPEE, MASS.,  
November 7, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Washington, D.C.:

Count on our full support in your efforts to restore funds for the economic opportunity program. I have already contact Senators Edward Kennedy, Edward Brooke and Congressman Boland for their support in this effort. Our local superintendent of schools, Dr. George Mefbring has already contacted Secretary Wirtz and recorded his protest in the cutting of funds for the various neighboring programs. If at all possible I will attempt to be in Washington on Thursday, Nov. 9th to give local support to your efforts.

RICHARD H. DEMERS,  
Mayor of city of Chicopee.

RUTLAND, VT.,  
November 3, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
City of Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: I have your letter dated November 2, 1967 regarding the \$2,060,000,000 authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have already contacted our Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont and I am sure that he will do all possible to retain as much money as possible for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Sincerely,

HAROLD J. NICHOLS,  
Mayor.

BUTTE, MONT.,  
November 7, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Washington, D.C.:

We have contacted Chairman Perkins of the House Education and Labor Committee and also our own Congressman Arnold Olsen. Wholeheartedly supporting your efforts to save the urban monies. As the President of the Montana Municipal League, I have spoken at least for the larger cities of this organization. Sorry I cannot join you personally.

Mayor TOM POWERS.

GLASGOW, KY., November 7, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Washington, D.C.:

May I commend you for your efforts in regard to retaining requested funds for community action.

This program should and can become most meaningful in the up-lifting of our less fortunate, in communities that are ready to do their part.

Glasgow, Kentucky will do its part.

We endorse retaining the program in full.

R. A. LESSENBERRY,  
Mayor, City of Glasgow Ky.

CITY OF JACKSON, MICH.,  
November 6, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor of Providence,  
Providence, R.I.

DEAR JOE: It is impossible for me to get to Washington just now. I am finishing a strenuous campaign for re-election. But I wish you success in your efforts to stem the "blood letting" of the OEO authorization bill and hope that enough mayors will join you to make an impression on the Congress.

Congress must be made to understand the serious trouble that is caused by starting programs which cannot be completed for lack of funds, or promising programs which never materialize.

I should think the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders might put in a word on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ALBERTA BENNETT,  
Mayor of Jackson.

CITY OF WORCESTER, MASS.,  
November 6, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Executive Department,  
Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: Your letter of November 2, 1967 is appreciated.

I am pleased to advise that I have communicated with our Congressman Harold D. Donohue and requested his favorable action on the \$2,060,000,000 bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MCGRATH,  
City Manager.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,  
November 6, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Office of the Mayor,  
Providence, R.I.

Poverty program in Syracuse is being reorganized we have not lost faith in this program and we urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry on a meaningful fight against all facets of poverty of paramount importance is that local share of these continued programs not exceed ten per cent grants in aid and cash otherwise local Governments will not be able to continue financial support of these badly needed programs.

WILLIAM F. WALSH,  
Mayor of Syracuse.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
November 8, 1967.

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY,  
Mayor—City of Providence.

Urge consider adequate funding OEO especially in light of limits on local tax load to otherwise continue existing programs.

STANLEY W. EARL,  
Acting Mayor, City of Portland, Oreg.

CITY OF WOONSOCKET, R.I.  
November 3, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SR: As Mayor of the City of Woonsocket, Rhode Island, may I express my opposition

to any reductions of funding for Community Action Programs to a \$600,000,000 level as opposed to the requested fiscal year funding of \$1,022,000,000, as requested by President Johnson.

The City of Woonsocket, Rhode Island has been conducting a Community Action Program for two years. It is partially funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity with an annual grant of \$137,206 to conduct four neighborhood multi-service centers, a comprehensive manpower program, and Headstart program.

Cutbacks in funding would necessitate the discontinuance of the following listed local programs:

1. Closing half our Neighborhood Centers with additional termination of other programs such as child care, home economics, consumer education, health education and referral.

2. Termination of Headstart and Manpower Programs.

3. There will be no funding for Neighborhood Youth Corps program for twenty school drop outs, a Legal Service Program and a youth center.

Any cutbacks in funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity is destructive to the concepts of community action and to programs initiated to meet local needs in providing opportunities for our unfortunate citizens.

If we are to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to community where he can find security, we must move forward by providing the necessary monies.

Very truly yours,

A. EDGAR LUSSIER,  
Mayor.

YONKERS, N.Y.,  
November 6, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: I have read, with great interest and concern, your letter of November 2nd, 1967, regarding the Economic Opportunity Program.

Please be assured of our continued support for this Program. I concur with you that it would have a devastating impact on the two (2,000) thousand communities which have the Head Start, legal services, health centers, neighborhood centers, and many other worthwhile programs designed to meet the needs of the poor. I trust that the outcome on November 7th, 1967, will be, indeed, favorable.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,  
JAMES F. X. O'ROUKE, M.D.,  
Mayor.

CITY OF CHICAGO,  
November 3, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: Thanks for your letter relative to the legislation affecting the Office of Economic Opportunity. Be assured, Mayor, that I am doing everything I possibly can to be of help and assistance in impressing upon Congress that the plight of the cities is urgent and that every possible aid should be granted to them in order to carry out the various programs for the good of all of our people.

Best regards.

Sincerely,  
RICHARD J. DALEY,  
Mayor.

CITY OF MONROE, MICH.,  
November 1, 1967.

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor of Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 28. I totally concur with your opinion and have



forwarded these sentiments to Representative Marvin Esch this date.

Very truly yours,

MORTON R. COHN, Mayor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967".*

Mr. GOODELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 2 be passed over and be read for amendment at the conclusion of the reading of the remainder of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the second section has not as yet been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$2,060,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$874,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of such Act, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums as may be necessary, so long as such appropriation does not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The Chair may or may not recollect that earlier in this session, if my memory is accurate, on the NASA authorization bill, we had under consideration an authorization bill as to which there might have been some similarity with respect to the situation we now face, in that once a figure was changed, as I recall, in the subportion, we could not subsequently revise the larger figure. I ask at this time if that is the case in this instance?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the gentleman from Michigan is correct.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 128, line 6, strike out "\$2,060,000,000" and insert "\$1,400,000,000"; line 8, strike out "\$874,000,000" and insert "\$421,500,000"; line 10, strike out "\$1,022,000,000" and insert "\$825,000,000"; line 13, strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$10,500,000"; and on line 14 strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000".

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret the circumstance which requires us to proceed in what I consider to be a disorderly manner, because this bill is written with all of the authorizations in the very first section of the bill. We are faced with the necessity of determining how much money we are going to put in the overall bill and how much money will be put in each of the titles of the bill right at the outset, and we do not know what the will of this House will be with reference to the specific sections.

We may be authorizing overall appropriations for programs that will be deleted in the wisdom of this House. We may be accepting new programs, in the course of the amendment process, without any authorization for those programs possible.

This is unfortunate. It is the reason why I asked unanimous consent to consider this section at the very end of the reading of the bill. That unanimous-consent request was objected to, so I have no alternative, as was made clear by the inquiry of the minority leader, other than to offer the amendment to the authorization section which would provide the amount of money which we feel is necessary to implement the opportunity crusade, \$1.4 billion.

I would emphasize that if the other changes are made in the bill that we propose to make, this would generate more than \$3 billion in money going into the pockets of the poor.

It would do this through the process of involving private enterprise. Instead of the Federal Government in each instance paying 100 percent, in effect, for the wages of all those who are to be aided, the Federal Government would use its money as seed money in order to try to help individuals over the hump of getting employment and keeping them in employment for a period of time when they may be less than fully productive. These are such programs as the Industry Youth Corps where a subsidy of the wage would be paid through local administrators. In private employment private employers would pay three-quarters of the wage. In effect, this brings private employers into this program as partners. They have employees who are productive and they are able to train them on the job. We have found that employers are the best trainers. It is much better than sending individuals off to institutions or schools. A variety of other proposals are in the opportunity crusade to involve private enterprise. We believe \$1.4 billion would fully fund the good programs in the present war on poverty. For instance, there is more money in the

opportunity crusade for Headstart than there is in the committee bill. We have more money unearmarked for community action in the opportunity crusade than there is in the committee bill. We would eliminate the earmarking of those special categorical programs which exist in the present law; \$1.4 billion can galvanize our country and our society, bringing in all elements of the community as partners, really to involve the poor themselves and really help them with productive and meaningful jobs—not dead-end make-work public jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House will agree to the \$1.4 billion level of expenditures, but I hope further that we will not stop there. I hope we will go on to implement some of the proposals offered in a bipartisan or unpartisan way—constructive proposals that will redirect the war on poverty in a more meaningful way. If we do this, we can truly begin to bridge the gulf that now exists between the affluent and the poor in our country. This is an imperative. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment to cut the authorization to \$1.4 billion, which is \$660 million less than the committee bill and \$660 million less than the President budgeted, but would make more than \$3 billion available to help the poor.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply refuse to recognize that this program is so far from being a success it is not funny, especially not to the taxpayer footing the bill, or the disillusioned poor. The war on poverty has been criticized in one respect or another by the whole American society, including U.S. Senators and even VISTA volunteers. I would like to add that this criticism has not been generated by my Republican colleagues and myself, as some of the support for the OEO and its programs has been generated through the lobbying and similar efforts of the OEO.

Some recent criticisms have been contributed by my Democratic colleagues:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for example, said of the community action program:

It has not worked in many communities of America, and I tell you that in many communities it has been a catastrophic flop.

He also observed of community action that—

This program is in disrepute today because fly-by-night outfits formed overnight have come down here to Washington and because they had friends in the OEO got millions of dollars to carry on all sorts of programs and the legitimate organizations in your communities... were by-passed.

Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, the gentleman from New Mexico, calls the war on poverty programs "lots of caviar, but no beans."

Congressman JOE POOL, the gentleman from Texas, has stated:

It's time to put an end to these giveaway programs like the War on Poverty anyway.

Congressman PHIL LANDRUM, the gentleman from Georgia, even goes so far as to criticize the OEO administration directly:

I still feel strongly that the so-called poverty program is sound in concept and designed to go after these problems on a long range basis of education and training. But I am saddened that the administration of



the program has been so poorly carried out and that so many bad judgments have been made.

Mr. Landrum said he thought there was "stupidity right here in Washington in Sargent Shriver's office."

I will not repeat at this time, but refer you to the minority views on this bill, for the speech of Congressman JAMES M. HANLEY on the floor of the House, in which he complained "never in my congressional tenure have I seen a more blundering mishmash of indecision than that served up to me by OEO during the last month," and he suggested "the Congress order a carload of medals for buck-passing struck and then direct that carload be delivered en masse to the Office of Economic Opportunity."

Some of the witnesses before our Education and Labor Committee this summer related their unhappiness with the administration of this program.

Mr. Blue Carstenson, National Farmers Union, stated:

*Community Action.* We have not been happy with some of the administration and policies of OEO. Most of this Committee is aware of our feelings and of the examples of these problems. We can share the views of many of you for the need for improving these policies and practices. If it is desirable to put OEO closer to existing agencies to cut interagency warfare and improve administration, it could be possible to move the entire OEO to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for example, keeping it as an Office of Economic Opportunity with the same status as the U.S. Office of Education.

The annual report of the Fond du Lac, Wis., Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc., as presented to the committee by Mr. Don Flanders, representing that committee, related:

The most serious problem of our office is, has always been and no doubt will continue to be, the erratically managed and administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The concept of economic opportunity that human resources cannot be wasted, that the local community must gear itself to meet the needs of the poor on a continuing basis in America, these are ideas that must be implemented. But the execution of these concepts gets bogged down in constantly changing guidelines and congressional ups and downs in response to criticism.

Mr. Joseph Dyer, at that time director of the Connecticut State OEO, commented:

At the present time Community Action Boards receive no direct instructions from OEO, have no motivating guidelines, are spoon fed the information they do get from paid staff members and most of the board members have no knowledge it is their responsibility to be a multivoice.

Mrs. Shirley Tannenbaum, director of the Frederick County, Md., CAP told her frustrating experience:

However, upon presenting this program package to OEO, we began a long series of negotiations which if it were not so serious could be called a comedy of errors. The day after presenting our proposals to regional office, the program analyst for my county resigned.

Since then I have had six program analysts. Every time I have had to go through these programs again, explaining and describing once again. This particular process went on for about a year.

Never was I told that the program was bad. The proposals were not rejected. They simply never were funded.

The end of this story is that finally, through the Bureau of Work Programs, we did get the programs funded.

We have been able to begin them July 10 of this year. However, this is not a completely happy ending to the story. During that year disillusionment set in among the people who were enthusiastic about the new opportunities about to be theirs. Now they find it difficult to believe that something is really going to be done. We have lost the faith of the poor in community action programs.

One State technical assistance director, who I shall leave unnamed, commented that when OEO decentralized much of its decisionmaking process to the regional offices, hope sprang anew that conditions would improve—but they did not. He also commented that "probably the most important difficulty results from exasperating and seemingly arbitrary actions by national and regional OEO in the realm of policies and procedures."

A study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., in April 1967, entitled "Strengthening the CAP Processes in the Regional Offices," contained numerous criticisms:

Headquarters imposes an excessive number of information demands on the regional offices \* \* \*. We identified several examples of inquiries from two or more headquarters offices about the same problem on the same day. While we have not conducted a detailed analysis \* \* \* (one) underlying cause: A lack of understanding on the part of headquarters personnel of the role headquarters is to play in the management process, and an unwillingness to function within the boundaries of that role.

The regional offices frequently receive detailed direction from a multitude of headquarters personnel. \* \* \* This problem grows out of a lack of understanding at headquarters of line authority and of the functional and advisory authorities of the various staff units.

Personnel at each level must develop and instill in subordinates a greater degree of discipline than has heretofore existed in CAP. By "organizational discipline," we mean the frame of mind with which individuals carry out their assigned responsibilities without dissipating time in nonessential meetings or veering off into areas of responsibility outside their own.

The lack of adequate headquarters discipline is a problem to the regional offices because of the excessive information requests that have been imposed, the management improvement projects that have been launched but have not been completed, and the needed actions that were delayed when decisions were not properly coordinated or when unauthorized persons intervened.

CAP critically needs to be able to apportion work and assign responsibilities in a logical manner so that each person fulfills his responsibilities without drifting into another's area of responsibility.

However, CAP has been hampered by an excessively high turnover in personnel that has undermined efforts to develop a fully experienced and effective staff. The magnitude of this problem is indicated by the following findings:

a. The rate of turnover among regional analysts has been 52 percent per year. The average length of service for analysts is only 10.6 months.

b. Every top-level position at CAP headquarters and at OEO, with the exception of the Director of OEO, has had at least two

occupants during the past 2½ years, some positions have had three or four occupants.

Some of the reasons for this situation were identified through interviews and through questionnaires completed by regional analysts. Low morale and general dissatisfaction were mentioned frequently in five of the seven regional offices.

Regional analysts are frustrated by the confusion, time demands, and lack of support under which they must work. \* \* \* indicated substantial frustration due to the "confused paperwork maze" in which they must function. \* \* \* The average analyst spends only 2.2 days per month in the field, and some have never visited their grantees.

The following newspaper articles cite a couple of instances of how this administrative "mass confusion" comes out at the local level:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Oct. 15, 1967]

#### PAPERWORK FOULS UP A "WAR"

For the last two years the city's anti-poverty agency has been sending the regional Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Chicago ever increasing reams of paper.

Stacks of reports, budgets, proposals, requests and communiques have flowed like a paper Wabash into the regional office to become lost in dark filing cabinets and bureaucratic labyrinths.

Lost. That is the word that William F. Stafford, CAAP executive director, received last week from Chicago. The Indianapolis file has disappeared.

And the dammed flow means proposals stop being processed there with a good possibility that proposals and a lot of other work may have to be duplicated here.

Stafford said: "It sounds impossible, doesn't it?"

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Oct. 14, 1967]

#### POOR WAIT A YEAR FOR CARE AS DENTAL TOOLS LIE IDLE

(By Lawrence J. Green)

Thousands of dollars worth of dental equipment, purchased through the federal poverty program to provide dental care to inner city residents, still rests in unopened crates a year after its delivery.

Dr. T. Aden Cockburn, director of health services for the poor, said the equipment remains unpacked and unused because the federal government failed to follow up with funds to install it. Or hire dentists and technicians to operate it.

The equipment, which he values at \$60,000, was purchased in August, 1966, and is stored in poverty health centers at 6061 Grand River, 5149 St. Jean and at Mt. Elliott and Charlevoix.

At least \$21,000 in additional funds would be required to set the equipment up in the centers, he said. The high installation cost results from the age of buildings.

Another \$20,000 in dental equipment, delivered at the same time, was only installed recently in another health center in a wing of the old Providence Hospital.

Dr. Cockburn said he expects to get that center in operation next week because he has found a dentist willing to work in it on a part-time basis.

Even now, he said, he does not know how much money will be available to set up the other equipment. Congress is still studying budget items for the Office of Economic Opportunity, the administering agency for the poverty program.

If the money is allocated, Dr. Cockburn added, it would require three to four months to set up the equipment and put it into operation.



Beyond that, he said, is the problem of recruiting dentists and hygienists for the centers.

He is authorized to pay dentists only \$5.50 an hour and hygienists not more than \$6,500 a year.

It is nearly impossible to get people to work for that kind of pay, he said.

The city council will review the rate structure next week.

Cockburn said dental care "is one of the most serious medical problems in the core city."

The present situation leaves him helpless, he added, even though the citizens advisory committee to the poverty program, when polled, listed dental aid as one of the major needs.

Last year, the health service of the poverty program gave examinations and treatments to 66,000 adults and children.

One of my many criticisms of the haphazard administration of the OEO lies in the area of evaluation. There is no OEO procedure to evaluate the success or worth of any CAP program prior to its being refunded.

Mr. Frank Ferro, director of the New York regional office of the OEO, recently commented on this subject:

At first we let communities try anything. Now it's time to start concentrating on the programs that have proven they can work... In the past, it's always been on a catch-as-catch-can basis. How can we help if we can't evaluate what has been done?

Because OEO has not been able to effectively administer the many programs under its authority, and holds out little hope to the future of improvement, we have proposed the transfer of training and education programs to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor.

James L. Sundquist, of the Brookings Institution, in a consultant report prepared for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty—September 1967—noted that the Economic Opportunity Act provided "a statutory basis for OEO's role as Government-wide coordinator of antipoverty efforts."

Some of Mr. Sundquist's comments on the status of OEO and the problem of coordination are:

OEO has a status distinct from the other coordinating agencies in only one respect—it is located in the Executive Office of the President. But this difference is little more than a paper distinction. The other agencies of government do not look upon OEO staff members as presidential agents speaking for the President and exercising his authority, like staff members of the White House, the Budget Bureau, or the Council of Economic Advisers. OEO is looked upon, and acts as, another operating agency on a par with the Cabinet departments—not on an organizational level above them. Its staff role is ancillary to its operating role in much the same sense as are the Presidential staff roles of the Secretaries of HUD, Labor, and the other departments.

The truism that only the President—personally or through presidential staff—can coordinate the Cabinet departments and independent agencies was recognized originally, as noted, when OEO was placed in the Executive Office of the President. Theoretically this design, which was vitiated when OEO was given its heavy operational load, could now be restored simply by divesting OEO of its operating responsibilities and leaving it only its staff functions as an element of the Executive Office of the President.

Dr. Sundquist noted that to improve coordination utilizing existing structures, he would recommend the alteration of the Economic Opportunity Council to a body similar to the National Security Council, the designation of the President as Chairman of the Council, with the Presidential staff serving the Council.

He felt such a staff, presumably, could be developed by the President into a coordinating unit with duties extending beyond those of the Economic Opportunity Council and the war on poverty to encompass, ultimately, as many of the other related problems of coordination as the President might wish to assign to it. In this manner, the strengthening of the Executive Office that is sought by the advocates of reorganization could be achieved through a Presidentially guided evolution rather than a congressionally imposed revolution.

We are proposing the establishment of a Council of Economic Opportunity Advisers in the Office of the President to chart a long-range course for the elimination of poverty, to undertake appropriate research studies, to evaluate existing programs and to recommend reorganization to eliminate waste and duplication.

Rather than divest OEO of all operating responsibilities to act solely as a coordinating body, we have chosen to propose that the OEO continue administering the community action program, which is ideally supposed to be a coordinating body of antipoverty programs in the local communities. We would also leave the VISTA program with OEO, which, because of its very nature, should be closely tied to the community action program.

Dr. Kenneth Marshall, vice president of Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc., New York, N.Y., endorsed our proposal at the hearings:

Mr. GOODELL. The suggestions you make in your presentation, I think, are extremely to the point. You are suggesting, in effect—if I understand you correctly—that if all OEO is going to do is what it now has under its administration, you could eliminate OEO and there would be no great loss.

You are suggesting that OEO should take on these new assignments that you are advancing and then it might have a valuable function. Is that a fair summary?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. The existing programs that OEO is administering, you feel, could be transferred without damage to programs in the existing agencies?

Mr. MARSHALL. Those that are already stabilized; yes, sir. I believe there is a great vital role in the innovative programs and nurturing them until such time as they become traditional and stabilized programs.

Mr. GOODELL. Since you were the originator of the idea originally, could you give your views as to why you feel something similar to the Council of Economic Advisers should be set up in this area, such as a Council of Economic Opportunity Advisers?

Mr. MARSHALL. Some \$30-odd billion touches upon the lives of the poor and are in some way related to this poverty problem. There is a need for a high-level council that would be directly talking to and advising with the President—a high-level council of persons who had power to clout, who could look at all of these programs which are here, there, and everywhere, from the point of view of the total impact and the coordina-

tion to bring about a greater impact to make for a more effective and efficient use of these dollars which are presumably and allegedly affecting the lives of the poor.

Mr. GOODELL. You are not suggesting anything like an advisory committee or some of these large groups we now have?

Mr. MARSHALL. No, this would be a small and tough one and I would say one with power. Without the power from the President it would be a futile body, but it would be a small and very toughminded group of persons with a very efficient staff who could look at all of these programs and specify from the point of view how they are or are not affecting the lives of the poor people.

Mr. GOODELL. This would be a full-time council something like the three-man Council of Economic Advisers with a full staff of top professionals who, in effect, would be looking at all of the Federal programs, to eliminate poverty in this country; how we can improve and innovate with new programs and eliminate some which are not working.

Is that what you are saying?

Mr. MARSHALL. Precisely.

#### REDIRECTION—JOB OPPORTUNITY BOARDS

In city after city across the Nation it appears that the poverty programs are not lifting the poor out of poverty but merely making them comfortable in it, if even that.

A few of the many criticisms made throughout the country regarding the effectiveness of local antipoverty programs are:

Phoenix: The Arizona Republic's findings indicate that most people in the target area are completely unaware of a poverty war.

Those who have been touched in one way or another by the dozens of programs in operation there generally are not touched enough to cause any significant changes in their social or economic statuses.

Many—responsible minority-group citizens—have told the Arizona Republic that the poverty level there is considerable animosity expressed against "Anglos" who have, on the one hand, encouraged them to work for their own betterment but, on the other hand, have failed to deliver the goods that will help them up the ladder.

Cincinnati: Rev. William Sicking, Cincinnati poverty war member, said during hearings on that city's program:

I have found very few programs encouraged and approved by the CAC that attack the problem of poverty at home plate. It seems to me that the CAC-approved neighborhood services tend to promise more than can be produced. Grass-roots poor people laugh at the anti-poverty program.

CAC? Never heard of it, they say. Those who have heard of it call them "big shots" who are telling us to raise ourselves by our own bootstraps, only we don't have any boots.

If it weren't for us poor people, those guys wouldn't have a job and be pulling down those fancy salaries.

New York: A survey by the Westchester Council of Social Agencies revealed that "The local war on poverty—Eastchester—is backed strongly by the majority of the poor but here appears to be little understanding of what is being attacked and what the programs are trying to do, especially in areas of employment, legal services and racial bias. Very few of those interviewed associated anti-poverty programs with providing help



with basic problems of employment, housing and legal rights."

San Antonio: County Commissioner A. J. Ploch declared the antipoverty program as a whole is "a complete joke," and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

San Francisco: An audit of the San Francisco program found the following deficiencies—

No clear delineation of the nature of work and responsibility to be carried out by each entity.

Serious separation of authority from responsibility, resulting in organizational diffusion, indecision and interference with coordination and control.

Lack of coordinated programs covering personnel and financial management and administrative procedures and services.

Lack of adequate performance measurement techniques and related program reviews, including staffing criteria and other cost analysis.

—A study of that city's poverty program revealed:

There are wasteful practices, duplicated efforts, and a lack of coordination, leadership and financial control in San Francisco's war on poverty. . . . Hundreds of public and private agencies, most staffed with earnest men and women, attack the multiple problems on their own—ignoring the existence of the others.

Louisville: A report prepared by the University of Louisville Urban Studies Center concerning Louisville's program stated:

About 45,000 of Louisville's 70,000 poor have been involved in the local poverty war, but very few of them have been raised from poverty as a result of the program.

Cincinnati: Congressman CLANCY testified at House hearings concerning the response to a questionnaire he circulated in his district which asked "Do you believe that the war on poverty program has been successful to date in improving conditions for the poor?" Congressman CLANCY said:

I tried to work that as objectively as possibly I could. We have had over 22,000 returns on that questionnaire. Of those who answered that question, 78.9 have said no, 10.9 have said yes, and the other percentage was no answer.

A major redirection is required in the community action programs if there is to be any economic impact on the poor. This redirection must involve the private business and volunteer resources of the community, which to date have been largely untapped, in job training and placement in meaningful jobs. Therefore, we have proposed in the opportunity crusade the creation of job opportunity boards which will bring together the business leaders and the poor of the community in a joint effort to close the gap that lies between the thousands of unemployed and underemployed and the thousands of jobs in private business that are begging to be filled.

During the past year several communities have enlisted business and industries in job development programs:

In Los Angeles, Calif., the Management Council for Merit Employment, Training and Research, which is composed of leaders of business and industry

has in cooperation with private companies and public agencies succeeded in placing 20,000 disadvantaged in jobs. A recent study conducted by the University of Southern California has established that practically all of them remained in their original jobs.

In Rochester, N.Y., during the past summer, more than 50 local businesses pledged their support to a new community organization, Rochester Jobs, Inc., which was formed by leaders from business, community organizations, and clergy. Since August of this year, Rochester Jobs, Inc., has successfully placed 866 individuals in jobs. It is noted that Rochester Jobs, Inc., is funded by local industries and operates without Federal money.

In Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., the Job Development Corporation, formed by community businessmen without Federal, State, or local financial assistance, has placed 550 individuals in permanent jobs and currently is training 300 additional prospects.

Recently officials of the Los Angeles, Rochester, and Hempstead programs were interviewed and they advised that it was their feeling that results in job development and placement could be more readily accomplished by privately financed agencies where programs could be implemented without the confusion, redtape, and contradictory guidelines that have prevailed in Federal antipoverty programs.

In St. Louis, Mo., the Community Action Agency—Human Resources Corporation—in October 1966, enlisted the aid of businessmen and community leaders in the Work Opportunities Unlimited program, which has served as the job development arm for the antipoverty agency. This program, which was financed 20 percent by St. Louis businessmen, has developed 7,359 jobs of which 2,699 have been filled. Work Opportunities Unlimited, by utilizing a maximum amount of business and industrial cooperation, has been successful in developing jobs at a 300 percent to 400 percent over quota ratio.

An example of one of the many imaginative approaches which could be developed through such a Job Opportunity Board is seen in the program of the Committee for Employment Opportunity in Indianapolis, Ind.:

#### COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The Committee For Employment Opportunity was established in Indianapolis, Indiana in the fall of 1965 under the sponsorship of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. Its creation effectively marked the entrance of local business and industry into the social problem solving field. Two significant factors which made this activation possible were the managerial manpower and financial support of the Center For Independent Action in New York, and the wholehearted cooperation of the Indianapolis business community through the loan of key executives to the program for specified periods of time. The effort was so successful that 334 companies are now participating in this ongoing effort.

The Committee's reason for existence is based on a paradox of modern American society . . . why are numbers of people unemployed while many jobs remain unfilled? In assessing the problem much study and effort went into a number of activities which

explored the best approaches to use in putting people to work. Basic to any effort of the Committee was a determination to apply sound principles of business management to this enterprise to insure efficiency and practicality.

From this beginning has evolved a program which places primary emphasis on helping unskilled unemployed persons prepare for, find, and adjust to gainful employment. The task is not easy. In addition to being not only unskilled and unemployed the people receiving assistance are non-high school graduates who interview and test poorly for jobs and who have highly unstable work histories.

On-the-spot research showed that the unskilled job seeker's frustration and lack of motivation to find work is caused primarily by poor job focus, personal problems, a history of poor interviews, and a resulting lack of self-confidence. By the same token his lack of good work attitudes is caused by poor understanding of his personal responsibilities to an employer, over-sensitivity and defensiveness with supervisors, and a generalized hostility to business and industry whom he views incorrectly as the source of his troubles.

The unskilled and unemployed person does not circle statically in an unchanging condition . . . he is on an ever-descending spiral of frustration and defeat with all that this represents socially. The Committee For Employment Opportunity saw as its task the reversal of this process by putting the person to work, giving him the self-respect of being self-supporting, and starting on the upward spiral of success rather than the downward spiral of failure.

The approach used to reverse this process is an intensely personal one featuring volunteers recruited from business and industry, church groups, and non-sectarian associations, to serve on a one-to-one basis in counseling and working with unemployed persons. Volunteers are recruited on a short range basis, trained in two sessions, and given responsibility for a single unemployed person.

The typical volunteer is twenty to forty-five years old, male, married, has twelve to fourteen years of schooling, \$6,000 to \$10,000 annual income and is employed continuously. He becomes a volunteer because:

He sees the employment problem of the hard core person as solvable; he can see the effectiveness of his work; the work is within his competence to perform; the activity is short term with an option for continued involvement; the program within which he works is businesslike and practical in orientation; and the volunteer has professional support.

Since the beginning of this year we have conducted 70 recruiting campaigns in Indianapolis resulting in 239 trained volunteers. After being assigned an unemployed person the volunteer:

Contacts the job seeker; arranges a meeting with him at the job seeker's home; obtains personal data and work history; uncovers the job seeker's personal problems.

In a minimum of seven more home visits the volunteer:

Helps the job seeker assess his work potential; prepares the job seeker for work interviews; arranges for a public service evaluation of the job seeker's work potential; assists the job seeker to improve in the weak areas indicated by the evaluation; refers the job seeker to job opportunities.

One of the volunteer's most important jobs comes after the job seeker has found work. It is to help him adjust to the new work situation and ease him over the rough spots.

There are four basic principles underlying the Committee For Employment Opportunity program:

The CEO works only with unsuccessful job seekers. It does not provide work for persons who are not actively seeking it; the job seeker



who becomes a job holder motivates others in his sphere of influence to become job holders; the unskilled job seeker undergoes an attitudinal change through a personal relationship with a successful person who cares about him; the middle income volunteer who assists the unskilled job seeker to get work undergoes a personal change of attitude toward unemployed persons which favorably affects his own socio-economic group in their attitude toward unskilled personnel.

In addition to encouraging recruitment of Voluntary Advisers from their respective firms, business and industry provide valuable assistance to the Committee For Employment Opportunity by:

An identification system comprised of 26 personnel offices of Indianapolis firms which screens out lowskilled and unskilled job seekers and refers these job seekers to the employment program for assistance; professional evaluations on a public service basis (22 companies are involved) or job seeker's work skills; listing job openings for the unskilled; entry-level and on-the-job training programs.

For 1967 the Committee For Employment Opportunity's project goals are:

1. to help twelve hundred unskilled and lowskilled job seekers to prepare for, find, and adjust to jobs.

2. to recruit, train, and supervise twelve hundred voluntary advisers. These voluntary advisers will be recruited from business and industry, church groups, non-sectarian associations, and people referred by voluntary advisers.

3. to increase the load of business and industry, specifically in the areas of job seekers referral, work potential evaluation, medical examinations, job listing, and on-the-job education programs.

The Indianapolis Employment Program is being prepared for transfer to other cities.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that the gentleman intends piece by piece to try to write into the bill the so-called opportunity crusade. The first amendment verifies that fact. This cut to \$1.4 billion would, for all intents and purposes, destroy thousands of worthy programs and literally yank thousands upon thousands of young people from preschool classrooms, from training opportunities, from college classrooms and many more of the needy from participation in health and other essential services.

I just want to tell you first how much it would cut back the Job Corps. From the authorization of \$295 million that we have in the committee-reported bill, it will cut the Job Corps back to 31,000 enrollees. Where we expect to serve some 80,000 during the next fiscal year, with a 41,000 enrollment at all times, it cuts it back to 31,000. This is just one effect of the cut to \$1.4 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the in-school NYC, the amendment cuts it back from 106,000 down to 62,000. And, let me call your attention to one thing in this so-called opportunity crusade. If the members of the committee will look at the language that is contained in that proposal, you would not have out-of-school—out-of-school NYC programs—in the opportunity crusade.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York. However, I wish to get along with my statement. I do not have much time.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman asked a question and I will answer it.

The out-of-school program would not be eliminated. A portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school money would be used to fund the Industry Youth Corps.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. The gentleman's bill does not make any provision for an out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from Kentucky is incorrect.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the adult manpower training programs under title I, part 1(b), and title V, enrollment levels would be cut by more than one-third. Again, you see we are not simply just cutting people out of training opportunities, we also would be destroying the worthy programs that we have in existence at the present time by the reckless shifts in the nature of the programs.

Mr. Chairman, community action programs would be cut to pieces.

As to neighborhood centers, in our bill, we provide for reaching about 3.5 million of the poor. Under this proposed cut you will deny services to almost 1½ million people.

Mr. Chairman, under the title II manpower programs operated by community action agencies in the Committee bill you have 117,000 persons to be served. However, under the alternative situation offered by the gentleman from New York, 117,000 participants would be cut by 24,000 people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to remedial reading, remedial education, let us just take that under consideration for a moment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not have much time to yield further, but I do yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, just as a point of reference and of information, what figure is the gentleman using? Is the gentleman using the \$1.6 billion figure?

Mr. PERKINS. I am using the \$1.4 billion figure as contrasted with the \$2.06 billion figure.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is not contrasting that with the \$1.6 billion, which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] stated that he was going to support?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not contrasting that with \$1.6 billion. My contrast is \$1.4 with \$2.06 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(Mr. PERKINS, by unanimous consent, was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to remedial education, under community action tutorial programs, 4,520 children would be cut out by this amendment.

Twenty thousand people would be cut out of adult education.

The housing programs from 55,000 possible families down to about 25,000. Nonprofessional employees would be cut about 25,000.

I believe this is a good illustration: for the full year under our bill we propose to serve 209,000 Headstart children the full year. Under this amendment 50,000 children will be cut out of the program.

These are some of the things that I believe should be pointed out to let the members of the Committee know that this opportunity crusade will just cut this so-called antipoverty program to pieces, and it will totally cripple community action agencies. The amendment is completely unrealistic. The series of crusade amendments of which this amendment is just one part has been thought up in a very hasty manner. It will not serve the people. And the amount of money that they propose to fund their substitute program on certainly would render any program—no matter how well conceived—ineffective in meeting needs that are even now being effectively dealt with under existing law.

This amendment should be defeated, and should not receive the support of any individual in this Committee who is interested in doing something about poverty. It certainly will not do the job. I hope that this Committee will waste no time in voting down an amendment that will completely disrupt the whole present operation of the OEO, and all the community action agencies throughout America, and will certainly do harm to hundreds and hundreds of thousands of poor people in this Nation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I agree thoroughly with the presentation made by the Chairman. In addition to the cuts in community action programs, and the fact in the complete absence of an out-of-school program, among other things, this would cut the Volunteers In Service To America, VISTA, by some 21 million to 26 million, and would do irreparable damage just in that one area, not to mention the others.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Because in my considered judgment it is utterly superficial, and I believe this was well characterized yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] who said it really is not the opportunity crusade, it is the opportunity charade.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, he knows the figure, does he not, of funding of VISTA for this fiscal year?

Mr. PERKINS. My recollection is \$25 or \$26 million.

Mr. QUIE. So we have the same figure as is presently the case for VISTA, leaving them at the present level. That hardly cuts the program.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota is an expert to a great degree



in this area, and he knows that this will disrupt all of our programs today in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. ERLENBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that we find ourselves in the parliamentary situation that we have here at the present time. We are now going to determine in this situation the amount of funds to be spent on a program and we have not yet an opportunity to determine what it will be, and what it is going to look like when the amendment process is completed.

I am happy that the chairman of the committee did not see fit to object to the unanimous-consent request but I am unhappy that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] did.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I did not object myself. I had an understanding with the gentleman from New York when we talked about this, I had not discussed passing over this section with other members of the committee.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I was at the moment complimenting the chairman on not objecting to the unanimous-consent request.

As the House, or this Committee should be aware, after the parliamentary inquiry of the minority leader, what we do with this amendment is irrevocable in this Committee of the Whole.

What we do with this amendment will establish, without any opportunity to later change our minds, the total funds to be spent in the war on poverty in the next year or two and the allocation of those funds, title by title.

It is unfortunate, as I say, that we cannot put this off until the end of the amending process when we will know at that time what amendments will have been adopted and what this program is going to look like.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York establishes the authorization figures in accordance with the opportunity crusade. All Members will have an opportunity to see what kind of a program that can fund, by reading the bill, H.R. 13894, which incorporates the total opportunity crusade, that at some time during the amending process I expect we will have offered as a substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk for just a moment about some of the comparisons that the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor made.

He was comparing, in the Job Corps for instance, the authorization in the present bill with the authorization that is contained in the opportunity crusade—rather than comparing it with the present authorization of the program that is in existence.

He talked about the cutting back of programs. As a matter of fact, this authorization of \$190 million in the Job Corps area or the residential vocational and educational area—the authorization of \$190 million contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will not require any reduction in the number of those now being served.

The Job Corps presently does have a figure of about 40,000 established. The opportunity crusade does not establish the number to be served. Certainly, it is to be hoped and expected—and I would be surprised if the facts do not bear us out—when the opportunity crusade is adopted and put into operation—the \$190 million authorized by this amendment will be able to aid considerably more young people than the \$211 million in the 1967 authorization and limitation under which the Job Corps is now being operated.

I think this will be true title by title.

You cannot compare the authorization of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and say that since it is less than the committee bill that we are cutting back on programs. By the same token, neither can you say that since there are less Federal dollars involved in this authorization that fewer people will be aided by the bill, because the whole thrust of the opportunity crusade is to mobilize additional resources. Whereas the entire thrust of the committee bill is to rely entirely on the Federal Treasury to support the so-called war on poverty.

I hope there will be at the time that this amendment is voted on a good representation of the membership of this House, because this is a crucial vote.

As I pointed out when I first took the floor, this is a crucial vote that will determine irrevocably the amount of money that can be spent in the next 2 years in this war on poverty.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, on April 11 of this year I delivered my address to this distinguished body on a subject which I stated then was, in my opinion, one of the most distressing problems of the 1960's, the tragedy of the poor of America, and the methods implemented to help solve their problems.

My opinion is still the same. I am still persuaded that it is no disgrace to be poor; but I said then, and I say now, that if one desires to improve himself, then I think that America can help fulfill that desire and continue to offer the opportunity of advancement to every individual.

There is compassion in the heart of every American, and the desire to alleviate the plight of the poor and of those who have suffered misfortune in life. There is no one in this distinguished body who does not care about that happens to the child in the next block, or on the other side of town, or in any section of our Nation. I would not dare charge that there is anyone within the sound of my voice who is so callous as to look upon the jobless, the economically broken, or

the deprived child, as being the target for political opportunism.

The Headstart program for deprived children has become easily the most accepted part of OEO's community action programs. Education is the key to interrupting the cycle of educational failure, unemployment, and poverty. Because of the administrative weaknesses of OEO and the long delays in funding, this important program has suffered, but it could expand and become viable if transferred to the experts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The stark tragedy in all this is that the public, the poor, and even some officials, of OEO, have lost faith in the concept and program which has been presented as the means to eradicate poverty in this great country. The bureaucratic befuddlement of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the quick and exaggerated denials of any criticism by its public relations machine, the political partisanship of some of its workers, and the loss of control of its programs has brought the indignation of many responsible citizens.

The true believers in the war on poverty now consider themselves betrayed, for the performance has not been as splendid as the promise.

Outside of this building, all over this country, there are Americans who have not been able to break down the barriers to full economic participation in the life of our Nation. I have cosponsored the opportunity crusade because I believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity has not proven to be successful.

I believe that the opportunity crusade can be the blitzkrieg of the war on poverty. This crusade would involve private industry and the several States in a partnership for the poor. This crusade is a new approach, built on the solid foundation of a free enterprise economy.

I support the opportunity crusade because I believe that the war on poverty is in desperate need of major redirection. Local knowledge and private resources must be adequately utilized, instead of cast aside by those Federal planners who do not believe in the concept that each man is his brother's keeper, but only in "big-brotherism."

The poor of this country cannot eat good intentions. They cannot wear programs which never reach their doorstep. They cannot live in hollow hopes offered but not achieved. We cannot destroy the hope of those who want to better themselves, without destroying as well, our country's greatness.

I am supporting the opportunity crusade because I believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity has lost its way in the credibility gap. Evidence of this very serious mistake by OEO came to light in my own State of Oklahoma just recently at the Guthrie Women's Job Corps Center, when it was discovered that the Washington office of OEO, in what appeared to be a plan to inflate Job Corps enrollment figures and reduce the per capita cost figures, asking the Guthrie officials to withhold information on June dropouts until after the close of fiscal 1967. The initial charges were



loudly denied by OEO officials, but during subsequent committee hearings it was admitted that the cost per enrollee figures were inflated as a result of the practice used, and that hardship resulted to terminated enrollees because they did not receive their termination checks until months later.

The record of this debate is already full of references to the failures of the Job Corps to either train enrollees, or to find them jobs by which to sustain themselves after graduation.

The Job Corps program has produced dismal results at enormous costs. It is as tragic a failure as anything attempted under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Under the opportunity crusade, the Job Corps would be transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Corps would be phased into the highly successful State vocational education system to provide residential vocational education for young people who need it.

In a consultant report dated August 1967, Sar Levitan prepared for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, the following observations of the Job Corps program, which I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point:

#### JOB CORPS

In 1966 there were about one million out-of-school unmarried youths from poor families, most of whom were eligible to enroll in the Job Corps.

During its first two and one half years, the Job Corps had to maintain a continuous promotional effort to fill the available facilities, which by mid 1967 could accommodate some 42,000 youths.

Based on the experience during the first 10 months in fiscal 1967, the total average annual cost per enrollee of operating established centers (in operation more than 9 months) averaged \$8,100, ranging from \$7,300 for conservation centers to \$9,700 for women's centers. Although the average exceeded the statutory limitation by nearly \$600 per year, the Job Corps did not ignore the limitation imposed by Congress. The law excluded from the \$7,500 limitation, overhead costs—enrollee recruitment, screening, placement, and Job Corps headquarters and regional expenses—which averaged \$600 a year per enrollee; the cost of amortizing the \$141 million capital investment (\$600 per enrollee); and the cost of materials expended on conservation work (\$854 per conservation center enrollee).

A great many of the difficulties were caused by the OEO. Even before opening its first center, the Job Corps embarked on an extensive national advertising campaign to interest young people. Concerned that the Job Corps could not attract an adequate number of enrollees and that the potential clientele would have to be sold on the idea, interested youths were invited to complete opportunity cards indicating an interest. The response of about a quarter of a million was better than the most enthusiastic advocates had hoped. Though many of those who responded were neither qualified nor really interested in the Job Corps, a large proportion were potential candidates. It took the Job Corps months to respond to the deluge of inquiries, some of which were never acknowledged. When the campaign started, the Job Corps had facilities for only a few hundred.

Under the circumstances, it is hard to understand the need for the extensive advance publicity. Indeed, knowledgeable advisers cautioned Shriver not to embark upon the

campaign. In this manner the Job Corps disappointed many potential clients even before it opened for business. The performance also antagonized some of the program's best friends. For example, Congressman William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York, a consistent advocate of the antipoverty war, complained publicly that as of June 1, 1967, 1,600 New York youths had applied but only two had been selected for the Job Corps.

Nevertheless, the data clearly revealed the major problem of the Job Corps—the inability to keep enrollees in the centers for an adequate length of time to affect their future employability. Even in the Harris sample, one-third of all respondents (or interviewees) departed from the centers in less than 3 months; the actual number, as was suggested earlier, probably exceeded 40 percent. Another third of the Job Corps population stayed between 3 and 6 months.

Six months represents the crucial cutoff period needed to make the Job Corps experience a success. This judgment is based upon a comparison of the labor force status and hourly rate for former corpsmen compared with the control group of "no shows"—accepted applicants who did not go to a training center. Since the "no shows" displayed characteristics similar to those of youths who actually entered the Job Corps, it is reasonable to consider them an appropriate control group. Only former corpsmen who stayed in centers longer than 6 months had a better employment record and received a higher hourly rate of pay than the "no shows."

Both the "no shows" and former corpsmen improved their employability, reflecting possibly their increased age—since the employability of youths increases as they mature. Indeed, some might speculate upon an examination of the preemployment record of former corpsmen that youths who remained in the Job Corps for 6 months or longer could possibly have made it on their own, without the aid of the Job Corps. Fifty-two percent of this group was employed prior to entering the Job Corps and 26 percent were unemployed; while of those who stayed less than 3 months, 37 percent were employed prior to entering the Job Corps, and an identical percentage was unemployed.

Regrettably, it must be inferred that no conclusive case has yet been established to justify the Job Corps on the basis of past performance. The issue is not whether participants require aid. Their high unemployment rates, low wages and deficient education offer ample evidence that Job Corps enrollees need help. However, alternative, less costly, programs are available. There is a need therefore for more convincing data to prove that the expensive Job Corps program is justified.

#### VIABILITY OF JOB CORPS

The experience of the Job Corps is reminiscent of the little girl with the curl: "When she was good, she was very, very good; when she was bad, she was horrid." For youths who stayed long enough to complete an assigned course of study, the experience has been meaningful and has helped them to gain employment at a higher wage level than they might have anticipated otherwise. But too few corpsmen remain in centers long enough so that the education and training they receive is meaningful in the outside world. Despite the current vogue of "the culture of poverty," studies have indicated that the aspirations of corpsmen are not very different from those of middle-class youth. Four of every five corpsmen stated that they enrolled in a center to learn a trade, and more than half said they wanted to get an education. Based on his extensive studies of aspirations by youths from impoverished homes, Dr. David Gottlieb concluded that: "... lower income youth do in fact seek a better life, a life which has the dimensions of what

we come to identify with the middle class." Not surprisingly, he found that poor youths discover this goal illusive.

The Job Corps is one institution with the potential of helping poor youth to bridge the gap between aspirations and reality. The harsh fact is that it has helped only a minority of those who sought its aid, despite the relatively ample resources that were allocated to it. The future of the Job Corps as a viable institution therefore remains in doubt. It will depend upon its ability to perform the Herculean tasks of operating efficiently residential centers where poor youths will remain long enough to gain an experience meaningful to their future, and of persuading the dominant sectors of the population that the effort is worth the investment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A quick look at the several deep slashes taken by the meat ax wielded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will indicate that lying deep in the bloody gashes left behind on his rampage, one of the programs most terribly mutilated would be the Job Corps. His amendment would cut to about \$421 million the funds authorized for title I, and cut the Job Corps by one-third of current operating costs, a slash of \$105 million.

Looking at the latest copy of the opportunity "charade," which I have before me I find that the proposal of the gentleman from New York is to allocate those funds in such a manner as to provide the Job Corps \$190 million. However, one of the strange paradoxes of this allocation is that at the same time the proposed legislation, which I assume will be the amendment upon which his fund cut is predicated, would propose to take the Job Corps centers that are now operated by private industry away from those contractors and turn them over to some supposedly existing group of ready and waiting State vocational education agencies.

In fact, the gentleman knows as well as I do, because we both serve on the General Education Subcommittee of this committee, that we have been working hard and long in that committee to assist the State vocational education agencies in tooling up to do the meager job that they are now trying very hard to do. Such agencies, even where they exist, are in no way equipped to take over this program now being operated largely by private enterprise.

It strikes me as very strange indeed, that after having said so many times on the floor of the House and in the RECORD of the proceedings of this House that the substitute that he presents would bring private enterprise more fully into the poverty program than ever before, that one of the very first cuts that he now proposes would drive them out.

It is true—and I am sure he will point it out—that his legislation does not spell out specifically that private contractors are excluded from the program. What it states, however, is that if there is any kind of State agency, regardless of its competence to take over the programs and operate them, that that State agency shall have priority in award of contracts, and it terminates all the existing contracts with private corporations at the end of the current contract year.



Who are we talking about? A bunch of small companies that are getting rich off the poverty program? No. We are talking about Westinghouse Electric, Graflex, Inc., Thiokol, U.S. Industries, RCA, Philco, Ford, Packard-Bell, Burroughs Corp., IBM, Litton Industries, Federal Electric, and Xerox, just to name a few. We pay these private corporations an average of 4.7 percent overhead to run the urban Job Corps centers, and the proposal that the gentleman is trying to sell to this House will drive more than half of those people out of this program the first year and the balance of them within the next year or so. Instead of going toward participation by private enterprise, we will be going directly away from participation by private enterprise.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I now yield to the gentleman from New York for a question.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. His comments are not directed to what is in our bill. Our bill provides for the continuation of existing centers. It provides for contracts with private profitmaking employers and corporations. If the director of vocational education wishes to continue those contracts—and it would be likely that he would because the Job Corps centers that have been run the best are those that have been run by the private corporations—there would be no change whatsoever made in the opportunity crusade with reference to those points.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I think the gentleman states the position quite accurately, but the only problem is the inflection he places on the word "if." The way the gentleman states it, the "if" leaves the door wide open. If we will take the time to look at the portion of his proposal which has been mostly recently circulated to the House, we will discover that is a tremendously large "if." As a matter of fact, if we take a little bit more time and inquire of the people on this side of the aisle, who have spent time trying to develop greater vocational educational activities in this country, we will discover that "if" is not an "if" at all, but it becomes a mandatory "shall" direction.

The revised opportunity "charade" bill would not completely prohibit the operation of centers by private contractors, but it would make such operation unlikely. First priority would be given to centers operated by State vocational education boards. Only if the States had no interest in operating such centers, or for some reason were unable to do so, would the use of private contractors be a probability.

This would be a bad mistake. The United States is the home of free enterprise, and the active participation of industry in the effort to end poverty may be uniquely American. We should be proud of it, and seek new ways to harness the great ingenuity of American industry for our common purpose, not downgrade or reject its contributions. It may well take Government and industry working together toward elimination of

poverty to reach this goal. We cannot afford to turn down the assistance of industry.

This is more than a theoretical argument. Industry has, in fact, made a valuable contribution to the Job Corps, and they have done so without asking the kind of financial return which is normal in Government contracts. The fee paid for management services has been approximately 4.7 percent, which is a third less than the same companies usually charge on other Government contracts. Nevertheless, many of the most successful Job Corps centers are operated under contract with private, profitmaking companies.

The experience of industry is particularly valuable in the area of vocational training. Most of Job Corps trainees will eventually seek jobs in industry, rather than Government. They can, therefore, profit greatly from direct contact with industry representatives who know in a way the Government may only guess what degree of skill is actually required in apprentice workers. Moreover, private contractors can convey to enrollees what industry standards are for reliability, promptness, good grooming, motivation, and related factors in a way that Government can only report secondhand.

This amendment should be rejected so that Government and industry can continue to work and learn together toward the elimination of poverty.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to try to make clear that there are some Members on our side of the aisle and, indeed, a number of mayors across the country of both parties, who support full funding for this program. Indeed, there are some who feel the existing amount as reported by the committee, \$2,060,000,000, is largely inadequate, if not totally inadequate.

I think one could debate here today provisions in both the Goodell-Quie substitute and in the committee bill—and I have been one of those who have said there are some good things in the Goodell-Quie substitute, such as the Data Bank and the greater emphasis on job orientation—but the point that I think is before the House very simply and very sharply is this: We have made a commitment now in three Congresses to the American people. We have made a commitment that we cannot, in my opinion, honor if we cut one-third or one-half of the funds that will be available.

There is no way that we can do the job that we must to help some 30 million Americans gain necessary skills, help the Job Corps, help the Neighborhood Youth Corps, continue and expand Community Action and its national emphasis programs, and do it by cutting \$500 or \$600 or \$700 million from the authorization.

I would urge in the strongest terms that we debate as thoughtfully as we can the merits of the bill, improve it if we can, but let us not try to cut the basic funding. The bill is already meager in certain areas, and it is absolutely necessary, in my judgment, that if the poverty of this House and its commitment is not to be made manifest for all to see, we must support full funding and make

it as effective as possible in order to uphold our commitment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], for making some of the aspirations for debating this bill in a bipartisan fashion come true. We have had a great deal of talk along that line, but I think the gentleman in the well, not only by his efforts on the committee, but over the years with respect to a reasonable and meaningful antipoverty program, has demonstrated this kind of program can be debated in a nonpartisan or in a bipartisan fashion.

I join a number of Members on this side of the aisle in commending the gentleman for his stand, and I hope some of his colleagues on his side of the aisle will follow his real statesmanship today.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I would state again I hope this bill today is not caught up in any kind of politics, that it can be addressed solely on its merits, and that we recognize our commitment to the cities of America, to the young men and women whose future rests in large part with this bill, to the ghettos where there is fear and hopelessness and despair today. If we seriously cut this program, no matter what the amendment is, there will be a conviction throughout America that the Congress has broken faith with its commitment.

If we cut the amount by \$400 million, \$500 million, or \$600 million, it would be a disastrous action. Above all, it would show the hollowness of our commitment.

I hope the bill will enjoy bipartisan support in the interest of necessary and full funding.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I know the debate may be interpreted here today as \$2.06 billion versus \$1.4 billion. The headlines will say that some people over here urge economy and some people over here want to be big spenders.

Really, what are we talking about? I believe we call this proposal the great charade or sometimes, the opportunity charade. All we are talking about at this time is how we are going to spend the money that the Congress will finally appropriate. Let us face this.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members on the Appropriations Committee have already let the Congress know how much they are going to agree to when an appropriation comes up for this program, for us to vote on. I believe that all of us in this Chamber are realists enough to know that we are going to adopt the figure which the Appropriations Committee brings in.

What figure are they talking about? They are talking about \$1.6 billion.



Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. Not at this time. I will yield later.

So let us cut out the great charade and let us talk about how we are going to control this program.

What is the issue, really, right now? The issue is, whether we are going to abandon the very carefully thought out and very carefully processed bill that has been presented here by the committee which includes the Green of Oregon amendment. On the other hand we are talking about whether we are going to spin all these programs out into the other agencies and hide them over there where no one can figure out what is going on, in all the other budgets of the other old agencies, or whether we are going to keep the Economic Opportunity Act together and the program together so that it can be appraised and worked on by the Congress.

That is all that is at issue here. It is not an economy versus spending vote.

The issue is, How are we going to control this program and how are we going to run the program?

The issue here is, are we going to adopt the Green of Oregon amendment, or are we going to adopt the Quie-Goodell substitute known as the opportunity crusade? That is all it really amounts to, because all of us know, if we are realists at all, that the only amount of money we are ever going to appropriate or put in this program is the amount those 50 members of the Appropriations Committee bring in here for us to finally vote on.

I do not believe the great debate that is taking place here right now is properly focused, unless we realize this is the issue here. The issue is whether we are going to spin these programs out, whether we are going to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity, in effect; whether we are going to follow the Quie-Goodell proposal, or follow the carefully thought out and carefully worked out bill adopted almost on a bipartisan basis in our committee, with much bipartisan support. The issue is whether we are going to destroy the fine work the people who worked with the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

That is really the issue.

I am glad to yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately and tragically, our committee was dealing in a fantasyland throughout its deliberations. It was ignoring the complete lack of confidence of the Members of the House and I believe of the American people generally as to the way this program has been operated.

Had we come to the floor with a major new direction, with some new realism in this program, with the good programs expanded and with the bad programs eliminated, then I believe we would have had a much better case to go before our Appropriations Committee and before the American people for more money.

Until this program is redirected we have no hope of getting the kind of money into the poverty program, the opportunity crusade, or whatever it is

called, that can be justified and which is necessary to eliminate poverty. The first thing is to get this whole program on the right track. Then perhaps we will have what should have been from the very beginning a bipartisan approach that will put the amount of money in this kind of program that is necessary.

An authorization of \$1.6 billion was never mentioned, to my knowledge, in the committee. We have heard that figure mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know what the ultimate figure will be, but I can tell the gentleman that I will go forward and fight for additional money if we have a good, realistic program and new hope that the program is structured to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] has agreed with me. We are really not talking about money here but are talking about a method of control. I would urge my colleagues to reject Mr. GOODELL's motion here, because if you adopt the motion, you are, in effect, adopting the principle that he stands for, which is, in effect, to spin this program out to the old line agencies. I urge you to be realists. I think all of us here are realists. The money cut in this program—and I am sure a cut is going to take place—is going to take place finally in the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations has already said that they are going to reduce this substantially. What we are debating here now is whether we will follow the Quie-Goodell method of controlling and handling the program or whether we will follow the program that the committee came out with, almost unanimously in some instances, and which revolves primarily around the amendment that the gentlewoman from Oregon is sponsoring and which is a part of this bill. I would urge my colleagues that the committee approach is the better approach and the wiser one for us to follow at this time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

He suggests two courses are open to the members of this Committee. I happen to think there might be another, because the Green amendment and the Gibbons amendment seem to me to have a very definite effect on the future of the antipoverty program. So I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps there is a third course which would eliminate those two amendments from the bill that has been before the House.

Mr. GIBBONS. I will have to let the Committee work its will and its wisdom on the Green amendment and my amendment to the bill. I am willing to abide by that, of course, but I think this is not a debate over money but over the technique of how you will control the spending of this money. I happen

to favor the committee's approach and I happen to favor the principle that has been most clearly enunciated by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, [Mrs. GREEN], and I am urging my colleagues to follow that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would rather not. I have received 3 additional minutes to speak under unanimous consent. If the gentleman would like to speak on his own time, I am sure he will have plenty of time to speak.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that there is a question of money involved in this bill. I do not see how anyone in this Congress can come to the well of the House of Representatives and say that there is not.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of people on the committee and in this body who seem to feel that there is not enough money going into an antipoverty program.

Mr. Chairman, neither of the amendments which have been offered are adequate. I have heard no one on this committee yet speak to the problems as to how many millions of Americans are living in poverty, Americans who are not benefiting from any of the programs, and who will not benefit from any of the programs that have been brought forth in this legislation.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. CONYERS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. I think the point which the gentleman from Michigan is making is well taken. The best figures I have seen indicate that there are some 8 million Americans who are either unemployed or are underemployed. Our closest estimate indicates that we have not reached many more than 500,000 of these and many not in sufficient depth.

I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, and I believe he shares this view, that we are facing the most serious domestic crisis in this country since the Civil War. Further, I would point out to the gentleman that the other body came within one or two votes of authorizing an additional \$2 billion for a job training program alone—including training and employment in both the public and private sectors.

The problem in the House of Representatives is frankly the fact that our sights have been set too low. We are not really recognizing the magnitude of the problem. The fact that there are millions of Americans who are not being reached either by private enterprise, local government, State government, or through any of the antipoverty programs is most pronounced.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope we can raise our sights high today.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York and it is my opinion that the gentleman is



expressing the view of what may be a minority of the Members of the House of Representatives, but who nevertheless feel strongly that these views ought to be aired during this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how we can come here, with our social fabric being ripped in a number of serious places, and have people go into the well and suggest that \$2 billion for the antipoverty program is going to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care how much more efficiency we work into this program, it is not going to be adequate, no matter how we slice it, no matter how we parcel out the use of the funds involved, and no matter how we patch it up and no matter how we approach it.

Mr. Chairman, I am just a little disturbed today about the fact that some of the members of the committee who have always been talking about more financing, are now switching their position to support economy and more efficiency. The problems which exist in American slums and the disorders we are faced with are not going to be solved by the kind of supposed solution which we expected to find in the so-called opportunity charade, or in these amendments that are going to turn the poverty program over to local politicians.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore this kind of activity and I hope someone on the committee will help begin to make real the kind of promise that was originally inherent in the antipoverty program.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that with reference to the last portion of what the gentleman from Michigan said, I agree completely, that we should not turn this program over to the politicians. And, I hope that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will join me when we come to that portion of the bill to reverse the regressive action which was taken in the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall be delighted to join with the gentleman from New York in his efforts at that point.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would agree that the amount of money we can spend is not sufficient and cannot solve the real problem involved here. We are expending some \$40 billion in poverty-oriented programs today. There must be something wrong with the manner in which we are expending that money, in my opinion. There must be a great deal of misconceived spending. First, we cannot say that the expenditure of \$2 billion, \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion or \$10 billion is going to solve this problem.

The answer is to get some realistic program into operation and get our feet on the ground in this operation that will provide meaningful jobs for the people involved in these programs.

Mr. CONYERS. It is just that kind of approach that has been compromising

the antipoverty program right out of existence every year when the time approaches for the House to work our will on this bill. We are not talking about spending \$40 billion, and the gentleman from New York knows it. We are here today to talk about whether that sum is to be \$2 billion or some other sum totally inadequate to meet the needs of this program.

Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question as to whether we can simply resolve this problem with money is, of course, that it cannot be resolved with money alone, but without adequate financing, there is no way to continue the modest beginning in this vital effort to eradicate poverty in America.

But many of us know in our hearts we are crippling the program through inadequate financing from the beginning, and that crippling will never, never help the program get to where it ought to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the debate here in the Committee comes as no surprise to many of us. I was disappointed when the gentleman from Michigan objected to considering the moneys at the end of the bill because it was very apparent that there would be a considerable number of amendments offered in the committee, and it would be literally impossible to know exactly what moneys would be needed until the committee had worked its will as to what type of poverty legislation this was going to be.

Now, this never came up in the committee, probably because the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. MAHON, had not stipulated that in all probability \$1.6 billion would be the top figure that the Committee on Appropriations would possibly appropriate for this program.

We had storm warnings sent up by the House while the committee was considering this bill. The Members will recall that on one occasion an amendment passed this House overwhelmingly regarding the increase in the Federal pay scale for our Federal workers wherein the OEO employees were eliminated from that consideration. Then we had another amendment on the continuing resolution that stipulated that the authorization would be prorated on the basis of \$1.2 billion a year, or \$100 million a month.

So, as I say, it came as no surprise to me to notice that there would be considerable support for a reduction in the total figure. Whether or not this is the proper figure no one at this point can actually determine, because we do not know just what the final legislation will be. However, I must say that the work of Congressman GOODELL and Congressman QUOTE in this general field over the last 3 years has convinced many Members that a very constructive program that will really help the poor can be operated at the \$1.4 billion per year figure.

I presume that further consideration of this will be postponed, Mr. Chairman, until there can be real serious thought as to what should be done in the days ahead

on the discussion of this proposal, but I would hope that the Members on the other side will realize that the Members on the Republican side are just as anxious to help the poor, but they want the poor to be really helped. We all know that there has been considerable waste in this program.

Mr. Chairman, I would not be at all surprised to see, after we go all through the debate, that even a lower figure will be agreed to.

There is one thing that I agree with Mr. GIBBONS on—we must be realistic regardless of what we do here, because this bill is finally going to be written in conference. I do not care what goes over to the conference, because it will be written by the conference, and after the conference report is brought in, then we will vote it up or down, and then, assuming it passes, the reworking is going to be done by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON has said that 1.6 is the most that we are going to get. In talking to some of the Members of the Committee on Appropriations they seem to feel that 1.4 is going to be the figure.

So when we come back next week to continue the debate, I hope that we will be able to control our tempers and be logical, but in the final analysis I would say to the Members that they should remember they are going to have about 1.4 billion which they will be voting on out of the Committee on Appropriations. So relax over the weekend.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am depressed by the empty defeatism of our domestic doves who seek a unilateral withdrawal from the war against poverty—a withdrawal in the face of an enemy whose battalions are composed of joblessness, hunger, illiteracy, and desperation.

Instead of poverty being the enemy, they appear to regard the poor as the enemy. I believe that there ought to be more domestic hawks on the floor of this committee—and I am proud to be one.

We have heard complaints that we are spending \$30 or \$40 billion on poverty in this country, so what does this \$2 billion mean?

The whole key to the matter is that the \$30 or \$40 billion we are spending—and I have never seen that figure verified—has been through agencies of Government at the Federal, State, and local levels, that have not historically been concerned with the poor and that have not made an impact on the poor.

The whole purpose of this \$2 billion poverty program, which is really a research and demonstration program, is to show where and how we can invest dollars in education and job training that will have an impact on the poor.

Virtually the entire gamut of the corporate leadership in our country has been involved in the poverty program.

Of the \$212 million allowed for Job Corps centers for the fiscal year 1967, \$147 million is fed into private industry by direct contract arrangement.

The poverty program is the machinery for galvanizing the energies and talents



of the private sector and focusing them on the problems of the poor.

This is done in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, and the new careers program.

A whole gamut of poverty programs is run by the talent of private industry, by mobilizing the talents of individuals and groups like IBM's chairman, Thomas Watson; Litton's chairman, Tex Thorton, and Vice President John Rubel; Hotel Corp. of America's President Sonnebend; Cleveland Electric Illuminating's president, Ralph Besse; Olin Mathieson's executive committee chairman, Thomas Nichols; Detroit Edison's chairman, Walter Cisler; and Michigan Bell Telephone's assistant general counsel, William Patrick, and dozens and dozens of major industries in America.

Mr. Chairman, the reason the Federal Government is in the business of bringing the resources of private industry into the poverty program is because local groups and localities do not have the funds to do it themselves.

The States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Mississippi all have a better than 56-percent rejection rate of young people in the Armed Forces mental test and better than a 80-percent rejection rate on young Negro Americans—again on the Armed Forces mental test. But every single one of these three States is doing as well as or better than New York State, my State, in the percentage of their personal incomes which they devote to education programs and they are all doing better than the national average.

Nobody can point the finger of scorn or shame at those States. We can only point the finger of shame at ourselves for not having helped these States to contend with their impoverished population, both urban and rural, and to do the job that they simply do not have the resources to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is a national problem and it must be a national responsibility.

The \$2 billion program that we are talking about today has had an impact on barely 10 percent of the poor in our Nation.

What this program needs is building up and not tearing down.

Of the 2.5 million kids in our country who ought to be in a full year Headstart program, only 213,000, less than 10 percent, are involved.

Of the kids who ought to be in a Followthrough program to help them to make a success of their elementary school years, less than 15 percent are involved.

Of the kids who ought to be in the Upward Bound program so that they can make a go of it and go to college, less than 4 percent are involved.

Of the adults who ought to be in the MDTA, the manpower development and training programs, virtually all of which are run by private industry, less than 4 percent are involved.

Is this a program, I ask my colleagues, involving the talents and energy and dynamism of private industry that ought to be built up or should it be torn down by an act of defeatism and despair and by a rejection of the hopes and aspirations of our poor?

#### SUCCESS OF APOLLO 4

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I might make an announcement out of order?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have received some very wonderful news. The Apollo 4 has now splashed down 9 miles west of its target and 6 miles from the carrier *Bennington*. So it is a complete success.

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I think the point ought to be made that despite all the dust, smoke, and sound that has been created, despite all the obfuscation, there is one point that comes over with extreme clarity, and that is that the American people want the poverty program. They feel that it has worked. They feel that Headstart has worked. They feel that the Neighborhood Youth Corps has worked. They feel that the Job Corps has worked. They feel that the follow-through program has worked. I have not heard a member of this committee say that from the States and cities across the country they have heard statements that the programs are not wanted. The failures of the programs have been conjured up in the minds of the opponents of the programs who are blind to success and who are reaching and grasping to find some shreds of evidence of failure, when the programs demonstrably have succeeded.

The question is, Can we afford this modest program of \$2 billion as a demonstration program on how we can erase the shame and the virus of poverty from our midst?

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I trust the gentleman in the well received, as I did, a wire from the Governor of the State of New York in the last 24 hours asking that the New York delegation do all in its power to continue funding this program at a level which would not mean cutting off payments to those who are doing their best to help the poor. You did receive such a wire, did you not?

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague for reminding our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly the Republican delegation from New York, of that important message from our distinguished Governor.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that what we are seeking now in the committee bill

really is a vote of confidence in the program from the House that we should continue this program and continue to improve it?

Mr. SCHEUER. We are asking for a vote of confidence in the community leaders, the civic leaders, the business leaders, and the church leaders across the face of the land—of every race, color, and creed, who have been creating, administering, and directing the local programs, and who feel that it is the only answer to rural and urban poverty in our midst. It is the grassroots leadership at the local, municipal, county, and State levels that we are asking to have validated.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that what we would like to do would be to go to the Senate and talk to our colleagues in the other body and go to our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee with the kind of justifications that they are going to seek from us to continue this program at an adequate funding level? We have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that in that great and august committee they are willing to talk about a figure which is \$200 million in excess of the limitation which is now being suggested by our colleague from New York.

In a sense, they are cutting below what even the august Committee on Appropriations is willing to consider in the event that we come to them with justifications. Is that not correct?

Mr. SCHEUER. There is no question about that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does the gentleman know whether the Governor of the State of New York is aware of the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is leading the fight to cut this program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8569, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 973, Rept. No. 904),



this source and from so called conservationists and members of the National Capital Planning Commission. Now they are using him, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, as a fall guy to rubberstamp the proposition that they have been putting forth for many years.

Mr. Speaker, if this course of action is followed, a course of action which in my opinion will create utter chaos, then the Congress of the United States is going to have to step into the picture and do the job that the Planning Commission, the Department of Transportation and others in the executive branch of government obviously are not capable of doing.

I regret, therefore, to learn that the Secretary of Transportation has decided upon a course which will result in further stalling and delay over the decision which ultimately must be made to go ahead with the inner loop in the District and another Potomac River crossing to Virginia.

It appears this decision was not made recently, Mr. Speaker, but back in May when the National Capital Planning Commission turned the question over to the Secretary. It seems to have been rigged from the beginning for Mr. Boyd to decide to scrap the careful planning of many highway experts in favor of a ridiculous set of "possibilities," many of which were evaluated years ago and discarded as unworkable.

Surely the Secretary and his advisers are aware of the fact that the Appropriations Subcommittee refuses to release funds for our much needed subway system until the inner loop and Interstate System in the District has been settled once and for all. As recently as today the chairman advised me that his position in this regard has not changed.

This decision concerns me greatly, because not only is our highway system endangered, but the subway is threatened as well.

Mr. Boyd's ill-conceived decision will result in transportation chaos throughout the Washington area.

#### THE INCREDIBLE PERFORMANCE OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR STALLING TRANSPORTATION IN THE WASHINGTON AREA DESERVES A HARD LOOK BY THIS BODY

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the incredible performance of the Federal agencies responsible for stalling transportation in the Washington area deserves a hard look by this body. First, we have a direct responsibility for the National Capital. Second, the attitude of the Department of Transportation toward freeways in and around the District of Columbia—if it represents a trend in Federal transportation policy—ought to give pause to every Member representing an urban area. The administration has pledged to make Washington a "showcase for the world." I fear it will be a showcase with a wall around it. One wonders whose city

will get the showcase treatment next. And third, the Department has ignored responsible local officials, elected and appointed, making it incumbent on Congress to exert its responsibility over executive agencies that seem to have forgotten what a representative government is all about.

In brief, the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, was requested by the National Capital Planning Commission to report on the number of lanes needed for the Three Sisters Bridge and the best location for such an additional Potomac River crossing. Unfortunately, for the cause of public understanding, the dispute has centered about the bridge alone, whereas the main issue at stake has been the entire freeway system for the metropolitan area. This is why the bridge has become the focus of attack by antifreeway forces. Thus it is no coincidence that Secretary Boyd, in recommending against the bridge, took the occasion to call for a cutback in the entire proposed system including one of the most vitally needed facets in the State of Maryland—extension of the North Central Freeway into a densely developed area of Montgomery County.

The result: no freeways whatever, into the Maryland suburbs adjoining Northwest Washington. An alternate suggestion, that the George Washington Memorial Parkway be extended into the District and connect with new roads along the Potomac, is nothing but a sop; that ought to be done anyway. The only consolation that can be drawn here would be, if this is the final decision then at least one road can go ahead.

The Department is doing this, furthermore, without due consultation with the District, Maryland, or Virginia officials whose interests are vitally at stake. Regional implications are totally overlooked. The DOT proposals are running directly contrary to countless engineering studies and reliable forecasts of traffic volumes. They violate a formal agreement that launched a mass transit program for the region with the approval of Congress; they repudiate the Bureau of Public Roads' own long standing position on freeways; they break faith with the citizens of the region who need a balanced system of both freeways and transit.

On the subject of local cooperation required by law, the Department particularly has ignored highway officials. It stalled on a simple factual decision for 6 months and then dumped a radically altered plan on the new District government. I fail to find that timing accidental. To be sure, Mayor Washington and the District Council are to be "consulted" and are being urged to accept the Department's recommendations. This strikes me as being about as mutually cooperative as a friendly suggestion from the only banker in town.

It is ironic that at the same time, the Bureau of Public Roads wants State highway officials to hold not one, but two public hearings for federally aided highway projects to afford the public an opportunity to speak.

Consider the consequences, Mr. Speaker. The suburbs will then develop more independently, giving greater emphasis

to lateral road facilities. Job opportunities will grow there, possibly at the expense of the central city; at the same time, access to them will be further reduced. This is already a serious problem. There may be rising resentment against mass transit by suburban commuters, who can only conclude that they are being blackjacked into riding transit—in the 1970's—by an administration that is denying them needed roads.

These are the same taxpayers who generate highway funds through Federal user taxes, and are being called upon to support mass transit which many could never conceivably use. This aspect might be of interest to other cities considering mass transit. Such a result would be disastrous. The area needs both freeways and transit, as I have said, and the system currently proposed is considered complementary by all concerned. Secretary Boyd has been recommending greater use of express buses on freeways. In the name of sanity, What freeways, Mr. Boyd?

It is another irony that some of the most persuasive data in support of freeways and additional river crossings has been generated by studies of rapid rail transit. And the Transit Authority's representative on the NUPC has consistently favored intelligent freeway plans.

Consequences in the District will be equally severe. I have already mentioned job mobility. An experimental air rights housing project is already endangered. Surface street congestion will continue to grow unabated. Massive opportunities for strategically located parking over and under freeways will be lost, as well as public and private facilities proposed for air rights construction. Potential gains in tax base will likewise disappear.

Secretary Boyd has proclaimed himself no enemy of freeways, and he argues persuasively for local solutions to transportation problems. I can only conclude that he is acting on the basis of faulty information in thinking what can only be described as a totally unrealistic position opposing area freeways.

I suggest that he take a long and realistic look at the region's transportation problems, and genuinely consult with area officials on the regional problems and adopt a more constructive approach. And I most seriously suggest that the responsible committees of the Congress closely monitor the process. Our duties demand no less.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial from the Washington Post and an article from the Evening Star:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### HIGHWAY ROBBERY

District highway proposals now being considered at the Department of Transportation threaten the precarious "treaty" which was perfected when freeway and transit backers got together to pass the transit authority act. They would tear that settlement apart by abandoning the Three Sisters Bridge, the South Leg of the Inner Loop, the North Leg of the Inner Loop and the section of 70S planned for the Baltimore and Ohio Railway corridor.

These are spectacular modifications of earlier plans behind which a painfully wrought consensus had gathered. Affirmative



changes would extend the George Washington Parkway, reshape the Georgetown waterfront (including the Whitehurst Freeway) and a tunnel-type link between the Roosevelt Bridge and the North Central Freeway, somewhere between Independence Avenue and G Street. Roosevelt Bridge would be opened to truck traffic.

A notable shortcoming is the failure to make any provision for limited access routes into the city from the North. There would be no main artery in the whole section from Interstate 95 in Maryland, westward to George Washington Parkway. Passenger traffic would have to use the parkway and commercial trucks and buses would have to filter through residential streets.

At the moment it looks as though the Transportation Department had gone almost all the way back to the Stolzenbach plan, which quite frankly contemplated substituting mass transit for the freeway system. It seems to have embraced very conservative estimates of future traffic requirements, particularly with reference to need for Potomac crossings.

The Transportation Department ought to take its proposals back to the drawing boards. It cannot stop the growth of the area, arrest the rising demands of traffic or enforce an order compelling all citizens to ride a transit system not yet built.

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Nov. 9, 1967]

#### UNITED STATES SEEKS TO ABANDON BRIDGE, INNER LOOP PLAN—PROPOSAL WOULD DROP THREE SISTERS SPAN, CHANNEL ROUTE 66 TRAFFIC TO ROOSEVELT

The Department of Transportation is seeking the new District government's concurrence on a proposal to kill several major Washington freeways and abandon the long-planned concept of an inner-loop highway network within the central city.

The department plan would rule out a Three Sister Bridge across the Potomac and require that traffic from Virginia's new interstate Route 66 rely almost wholly on the existing Roosevelt Bridge.

The proposal's other major modifications in the city's longstanding and frequently approved freeway system include:

1. Elimination of the freeway tunnel under the Tidal Basin between the Lincoln Memorial and 14th Street, plans for which already are well advanced. This route was to comprise the southern portion of the inner loop.
2. Elimination of a north leg for the inner loop, initially planned in the general vicinity of Florida Avenue NW.
3. A single east-west arterial through the city from the Roosevelt Bridge, probably making use of the already projected extension of the E Street Expressway in a tunnel beneath the Ellipse and proceeding to connect with the center-leg freeway now being built near Third Street NW. An alternate possibility is to build this connection along K Street NW.

4. Abandonment of the so-called Route 70-S portion of the North Central Freeway, which was to extend roughly from Riggs Road NE to the Capital Beltway in Maryland and serve as the sole freeway route from the western suburbs to downtown Washington.

5. The new proposal would designate the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Maryland shores of the Potomac—already built from the Capital Beltway to Chain Bridge—as Maryland's Route 70-S connection to the District, with its use, however, probably banned to trucks. From Chain Bridge this route would be extended along the Georgetown waterfront with the limited design standards of a parkway—rather than with the higher capacity expressway standards previously planned.

The precise details of several of these proposals apparently are still to be developed. It was understood also that Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd's endorsement of the proposal is subject to change—specifically if revisions are requested by the new city government.

The department's position, it was understood, is that the determination of the freeway system which the District should have is essentially a local decision which should be made by the mayor and the new City Council.

In essence, however, the department's proposals constitute the freeway package which Boyd is telling the local government his agency is willing to finance if the city government buys the proposition. If the new local leaders should disagree, the matter presumably would be open to further negotiation.

Mayor Washington flatly declined to comment on the situation. This sudden turn of events, however, confronts him with an immensely difficult new problem during his first days in office.

Ironically, Boyd's intervention in the freeway controversy was sought last May by the National Capital Planning Commission solely in terms of the Three Sisters Bridge. The secretary was asked first whether he considered that additional river-crossing lanes were needed. In the event of an affirmative reply, he was asked whether he favored a bridge or a tunnel in the Three Sisters area.

#### CONCEPT CALLED WRONG

Actually, the secretary responded that he favored a bridge if any crossing were to be built. After six months of deliberation, however, his department apparently has decided not only that another crossing is not justified by the traffic projections, but that the entire concept of the freeway system is wrong.

The Transportation officials reportedly feel that the scaled-down freeway version would be satisfactory if a major rail-transit system comes into being—and if various other alternative forms of moving people are put into effect. Among studies under way within the Transportation Department, it was understood, are the possibilities of making bus service more effective and attractive within existing street systems and the wider use of commuter trains.

As to transit, the new development is certain to stir repercussions on Capitol Hill. Representative William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), who controls District finances in the House, has warned forcefully on several occasions that rail-transit funds will be in jeopardy if a satisfactory freeway system does not proceed. Apart from transit, moreover, several Washington area congressmen have been persistently pressing Boyd for a decision on the Three Sisters Bridge which would permit freeway construction to move ahead.

#### EXTENDED DELAY LIKELY

One conclusion appears certain: The freeway program faces further delay—perhaps an extremely lengthy delay.

The suggestion that a park-way-type road along the Potomac River should serve as western Maryland's major traffic artery to the city revives a proposal first advanced under the Eisenhower administration in 1955, and later discarded as inadequate.

As to the south-leg freeway beyond the Lincoln Memorial in West Potomac Park, the concept of tunneling this route, at considerable expense in order to preserve park values, had been advocated by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, and was agreed on by Rex Whitton, the previous federal highway administrator. All of Whitton's highway agencies were absorbed, however, with the creation of the new Department of Transportation.

The possibility of extending the present

truncated E Street Expressway in a tunnel beneath the Ellipse and eastward of the Treasury Department has long been advocated by the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue as a means of distributing traffic to this section of the city. The possibility of considering this route as the sole east-west freeway in central Washington, however, had never before been advanced.

Ironically, the DOT proposal comes just after the most recently completed traffic study for the Washington area showed that most of the long-planned for highways were needed.

The study was done for the Washington Metropolitan Area, Transit Authority, which said last month the Washington area should build a 96-mile regional rapid transit system.

The Alan M. Voorhees consulting firm, taking into account the most recent traffic studies, assumed that a 150-mile rapid transit system would be in place in 1990. Then it took the highway system approved by the National Capital Planning Commission in June, 1966, which included the controversial bridge, Tidal Basin tunnel, complete North Central Freeway and a six-lane K Street tunnel.

The result was an estimate by computers that in the peak hour in 1990, an estimated 141,000 persons would use the 150-mile rapid transit system. Another 25,000 persons were expected to use busses.

But even with the extra 60 miles of rapid transit system, the computers said 453,000 persons would use only autos to make trips in the rush hour.

The Voorhees study further predicted that the 14th Street bridges would be badly overcrowded in the rush hour and could not handle any overflow of traffic from the Three Sisters Bridge area. Also, the study said that highways in corridor leading to the bridge also would be slightly overcrowded at the Arlington County-Falls Church area.

#### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 26, I stated, Mr. Speaker, "that section 406 of title IV, if passed, into law, would accomplish through a back-door approach that which it has not been possible to accomplish openly; namely, it would transfer to the Department of Commerce certain vital functions currently being carried out by SBA."

I added that "transferring SBA's functions to another agency would be about the same as transferring the agency itself."

Congress expressly provided in section 4A of the Small Business Administration Act that the agency "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

I referred at that time to the responsiveness of the Small Business Administration to the needs and desires of the people.

Each month for the past 4 months, July through October, an average of 1,000 men and women have made their way to the Chicago regional office of the SBA. I have personally arranged appointments for many of my constituents. The personnel in the SBA regional office have always proved helpful.



But the SBA people in Chicago do not wait for the people to visit them. Each month for the past 2 years a financial officer or management specialist and sometimes both have spent a full day in Peoria, Ill., where the local chamber of commerce makes facilities available.

In addition SBA people are now carrying their services to the Champaign-Urbana, Ill., area the second Thursday of every month.

The fourth Thursday of every month the citizens of the Rock Island-Moline area and also the Springfield area are able to make appointments and see a financial or management man in their county building or chamber of commerce from the Chicago regional office of the SBA.

Last week there were so many appointments in the Rock Island-Moline area that two men had to be sent there to meet locally with the people.

Three years ago the Chicago regional office carried 200 loans on their books. Today they have 743. Approximately 200 economic opportunity loans have been made totaling \$2 million.

But not everyone who goes to the Chicago regional office gets a loan. Financial help is sometimes only a symptom for a management need which is more basic to the success of a small business. The goal of every man in the Chicago office is to provide each person who comes in with the maximum of SBA services to suit the individual's specific needs and to do this in as short a time as possible.

Some of the people who come in are encouraged and counseled as to ways in which they might develop their business so as to become eligible for a loan through a bank or through the agency.

Some of the people who come in are encouraged to attend one of the free workshops in business management given each month in the Federal building. Some are encouraged to attend courses cosponsored by the Small Business Administration with chambers of commerce, service clubs, high schools, and universities.

These services are made available to all citizens regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, or sex. Just last Sunday the William L. Dawson Free School of Business Management and the Small Business Administration graduated 153 men and women from an 8-week course, two nights a week. A large number of these graduates were from the heart of Chicago's South and West Side. More than 2,000 men and women have been graduated since this school began 5 years ago.

Next week 1-day workshops are being conducted in Rock Island and Freeport, Ill. Small business provides a broad economic base from which big business can develop and by which big business can be judged competitively.

Each of the thousands who come into the Chicago regional office of the Small Business Administration every month can be a part of the American dream, a part of the producing segment of our economy which can continue to keep this country in the forefront of those making possible a good life and an equal opportunity for all.

No, SBA does not make loans to everybody. But more loans are on its books today than ever before in its history. These loans are not the kind that add to inflationary pressures—making already high prices higher and contributing to short supply.

These loans are to the little man. They help him produce; help him contribute to lower prices, and help contribute to the broad base of the economy.

Whether it is financial assistance or financial counsel, management assistance on a one-to-one basis or management assistance through workshops and conferences, procurement assistance—more than \$6.6 billion was subcontracted to small business firms in fiscal year 1967—whichever service is provided, SBA is where the action is.

The agency needs support by this House in many areas, but at this time I ask my colleagues to join me in strengthening, not weakening the agency.

#### PATENT LAW REVISION

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill proposing major revisions in the Nation's patent laws.

Based on the research, study, and recommendations of the Patent Section of the American Bar Association, my bill is designed to explore the possibility of a middle course between that proposed by the administration's Patent Reform Act, H.R. 5924, and those proposed by such bills as H.R. 7454 and H.R. 10006.

Although few will dispute that American's patent laws are and have always been superior to those of other nations, most inventors, large and small, most practitioners of the law, and most jurists skilled in the law agree that there is room for further improvement. Both substantive and procedural changes can be made which will enhance the value of patent rights, stimulate the inventive genius of the people and promote the vigorous progress of the American free enterprise system.

I do not introduce this bill with the notion that it is the perfect answer. Indeed, in some of its parts it may be later demonstrated to be imperfect or inadvisable. I introduce the bill primarily to lay the predicate for a meaningful dialog which hopefully will focus public attention upon the several ingredients of the total issue. Since I am privileged to sit as a member of the subcommittee which next year will resume hearings on the question, I prefer to maintain a posture of neutrality and intellectual flexibility until hearings have been completed and the legislation has been maturely considered in executive session by the subcommittee.

By way of brief explanation some of the changes in present law my bill would make are those which would:

First. Authorize a research program so the Patent Office may take advantage of technological advances to facilitate processing and examining of patent applications—section 12;

Second. Define more precisely the prior art used in determining the scope of a patent grant—section 100;

Third. Permit owners of inventions as well as inventors to file applications for patent—section 111;

Fourth. Relieve the Patent Office of the load of examining applications for "defensive" patents by authorizing voluntary publication of patent applications—section 123—and preserve defensive rights even though the application is abandoned—section 107;

Fifth. Provide a period after allowance of a patent application during which the public may present additional prior art to the Patent Office for consideration—section 136;

Sixth. Insure uniform interpretation of the patent laws by consolidating all review of Patent Office decisions in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals—chapter 13;

Seventh. Encourage applicants to expedite prosecution of their pending applications by computing the term of the patent as 20 years from its filing date—section 154;

Eighth. Relax some of the rigid requirements concerning licenses necessary for filing applications in foreign countries without affecting measures necessary for the security of the United States—sections 184 and 185;

Ninth. Implement the recommendation of the President's Commission that the rule of reason apply to the transfer and licensing of patents and inventions—section 236;

Tenth. Protect processes patented in the United States by prohibiting importation of products made in other countries according to the patented process—section 271; and

Eleventh. Enlarge both the jurisdiction and the number of judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to provide a panel of judges experienced in patent law to assist other courts in handling the heavy load of complex and frequently protracted patent cases where the chief judge of the other court requests such assistance.

As indicated earlier, this bill attempts a compromise. The compromise would lie between what has come to be known as the "first-to-file system" proposed in the administration bill and the "first-to-invent system" which has been and now is the patent law of the land. Under my bill, the patent would be issued to the person who files first. Yet, it would preserve to the first inventor the right himself to obtain a patent by producing satisfactory proof of inventorship.

#### THE NEED FOR IMPORT CONTROL AND QUOTAS

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I simply do not understand the complacent attitude of the Johnson administration regarding the very real problem confronting many domestic businesses in that increasing imports of cheaply made foreign goods have caused substantial losses



in profits and necessitated employee layoffs. Time and again I have spoken about this situation here in the House, as have several other Members—and the problem continues to grow.

Two weeks ago, this House passed H.R. 478. This action was gratifying because it was at least a step—a first step—in the right direction. But this is not the final answer. What is needed is action on the orderly marketing bills which are presently dying a slow death in committee without any action being taken or scheduled.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite an example of what imports can do and are doing to our own local businesses. Only last weekend New Hampshire Ball Bearings, Inc., with plants in Peterborough and Laconia, N.H., announced that it would be necessary to lay off nearly 500 employees for a minimum of 60 days. Why? Because imports continue to take a larger and larger share of the domestic market. These are precision-made bearings not a type simply and cheaply thrown together.

I am in receipt of information indicating that the Department of Defense is buying heavily, but outside the United States, because it is cheaper. Current usage of precision ball bearings is more than 50 percent military and Japanese and Canadian products are priced between 15 and 40 percent below the U.S. market.

The competition is not coming from some undeveloped nation toward which a present obligation to extend foreign aid could be asserted. These are highly industrial competitive nations.

As a measure of the effect of the adverse impact of this unrestricted foreign competition, New Hampshire Ball Bearings had a gross value of orders for the quarter ending June 1966 of \$5,537,000 compared with the quarter ending June 1967 of \$2,270,000—less than half.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is serious. How much longer can we stand back and do nothing, while hoping that the situation will improve, if we leave it alone? Action is needed by this Congress and this action is needed now. I cannot urge too strongly that the Committee on Ways and Means consider an orderly marketing bill and report it favorably at the earliest possible moment.

#### MAJ. MARIE L. RODGERS

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in ceremonies yesterday at the White House the President of the United States presented the Bronze Star Medal to Maj. Marie L. Rodgers, Army Nurse Corps, U.S. Army. The medal was presented to Major Rodgers for distinguishing herself by outstanding meritorious service in connection with ground operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam.

Major Rodgers is a native of Birmingham, Ala., and her city shares with her family their deep pride in her achievement and her service to our country.

In a release concerning the presentation ceremony, the Army said of her:

Major Rodgers volunteered for duty in Vietnam and was assigned to the 24th Evacuation Hospital in Long Binh where she served as Operating Room Supervisor. A model nurse, leader, and administrator, she worked tirelessly to insure the finest possible nursing support for the great number of combat casualties treated. The citation accompanying the award recognized Major Rodgers' selflessness, compassion and genuine concern for human medical welfare which are the true hallmarks of a professional nurse . . .

Major Rodgers entered the Army Nurse Corps February 7, 1952 and has served overseas in Puerto Rico, Europe, and Korea and in five major Army hospitals in the United States.

Maj. Marie L. Rodgers, Army Nurse Corps was born 24 September 1926 in Birmingham, Ala., where her father Mr. Christopher R. Rodgers now resides. Upon graduation from high school in Birmingham, Major Rodgers enrolled in the Homer G. Phillips Hospital School of Nursing in St. Louis, Mo. After graduation from nursing school in 1947, Major Rodgers traveled to California to work as a staff nurse in the Los Angeles area until her entry on active duty with the Army Nurse Corps on 7 February 1952.

Following the Medical Service women's officer course at Fort Sam, Houston, Tex., Major Rodgers was assigned as a general duty nurse to the U.S. Army hospital, Fort Custer, Mich. for 5 months. In August 1952, she was reassigned to her first overseas assignment where she began her career as an operating room nurse at Rodriguez Army Hospital in Puerto Rico. At the completion of her overseas tour in August 1955, Major Rodgers was selected to attend the operating room nursing and administration course at Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif. Her next duty station was Madigan General Hospital, Tacoma, Wash. In March 1958 Major Rodgers departed for Europe where she served with the 42d Field Hospital. Upon returning to the United States in 1960, she joined the operating room staff at Fitzsimons General Hospital in Denver, Colo. To further her education and training in the clinical field of operating room nursing, Major Rodgers attended the advanced operating room course in 1964 at Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D.C. Major Rodgers' third overseas tour began in June 1965 with the U.S. Support Group for Korea Dependent Housing. Knowing the need for Army Nurse Corps officers to assist in the care of our fighting men in Vietnam, Major Rodgers volunteered to be reassigned to Vietnam in September 1966. Major Rodgers was assigned to the 24th Evacuation Hospital where she continued to contribute to the Medical Service Team with her outstanding nursing ability. Major Rodgers returned to the United States in September 1967 and is now on the operating room staff at Walter Reed General Hospital.

The first woman to win the Bronze Star Medal, Major Rodgers received the following citation in the presentation ceremony:

#### CITATION

By direction of the President, the Bronze Star Medal is presented to Maj. Marie L. Rodgers, N2654, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, for distinguishing herself by outstanding meritorious service in connection with ground operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam during the period October 1966 to September 1967. Fully aware of the innumerable dangers and sacrifices which make up a greater part of everyday life in a combat zone, Major Rodgers volunteered for duty in Vietnam and was assigned to the 24th Evacuation Hospital in Long Binh where she served as Operating Room Supervisor. A model nurse, leader and administrator, she worked tirelessly to insure the finest possible nursing support for the great number of combat casualties treated at the 24th Evacuation Hospital, and she immediately became one of the most valuable and respected members of the hospital's patient-care team. She provided brilliant supervision in the planning, organizing and equipping of the operating room suite as well as the central materiel section to insure the finest surgical nursing support at this hospital when it began receiving patients in January 1967. The 24th Evacuation Hospital was designated as the neurosurgical and maxillofacial surgical treatment center for Vietnam in March 1967, and it bore the brunt of the patient load in these highly specialized categories. During her entire tour of duty in Vietnam, Major Rodgers exhibited the selflessness, compassion and genuine concern for human medical welfare which are the true hallmarks of a professional nurse, and she served as an ideal representative of the Army Nurse Corps in action. Through her dedicated efforts, she contributed significantly to the success of the Army Medical Service in providing outstanding medical support to American forces engaged in combat. Major Rodgers' performance of duty throughout this period was in keeping with the most cherished traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon herself and the United States Army.

#### IN SUPPORT OF AUTHORITY FOR OVERSEAS STUDY BY HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE OF POSTAL FACILITIES AND OPERATIONS OVERSEAS

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today Representative Nix, chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, and I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, have cosponsored a resolution authorizing members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to study the U.S. postal operations overseas and the postal facilities and operations of certain Far Eastern and Western European countries.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, at our regular meeting last week on November 2, authorized me and Mr. Nix to initiate action by the House authorizing this study. The staff work on the study will begin at once and overseas study by the Members will be arranged either late this year after the session has adjourned, or early next year.

Previous studies of our domestic postal operations overseas provided the basis for the introduction and enactment of three separate legislative proposals designed both to improve the dispatch and expedite the delivery of the vast



predict whether or when there may be such an opportunity for a woman. The question of whether a woman officer may achieve this rank will depend entirely on her individual qualifications, and on the availability of a specific position for which she would be best qualified—in the event of such a promotion, the incumbent would hold the rank only while serving in the specific position."

At the East Room this morning, "Hail to the Chief" was played by the 14th U.S. Army Band, the only all-woman official band in the Armed Forces. It is based at the Women's Army Corps Center in Fort McClellan, Alabama. The Marine Band, which normally plays at Presidential ceremonies, relinquished the stage for the occasion. The United States flag and the flags of the various services were carried by a color guard of enlisted women.

The President will enter the East Room through a cordon of fifty women from all branches of the Armed Services.

A male chorus of 20 from Fort Myer will entertain with a medley of songs during a reception following the ceremony in the State Dining Room.

#### HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The idea of women in the American Armed Services goes back to the American Revolution, when Molly Pitcher and Deborah Sampson went into the field with the Continental Army. During the Civil War, four Sisters of The Order of Holy Cross served aboard the *Red Rover*, a confiscated Confederate steamer which was outfitted by the U.S. Navy as a hospital ship. Ashore, Dorothea Linde Dix and Clara Barton established a women's nursing service to aid the Union Army.

During World War I, the British organized women into their Armed Services to perform a number of non-combatant tasks other than nursing. Their performance so impressed General Pershing that he asked for units of American women to be enlisted into the United States Army for service with the American Expeditionary Force. Laws then covering the Army restricted enlistment to men, so the General's request could not be honored although a number of American women did serve as telephone operators overseas under contract to the Army.

Through a quirk of legislative wording undoubtedly not intended by Congress, the laws governing enlistment in the Navy during this period use the term "persons" instead of "men." Under this broader authority, the Department of the Navy enlisted several thousand women volunteers as Yeoman (Female)—popularly called "Yeomanettes"—during World War I, and a few hundred women as Marine Corps Reservists, or "Marinettes." These Yeomanettes and Marinettes were the first enlisted women in the American Armed Forces. The program was not intended to be permanent, however, and both the Navy and the Marine Corps released these volunteers at the end of the war.

#### WORLD WAR II

The experience of Great Britain during the early years of World War II convinced U.S. planners that many wartime manpower problems could be solved by using women in a broad range of duties, both in civil life and in the Armed Forces. Where Britain drafted women, both for the Armed Forces and for industry, civilian and military programs for women were voluntary in the United States. In May 1942, Congress authorized formation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, known as the WAAC. Two months later, Congress authorized formation of a women's auxiliary for the Navy. Formally entitled Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service, it immediately became known by the nautical acronym, WAVES. That fall, the Coast Guard followed with its SPARs, whose name was derived from the Latin motto of that service and its English translation—"Semper Para-

tus, Always Ready." In February 1943, Congress authorized the Women Marines. Also in 1943, the War Department changed the status of the WAAC from an auxiliary of the Army to a component, at the same time changing its name to Women's Army Corps, or WAC.

More than a quarter million women served on active duty in the Armed Forces during World War II, 155,870 in the Army; 93,341 in the Navy; and 18,463 in the Marine Corps. Except for Army and Navy nurses, however, all were members of the reserves. Thus when the Armed Forces rapidly demobilized at the end of the war, only a few thousand WACs and WAVES and Women Marines were kept on active duty.

#### POST-WAR PERIOD

In 1947, Congress passed new legislation clarifying the permanent status of the Nurse Corps of both the Army and Navy, and also establishing a permanent Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army. At that time, the Defense Department asked Congress for legislation making the other women's branches permanent. Witnesses testifying in favor of this move included General Eisenhower and other top military commanders. In 1948, Congress passed the Women's Armed Services Integration Act, which continued reserve status for women and for the first time made it possible for women to be commissioned or enlisted in the Regular services as well. That act also gave permanent status to the Women in the Air Force—the Air Force just having been created as a separate service. Most members of the newly created WAF were former WACs. Many had served in the original WAAC in the days of World War II.

#### OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES

In peacetime and in war, women have filled a variety of skilled positions in the Armed Forces. While the early Yeomanettes and Marinettes were basically office clerks, modern WACs, WAVES, WAFs and Women Marines serve as air controllers, electronic technicians, photographers, medical corpsmen, dental technicians, meteorologists, computer technicians, parachute riggers, communication technicians, radio and teletype operators and, in fact, in practically every noncombat specialty also open to men. WAC, WAVES, WAF and Women Marine officers include communication officers, supply officers, general administrators, lawyers, public affairs officers, and many other kinds of specialists.

The Army, Navy and Air Force Women Medical Specialist officers are completely separate from the WAC's, WAVES and WAF's. The Army Women's Medical Specialist Corps was established in 1947. The Navy's Medical Service Corps was established the same year as an all-male organization. Women have been commissioned in this Corps since 1952. Women have been commissioned in the Air Force Medical Specialist Corps since 1945.

Women in the Navy Medical Service Corps and Medical Specialist Corps of the Army and Air Force serve as pharmacists, dietitians, occupational and physical therapists, radiologists, bacteriologists, optometrists, psychologists, parasitologists, public health specialists, and in many other technical fields, as well as in hospital administration and medical supply. Many hold Master's and PhD degrees in their specialties.

#### NUMBER MOBILIZED

The numbers of women in service have fluctuated as the size of the Defense establishment changed with the world situation. In June 1948, the total had dropped from the wartime peak of more than 266,000 to an all-time low of 14,458. As recruiting picked up under postwar legislative authority, strength grew quickly. In 1952, during the Korean War, strength hit its post-World War II peak of 48,657 for all services. On June 30, 1967, women in the Armed Forces numbered 35,173. Of these, 12,619 were commissioned officers and 22,554 were enlisted. They included 14,-

483 WAC's, Army Nurses and Army Medical Specialist Corps officers; 8,521 WAVES, Navy Nurses and Navy Medical Service Corps officers; 2,311 Women Marines, and 9,858 WAF's, Air Force Nurses, and Air Force Medical Specialists Corps officers.

#### AWARDS FOR HEROISM

Servicewomen have performed heroically in time of war, as well as meritoriously in time of peace. During World War I, four Navy nurses were awarded the Navy Cross, a decoration second in rank only to the Medal of Honor. Three of these awards were posthumous, and a destroyer, USS HIGBEE, was named for one of the nurses who gave her life in service. During World War II, members of the WAC earned one Distinguished Service Medal (awarded to the first WAC Director, Colonel Oveta Culp Hobby), 62 Legions of Merit, 10 Soldier's Medals, 562 Bronze Stars, two Air Medals, and 16 Purple Hearts. Army and Navy nurses, WAVES, and Women Marines also earned more than their share of medals and commendations during World War II and in Korea.

Four Navy nurses have been awarded the Purple Heart in Vietnam, two the Vietnamese Medal of Honor, two Navy Commendation Medals, and one a Secretary of the Navy Commendation for Achievement. Army nurses have earned more than a hundred medals in Vietnam, including 39 Bronze Stars, six Legions of Merit, and a Soldier's Medal. Approximately 500 Army nurses now are serving in Vietnam. More than 150 Air Force nurses are stationed in Vietnam, with many more in Thailand and the Philippines where their work supports the Vietnam war. They, too, have earned their share of awards. One Air Force Medical Service Corps officer and a dozen WACs also have been decorated for service in Vietnam.

The bill which the President signed today realizes a goal for a number of women's and veterans' groups who have supported it, as well as for the women in service whom it benefits. The bill, a Defense Department legislative proposal, was introduced by Representative Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and passed by the House of Representatives in 1966. It was not passed by the Senate that year, however, and Mr. Rivers introduced it again this year. Representatives Pike (D-N.Y.), Schweiker (R-Pa.) and Gonzalez (D-Tex.) and Senator Thurmond (D-S.C.) introduced similar bills. The Rivers Bill, HR-5894, passed by the House of Representatives February 21, 1967, and by the Senate October 26, 1967.

Current directors of the Women's services are Col. Elizabeth Hoisington, WAC, Col. Jeanne Holm, WAF, Capt. Rita Lenihan, WAVES, and Col. Barbara Bishop, MARINE.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 9, 1967]

#### JOHNSON SIGNS BILL FOR WOMEN GENERALS AND PINS MEDALS ON TWO NURSES

WASHINGTON, November 8.—President Johnson signed today a bill he said assured equal opportunity for women in the armed forces and pointed to the day when there might be some female generals or admirals.

Looking on were high-ranking military men and women, members of Congress and Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Johnson said with a smile:

"There is no reason why we should not some day have a female chief of staff or even a commander in chief."

The President marked the occasion by presenting medals to two women military nurses for outstanding services in connection with Vietnam operations. He called them "two very brave ladies."

He pinned the Bronze Star on Maj. Marie L. Rodgers, a native of Birmingham, Ala., and a member of the Army Nurse Corps for 15 years, for her service as an operating room supervisor in the 24th Evacuation Hospital



in Longbinh, not far from an area where American were battling hostile forces.

And he gave the Legion of Merit to Col. Ethel A. Hoefly, a native of South Ozone Park, Queens, an Air Force nurse who served as chief nurse in Air Force hospitals in Japan and Okinawa.

The bill Mr. Johnson signed, handing out pens to the nation's top women officers, provides for equal military promotional opportunities for women. Although none now could qualify to be raised in rank to general or admiral, they could some day compete with men for those ranks.

#### PRESIDENTIAL VILIFICATION IS NOTHING NEW

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been intrigued by a recent volume by Joseph Rosner called "The Hater's Handbook."

It is a wide ranging collection of invectives, but what interested me most was the chapter on American Presidents.

When President Johnson reads the attacks upon him, he can take comfort from the fact that abusing Presidents is an old American custom.

For the benefit of those interested, I would like to quote just a few of the choicest observations from the past about our Presidents—and a few rebuttals:

Open letter from Thomas Paine to Washington in 1796:

And as to you, sir, treacherous in private friendship . . . and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an impostor, whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any?

In 1807, Jefferson wrote:

Nothing can now be believed which is seen in the newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle. I will add that the man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them . . .

In the long and colorful history of public abuse in America, no President has been subjected to such vile and frequent attack as Abraham Lincoln.

Dr. Orestes Brownson wrote in the New York Post:

When he hits upon a policy, substantially good in itself, he contrives to belittle it, besmear it in some way to render it mean, contemptible and useless. Even wisdom from him seems but folly. . . .

He is a good sort of man . . . but he is misplaced in the Presidential chair . . . His only fault is, the misfortune of being unconscious of his own unfitness for his place.

The Chicago Times commented on the Gettysburg address:

An offensive exhibition of boorishness and vulgarity.

Because of attacks such as this, Lincoln was able to believe that—

If to be head of Hell is as hard as what I have to undergo here, I could find it in my heart to pity Satan himself.

William Cowper Brann, editor of the Iconoclast, described Cleveland:

Stubborn without courage, persevering without judgment, and greedy without gratitude, these unpleasant characteristics Cleve-

land and the hog have in common. There are several other points of resemblance; but I have no desire to be hard on the hog. . . .

I could include a number of other remarks about recent Presidents, particularly Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, but I think we are all aware of contemporary smears.

What impresses me is that—in the perspective of abuse—there is an amateur quality about attacks on Lyndon Johnson. His enemies try, but they have a long way to go before they hit the Lincoln level.

#### PUBLIC SENTIMENT ON ANTIPOVERTY

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that attempts to scuttle the anti-poverty program do not represent the sentiment or feelings of a majority of Americans.

This is particularly true of those who have taken the effort to become involved in community action programs and have learned on a firsthand basis what poverty is all about.

Recently, Bill Hilgers, the chairman of the Human Opportunities Corp., in Austin, Tex., polled a cross section of the community to ascertain whether the community at large is concerned with the problems of the underprivileged.

Specifically, he asked frank opinions to three questions:

First. Is the antipoverty program worthy of public support. Second. Does the antipoverty program deserve continued financial backing in Congress? And, third, do you feel that the anti-poverty program represents a waste of public money?

All of the responses were enthusiastic about the importance of the Government's continued support of the anti-poverty program.

At this point, I would like to present for inclusion a small sampling of the letters, which speak for themselves, received by Mr. Hilgers, and I urge our colleagues to read what the public is saying:

AUSTIN, TEX.,  
November 7, 1967.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE,  
Congress of the United States,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JAKE: Last week I directed a letter to the Community Council of Austin and Travis County and to the directors of the Human Opportunities Corporation as representative of the community at large in its concern for problems of the underprivileged. In this letter I asked for a frank expression of opinion on 3 questions: (1) Is the Anti-Poverty Program worthy of public support? (2) Does the Anti-Poverty Program deserve continued financial backing of Congress? (3) Do you feel that the Anti-Poverty Program represents a waste of public money?

Enclosed are the letters which I have received to date in response to my request. They are uniformly enthusiastic about the importance of the government's continued support of the Anti-Poverty Program.

All of us are conscious of the great responsibility borne by Congress for the economic

well-being of our country. This is a cost that must be borne in one form or another. To assume that by discontinuance of a program which has proven its effectiveness that the cost will end is a false and short-sighted conclusion. If this country is to fulfill its responsibilities to its citizens it must provide opportunity. Failure to appropriate funds for the continuance of the war on poverty is simply to choose the most expensive way of dealing with the problem; that is, the way of increased welfare, increased unemployment and increased ignorance.

Please convey to the Congress the deep concern of the representatives of the community in Travis County for the action which is being considered. We urge you to do all that is possible to continue the war on poverty.

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM B. HILGERS.

NOVEMBER 5, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
Austin, Tex.

DEAR MR. HILGERS: As a graduate of the slums and poverty of Austin, I welcome this opportunity to express my 2c worth views.

Perhaps if Congress had been awake 25 years ago, people would not have lost out on many of the things that are now available.

The anti-poverty program is indeed worthy of public support—to think otherwise takes us back to the stone age.

Yes, it does deserve the continued financial backing of Congress. To lose this support would mean the loss of hope, and loss of hope for the poor is loss of life.

No! It certainly does *not* represent a waste of public money.

RAY N. MONCIVAIS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,  
Austin, Tex., November 6, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp., Austin, Tex.

DEAR BILL: I will be as explicit as I can in the answering of the three questions posed in your November 3, 1967, letter.

(1) Is the anti-poverty program worthy of public support?

Yes, in my considered opinion, both as a professor of psychology and as a member of the Human Opportunities Corporation. Poverty is deep-rooted and somewhat refractive to immediate alleviation. The general program as I see it is worthy of public support although I admit as in all programs there is room for improvement. However, this does not negate the general idea that the poverty program should continue to receive support from the public. It is unfortunate that there is somewhat of a backlash against the program. However, you will recall that many programs during the depression were also ridiculed, but in the long term proved to be of extreme worth to the nation as a whole.

(2) Does the anti-poverty program deserve the continued financial backing of Congress?

Yes, in my opinion. To withdraw support or to reduce support at this point would be disastrous. We have after all indicated to many people that there is a way out of their situation. To block this way without an alternative would give rise to justifiable anger, discouragement, and most unpleasant consequences.

(3) Do I feel that the anti-poverty program represents a waste of public money?

The word *waste* has to be defined and there is always a value to be attached to the spending of money. How wasteful is it to drop bombs in Viet Nam? How wasteful is it to invest billions of dollars for weapons which we know will be obsolete in three to four years? In hard factual terms, the dispensing of funds to the poor is never wasted in as much as most of the funds go into the economy. The goals of the anti-poverty program are to help people get into a position where they may not



need certain types of public assistance or where they may be able to cope more adequately with their problems. These goals are laudable ones and I believe are being accomplished to some extent. That programs need to be reviewed and that energies have to be perhaps re-focused goes without question. However, I do not think the great bulk of the money is being wasted. I feel it is being used to good purpose and that the results will eventually be worth the expense.

The above are my opinions. I wish to state clearly and unequivocally that I, as a citizen, am proud of what our city and county is accomplishing. The involvement of the community speaks for our concern. We cannot withdraw from the battle against poverty now. If we do, it will cost us severely in later years in terms of money and human potential. I would urge you and our representatives in the Congress to battle mightily for at least a continuation of the poverty program at its present level.

Sincerely,

IRA ISCOE, Ph. D.,

Professor of Psychology and Education.

AUSTIN, TEX.,

November 6, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President,  
Human Opportunities Corp.,  
Austin, Tex.

DEAR MR. HILGERS: In reply to your letter of November 3, I should like to express my concern over the status of the poverty program. Any curtailment of the program at this time would be quite unfortunate for the people who are now receiving benefits from the program.

This program, in my opinion, is certainly worthy of public support, since there are self-help elements built in—such as day care, job-training, and the like. I feel that it deserves the financial backing of Congress, because without this backing it could not continue. Rather than a waste of public money, I think that it could be considered an investment, because people in poverty income bracket are being helped to help themselves, and in the near future, some of these people will be self-supporting, tax-paying citizens, instead of being supported by tax money.

In view of these considerations, I hope that you will be able to add whatever you can in an effort to continue the program as it is, without any curtailment.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. BEULAH TAYLOR.

AUSTIN, TEX.,

November 6, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp. of  
Austin and Travis County, Tex.

DEAR MR. HILGERS: It is my understanding that very soon the Congress will be considering the possibility of discontinuing the anti-poverty program as it now stands. The purpose of this letter is to ask you to contact our Senators and Representatives, urging them to re-fund the program and remain in the fight to accomplish this very worthwhile national endeavor.

The poverty programs are just now beginning to show the results of a lot of hard work by many public-spirited individuals interested in aiding the under-privileged. Problems of poverty take time and money to understand and solve—all effort to this point will be wasted if Congress votes to end the program. Congress should be made to understand that money is not the only thing being spent in this effort—but it is a vital portion, if the human element is to have any success at all.

Personally, I feel that the Head Start Program is the most worthy human improvement work ever undertaken by our Government—it should be continued over and above all other federal aid to education of whatever nature. Likewise, the Legal Aid Program and the Child Welfare programs touch the

distressed individual in a very tangible way. No other offerings by the national government has ever so directly helped the individual actually needing the assistance as has the current programs.

Poverty is one of our biggest problems. The public must work and pay to help solve that problem. In all areas of public spending, none returns as much to individual people—people who make up the public from whom the funds are derived in the first place.

As a citizen and taxpayer, I think the poverty fight should not only be continued, but expanded. Our Government has moved in the right direction to meet this situation head on, and I hope the movement will be allowed to continue and grow.

Yours very truly,

PAT CARLISLE.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Austin, Tex., November 4, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp., of  
Austin and Travis County, Tex., Austin,  
Tex.

DEAR MR. HILGERS: This letter is to give you my impressions of the federally supported anti-poverty program as I have observed its operation in Austin.

In my judgment, the anti-poverty program is not only worthy of broad public support, but it deserves the active participation of all persons of good will and the cooperation of all units of government at all levels. For the sake of brevity, I mention only three specific projects and the reasons I think they deserve local, state and national support.

1) The Head Start program gives children from deprived areas a more nearly "even break" with other children in getting an adequate elementary education. This program includes parents in its objectives, and thus helps to create in whole families a more receptive attitude toward education as well as the opportunities to receive it.

2) The projects in Law and Justice and Legal Aid have given our underprivileged neighbors the feeling that perhaps, sure enough, "liberty and justice for all" is not just a bit of July Fourth oratory, but a valid American dream on its way to fulfillment.

3) The Child Care Centers have given working mothers (so often without husbands in the family) the opportunity to earn the family livelihood, secure in the knowledge that their small children are receiving adequate care and pre-school training. Again, this program offers people a chance to break out of poverty circumstances under conditions of personal respect and pride.

In all of these programs, as well as in others encompassed by the anti-poverty efforts under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the emphasis is upon helping people help themselves. This total program is a noble effort to help people break out of conditions of poverty, despair and disillusionment and into conditions of economic security, hope, and confidence in themselves and in the traditional American dream.

Obviously, such objectives are long-range in nature. They cannot be achieved in one, two or three years. They simply take time. No resource of a nation is more deserving of massive investment than its people. From these observations, it is my sincere conclusion that the anti-poverty program deserves the widespread support of the American people; that continued massive financial backing from Congress is absolutely necessary; and that rather than being a wasteful investment, these programs represent the most desirable investment imaginable—in people.

I can think of no more cruel action than to hold hope out to the poverty stricken people of our society, than to snatch it out of their very grasp by our failure to give these programs a chance to work.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SANSOM,

Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent.

DEVALLE, TEX.,

November 7, 1967.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PICKLE: Thank you for attending our last Human Opportunities Corp. meeting. It was a privilege to have you and I believe you now have a better understanding of what the anti-poverty program means to Travis County.

It is cruel to promise the people assistance and not be able to follow through. I believe this program is worthy of public support and deserves the financial backing of Congress.

Some money is probably wasted, over the country, but as a whole, I believe it is wisely used. Our group is trying to use every dollar wisely, to aid the greatest number of people possible.

We will appreciate your continued support of the antipoverty program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. VERNON GREGG.

TEXAS COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

Austin, November 7, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp., of  
Austin and Travis County, Community  
Action Agency for the War on Poverty,  
Austin, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. HILGERS. As a member of the Corporation Board for the past few months, I have had an opportunity to observe many of the very constructive and worthwhile programs operating in this community under OEO auspices. As I listen to the reports of the information and referral centers, I have been struck by the multiplicity of community services which they have rendered. I get the impression that these centers are giving the poor a channel for their feeling that someone cares and for their participation in community life.

The Head Start programs, the basic and vocational education programs for drop-outs or potential drop-outs, legal aid services, and many other substantial programs give me the impression that the war on poverty is beginning to be won in this community.

I am pleased that you are conveying to the Congress our belief that the OEO program deserves their continued support.

Sincerely,

HAROLD KILPATRICK,

Executive-Secretary.

NOVEMBER 6, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
Austin, Tex

DEAR MR. HILGERS: I welcome this opportunity to express my views on the anti-poverty program.

It is incomprehensible to me that many people who should know better expect instant results from the anti-poverty program.

Ten years ago our country embarked on a massive space program. After ten years of effort by the best minds that our society can produce, and untold billions of dollars we have yet to reach the moon. Why aren't these same critics complaining about the lack of instant results in reaching the moon? With our advanced technology I believe it is easier to reach the moon than to solve poverty problems. By comparison the resources used on the war on poverty pale before those used in the space program.

It is my firm conviction that the anti-poverty program deserves greater support from all levels of government, with the Congress providing funds and imaginative leadership.

I do not feel that the anti-poverty program is a waste of public funds. To allow a large segment of our population to continue in the grip of poverty and deprived of opportunity is a greater and more serious waste of our resources.

The anti-poverty program is still in its infancy. Certainly this program has its shortcomings. I am confident that given suf-



cient time and support this program can become effective in greatly reducing poverty.

Sincerely yours,

GILBERT M. MARTINEZ.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF AUSTIN &  
TRAVIS COUNTY,

Austin, Tex., November 7, 1967.

Mr. WM. B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp. of  
Austin and Travis County, Austin, Tex.

DEAR BILL: The needs of deprived people in Austin and Travis County have been well documented. The efforts of the Human Opportunities Corporation to awaken the community to this problem are to be commended while we recognize that the magnitude of the problem prohibits a quick and easy solution.

Your programs under OEO of day care, Head Start, public dental health, family planning, legal aid and Information and Referral are all making an impact on getting people out of poverty.

I am also pleased to hear of your plans to involve the business community in locating jobs for these people.

It is my understanding that terminating OEO at this time would be very harmful to the people who have worked hard to pull themselves out of poverty. This in turn would be hard for our entire community.

I wish that you would convey my thoughts immediately to Jake Pickle so that he might know the views of his District. I also want you to know of my continued interest in the deprived of our community.

Sincerely,

BILL YOUNGBLOOD,  
President.

AUSTIN, TEX.,  
November 8, 1967.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE,  
U.S. Congressman,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your continued full support of the poverty program under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Next summer's problems in all urban centers must be anticipated now.

Best wishes.

BOB TINSTMAN,  
City Manager.  
BAPTIST TEMPLE CHURCH,  
Austin, Tex.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HILGERS,  
President, Human Opportunities Corp.  
Austin, Tex.

DEAR MR. HILGERS: The purpose of this letter is to express my views in connection with the anti-poverty program as it affects my community. I have been serving in this poverty-stricken area for six and one-half years—my first real experience with poverty. For four years my time was spent searching for food and clothing but I found that this was not the answer to their total need. When I learned of the O.E.O. program here I wanted to be a part of it and became a volunteer.

Surely the public should be aware that seven out of ten persons who have had the advantage of being a part of the anti-poverty program have been helped to the extent of their total needs and are now on the way toward becoming able to take care of themselves. For this reason I earnestly believe the program to be deserving of full public support.

Inasmuch as the program is just now becoming really effective, to cut its funds at this time would certainly be most harmful to all concerned. I sincerely hope that Congress will continue its support in order that all of the hard-earned benefits, which mean so much to these people, will not be lost.

In the beginning it was my opinion that there was some waste of public funds but this has subsequently been corrected. I be-

lieve the money is now being wisely and well spent in behalf of those it was meant to assist. Visible results in the community make me feel proud to be a part of this tremendous effort.

Sincerely,

A. J. CARVER,  
Pastor.

### THE FALLEN KNIGHT?

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Governor of California, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, recently addressed a huge political fundraising dinner in Columbia, S.C. Three thousand five hundred people attended this affair, which was advertised as a \$100-a-plate dinner. A huge sum was raised, presumably to defeat some of our conservative colleagues here in the House who have never wavered in their support of constitutional government and our private enterprise system.

The "white knight" galloped out of the "Golden West" into the township auditorium. It was reported that there was considerable whooping and hollering and generally a lot of steam. Sponsors of the dinner boasted that the Governor was interrupted time and again by almost thunderous applause.

The Governor, though at one time an extreme liberal, was billed at this particular affair as a great conservative and heir to the illustrious Goldwater mantle—a man of absolute truth, integrity, and principle.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington admitted his indiscretion when he cut down the cherry tree and then went on to become President of the United States. I believe this incident helped the Father of our Country to become President. It has certainly been an inspiration to schoolchildren since that day. It would enhance the Governor's prestige everywhere, including South Carolina, should he follow the example of Washington.

Governor Reagan possesses many admirable qualities. He is personable and attractive. He was superbly trained in the art of acting and when I was a boy, he had my great admiration as an outstanding actor. During his acting career, the Governor was cast in various roles, but usually as a crusader, a hero, and a "white knight."

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star is a highly respected conservative newspaper. Appearing in the November 7 issue of the Star along with a number of splendid editorials and articles was the following editorial:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 7, 1967]

### THE FALLEN KNIGHT

Ronald Reagan, the white knight of the GOP presidential hopefuls, has just undergone his first major trial in the journalistic lists and has fallen flat on his face. Whether he can ever restore his armor to its original dazzling shine is very much open to question.

The California governor's unhorsing came when he was asked, during a televised press conference, about a syndicated article by

columnist Drew Pearson in which it was stated that two homosexuals had been fired from Reagan's staff. Reagan, the article said, had harbored the two men for months after the scandal became known. Pearson added that Lyn Nofziger, Reagan's press secretary, had told a few reporters during the recent governors conference about the firing and the reasons for it.

Up until the moment of the press conference, Reagan had acted with integrity and propriety. When the rumors started, an investigation was carried out. As a result of that investigation, the two men were quietly dropped from Reagan's staff. The governor's insistence on morality in official life and his personal comparison for tragic human frailty were both well served.

When asked about the matter, it would have been simple—and quite legitimate—for Reagan to present himself in a most favorable light, while making Pearson appear as something of a cad for bringing the whole thing up. Instead he denied that the unfortunate affair had happened, and denied that he or his aides had ever told any members of the press any such thing had taken place.

The fact is that Nofziger, during the governor's cruise aboard the S.S. Independence, did tell a handful of newsmen—The Star's political writer, Paul Hope among them—that two of Reagan's staff members had been fired for homosexual activity.

The black mark on Reagan's record is not that he hired such men, or that he was slow in firing them. Where he stumbled was in his histrionic denial and in calling Drew Pearson a liar when he must have known that Pearson's article was factually correct. The motivation of this extraordinary performance is not easily discerned.

It was, in any event, a serious error of judgment in Reagan's first real test under pressure. And it must inevitably raise very real doubts about his personal dedication to the truth and his fitness for the high office to which he so obviously aspires.

### WELCOME TO SOUTH CAROLINA, SENATOR BROOKE

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable EDWARD BROOKE, of Massachusetts, made the principal address to the Citizenship Conference of the Palmetto Medical, Dental, and Pharmaceutical Association in Columbia, S.C. Senator BROOKE was welcomed at the airport by the Honorable Lester Bates, mayor of Columbia, and presented a gold key to the city. Senator BROOKE met with our Governor, the Honorable Robert E. McNair. He spoke at the University of South Carolina, Benedict College, and Allen University. We were honored to have Senator BROOKE visit our State. He made a great impression, and we hope he can visit with us again.

Mr. Speaker, South Carolina has a heritage of tolerance, brotherhood, and understanding. The Honorable Solomon Blatt has been speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives longer than any man in history—more than 25 years. It is my understanding that he served longer as speaker of the house of representatives than any other speaker of any other State of the Union.

The late Bernard Baruch, a native of South Carolina, once made the remark that he was welcome to any civic club or gathering in South Carolina, but that in



Actual summonses were drawn up and attempts were made to serve the various defendant embassies here in Washington on November 7. I understand that the Soviet Embassy here in Washington, in keeping with its 50-year history of rule of law, unceremoniously bounced the process server. The trial, scheduled for January 18, will be held in Minneapolis. As the various parties named in the indictment claim to be the "peace" parties of the world, it would indeed be interesting if the defendants showed up for the trial and tried to explain why the condition of peace necessitates the slaughter of millions of human beings.

One thing is certain: the young people of YAF were not fooled one bit by all the propaganda on the 50th anniversary. Their "Indictment for Crimes Against Humanity" indicates a realistic grasp of a worldwide threat which, unhappily, is not realized by some many years their senior. For a brief but true listing of the "accomplishments" of the Soviet October revolution, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point the "Indictment for Crimes Against Humanity," along with a sample summons to the various Communist parties to answer the charges of the free people of the world:

[In the Court of Public Opinion, Minnesota Division]

#### INDICTMENT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

*Free People of the World v the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Poland (also known as the Polish United Workers' Party), the Communist Party of Hungary (also known as the Hungarian Workers' Socialist Party), the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party of Rumania (also known as the Rumanian Workers' Party), the Algerian Communist Party, the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Communist Party of North Korea (also known as the Korean Party of Labor), the Communist Party of North Vietnam (also known as the Vietnam Workers' Party), and the Communist Party of Cuba (also known as the Popular Socialists' Party of Cuba), Defendants.*

#### The indictment charges:

1. The defendants are the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Poland (also known as the Polish United Workers' Party), the Communist Party of Hungary (also known as the Hungarian Workers' Socialist Party), the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party of Rumania (also known as the Rumanian Workers' Party), the Algerian Communist Party, the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Communist Party of North Korea (also known as the Korean Party of Labor), the Communist Party of North Vietnam (also known as the Vietnam Workers' Party), and the Communist Party of Cuba (also known as the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba), which with their fellow conspirators, the other 85 national Communist parties, comprise the International Communist Conspiracy, in a joint and several campaign of infiltration, espionage, terror, deceit, murder, theft, kidnapping, and all other forms of revolutionary warfare against the peoples of the Free World including the United States.

2. Since 1917, the International Communist Conspiracy has waged a total war upon all peoples, nations, and religions of the Free World; the International Communist Conspiracy redeclared this war in its Moscow Manifesto, issued December 5, 1960, which called for an intensification of the

prosecution of this war. The named defendants were represented at this meeting and reaffirmed this Manifesto when they returned to their national Communist organizations.

3. Pursuant to said Moscow Manifesto of December 5, 1960 the defendants and other members of the International Communist Conspiracy have waged overt and covert war against all peoples and nations of the Free World, and the defendants and other members of the International Communist Conspiracy are confronting the Free World with the desperate alternatives of either surrender via thermonuclear blackmail, capture by encirclement and internal subversion, or destruction by thermonuclear weapons.

4. The defendants and their co-conspirators have already destroyed the independence and freedom of many nations including Byelorussia, Cossackia, Azerbaijan, Turkistan, Ukraine, Georgia, White Ruthenia, Idel-Ural, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Yugoslavia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, mainland China, North Vietnam and Cuba.

5. The defendants and their co-conspirators have murdered some 5 million Russian peasants or kulaks by artificial famine, 10,000 helpless Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, 20,000,000 Chinese landlords or anti-Maoists, 57,559 helpless prisoners of the North Korean Army including 6,113 captured American soldiers, thousands of helpless prisoners of the Viet Cong Army, over 10,000 Cubans, many innocent persons who accidentally enter Iron Curtain territory like Bible book salesman Newcomb Mott of the U.S.A., and thousands of persons selected for assassination by the Department of Wet Blood Affairs of the K.G.B., without even the pretense of a fair trial or any trial at all.

6. The defendants and their co-conspirators have wrongfully seized and imprisoned millions of innocent persons to serve as slave laborers in the Siberian slave labor camps with the annual number of inmates at these slave labor camps estimated to be 15 million and described by the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Communist Aggression and by the few survivors like Elinor Lipper, John Noble, and Father Walter J. Ciszek, S. J. The deportation of innocent people from their homes to these Siberian slave labor camps included 1,392,000 Poles, over a hundred thousand Hungarians, 200,000 Georgians, hundreds of thousands of Byelorussians and Azerbaijanis, 1,000,000 Kaimuks and Crimean Tartars, 500,000 Chechen-Ingush people, more than a million Ukrainians, and hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of the former Baltic Republics. One hundred and forty thousand Balts were deported to Siberia in one year, namely June, 1940 to June, 1941. In clear violation of international law, Moise Tshombe, a distinguished Negro statesman, was kidnapped over international waters of the Mediterranean Sea by agents of the defendant, the Algerian Communist Party, and taken to Algeria where it is reliably reported that he is dying in prison. In most of these deportation crimes against humanity, the families were broken up and never permitted to see each other again.

7. The defendants and their co-conspirators have persecuted all religions, Orthodox, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Moslem. They have arrested, imprisoned, tortured and executed clergymen of all faiths. They have looted, closed and converted into non-religious structures most of the churches and synagogues. The Ukrainian Catholic Church was particularly persecuted. All members of its hierarchy are in jail or dead. Cardinal Josef Slipyi was a prisoner of the Russian Communists for 18 years and then deported. Defendants have refused to permit Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski of Poland to attend the Vatican Council in 1965 or to attend the

World Synod meeting of the Catholic bishops held in Rome in October, 1967. The defendants have kept Cardinal Mindszenty a prisoner in the American Embassy in Budapest, Hungary under day and night guard since November, 1956. The defendants tortured and imprisoned Lutheran Minister Richard Wurmbrand for fourteen years before selling him for ransom. The defendants are responsible for a score of livid scars on the body of the Reverend Wurmbrand including holes burnt into his back by Communist torturers. With reference to the Catholic Church alone, the records of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome show that defendants and their co-conspirators have closed 31,779 churches, 3,334 seminaries, and 1,600 convents. Churches and seminaries of other creeds have been similarly taken over and closed by the defendants and their co-conspirators. This persecution of religion continues in 1967. The State University of Scientific Atheism in Alma Ata was officially designated by *Kazakstanskaia Pravda* on March 3, 1967 as "the School of Those Who Will Never Make Peace".

8. The defendants and their co-conspirators have acknowledged no limitations upon the nature of their activities or upon their conduct or upon that of their members, and have openly and repeatedly dedicated themselves to the proposition that all of the present governments of the Free World, including the United States, must ultimately be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence. The defendants constitute a clear and continuing danger to the security of the United States. They are the means whereby individuals are seduced into the service of the World Communist Movement, trained to do its bidding, and directed and controlled in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. They and their co-conspirators are the instruments of a conspiracy to overthrow the governments of the Free World.

9. The leaders of Soviet Russia have announced their intention and capability to destroy the governments of the Free World. "Capitalism . . . wants to bury the Socialist system and we want—not only want but have dug—quite a deep hole, and shall exert efforts to dig this hole deeper and bury the capitalist system forever." Khrushchev, Speech in Moscow at the Plenary Meeting of Communist Parties on June 21, 1963. "You know, they say that in order to destroy your country all one needs is six H-bombs, perhaps nine at the most. I have twelve, all set aside just for you." Khrushchev, as reported by Alberto Rouchey in *Russia in the Thaw*, Norton, p. 161. "The quantity of intercontinental and orbital missiles now at Soviet disposal is perfectly sufficient to finish off once and for all any aggressor or group of aggressors." Leonid Brezhnev speech in Moscow on July 3, 1965. The present leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union also stated: ". . . a few years ago the Communist Parties drew the conclusion that the balance of forces in the world arena was steadily changing in favor of socialism. This conclusion has been fully confirmed. . . . The progressive forces are on the offensive. . . ."

10. The defendants and their co-conspirators have violated every major agreement made with the Free World, including the Kellogg-Briand Pact of August 27, 1928 renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, the non-aggression pacts they signed with Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, etc., the agreements made at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963. The United Nations Command states that the defendant Communist Party of North Korea has committed 5,300 violations of the Panmunjom Truce Agreement between July 27, 1953 and November 1, 1966. The defendants and their co-conspirators all practice what Lenin, the modern founder of Com-



münism, taught: "Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken." The Communist principle that agreements are not binding was restated by Stalin as follows: "Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood." In complete violation of the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement of November 16, 1933 in which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in exchange for recognition, agreed to religious liberty in Russia and not to intervene in U.S. affairs, Boris Ponomarev, Chief of the Foreign Section of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R., wrote a pamphlet in November, 1964 for distribution by the Soviet Embassy in Washington which stated: "The Revolution in the United States has begun"; and in furtherance of this revolution, the defendants are continuing to subvert our youth and to obtain our military and other secrets by theft and bribery.

A true bill.

THE GRAND JURY OF THE WORLD'S  
CONSCIENCE,

By \_\_\_\_\_,

Foreman.

[In the Court of Public Opinion, Minnesota  
Division]

#### INDICTMENT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

*Free People of the World v. the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Poland (also known as the Polish United Workers' Party), the Communist Party of Hungary (also known as the Hungarian Workers' Socialist Party), the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party of Rumania (also known as the Rumanian Workers' Party), the Algerian Communist Party, the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Communist Party of North Korea (also known as the Korean Party of Labor), the Communist Party of North Vietnam (also known as the Vietnam Workers' Party), and the Communist Party of Cuba (also known as the Popular Socialists' Party of Cuba), defendants.*

To the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of North Korea, the Communist Party of North Vietnam and the Communist Party of Cuba c/o of the Soviet Union Embassy, 1125 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036:

You are hereby summoned to appear before the Court of Public Opinion for the State of Minnesota Division in the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota, on the 18th day of January 1968, at 10 o'clock a.m. to answer to the attached Indictment for Crimes Against Humanity.

Dated November 7, 1967.

Clerk of the Court of Public Opinion.

This summons was served by the undersigned at the Soviet Union Embassy in Washington, D.C., on the 7th day of November, 1967.

Process Server.

(Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HOSMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### VIETNAM INSPECTION

(Mr. COWGER (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, on next Thursday, November 16, 1967, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, and I are leaving on a 12-day inspection of South Vietnam. As Members of Congress, we feel it is most important that we become better acquainted with the situation in Southeast Asia. We intend to study our Nation's commitments and visit with both civilian and military personnel. The U.S. Department of State is making arrangements for us to visit several cities in South Vietnam and to visit Bangkok, Thailand. We have also been invited by the Government of the Republic of China to visit Taiwan. Even though we are going at our own expense, we will be, as Congressmen, inspecting our Government's facilities in Vietnam.

We have been working on our plans for over 3 months now and all arrangements have been made. At the time we planned this trip we had some assurance that Congress would be adjourned before Thanksgiving. It appears now that we will miss some of the business coming to the floor of the House. Therefore, we request unanimous consent from our colleagues to be absent from November 16, 1967, through November 28, 1967. Upon our return we will make a full report to our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### UNFAIR LABOR STANDARDS

(Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, each year during the Christmas season, thousands of unskilled persons are given seasonal employment in the retail industry. These persons, during the months of October, November, and December, have an opportunity to learn a skill that can lead to full-time, year-round employment.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, these seasonal employees must be paid the full minimum wage. This requirement, because of the cost involved, will deny thousands of persons employment across the Nation. The retail industry is swamped during the rush season and would undoubtedly employ as many additional persons as necessary to meet the increased customer load—but the added cost will be a limiting factor.

The bill I am introducing today will allow these retail and service firms to hire, for the rush season only, at a rate of 90 percent of the minimum wage as set by the 1966 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy enactment of this or similar legislation, in order to meet immediate needs. Adoption of this legislation will mean more employment and will benefit the retail trade.

H.R. 13938

A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a special minimum wage rate for seasonal employees of retail or service establishments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act

of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the employment of seasonal employees by retail or service establishments during the three-month period in each year beginning on October 1 at a minimum wage rate not less than 90 per centum of the minimum wage applicable under section 6. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'seasonal employees' means employees who were not employed by any retail or service establishment during the nine-month period immediately preceding such three-month period."

(b) The center heading for such section is amended by striking out "AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS" and inserting in lieu thereof "HANDICAPPED WORKERS, AND SEASONAL EMPLOYEES".

#### OEO AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

(Mr. GARDNER (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in this body today, or any member of our Education and Labor Committee, who is not deeply concerned about the problems of poverty. We heard the statement made before this body that everyone is concerned about poverty, and I think this is a very true statement. However, there is an honest and basic difference in how we should approach the methods and the effectiveness of being able to eliminate poverty in America.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I had an opportunity to sit and listen at great length to what I consider was a Broadway production staged by the Office of Economic Opportunity, telling us day after day of the wonderful merits of this program. But during these very long weeks of hearings we heard very few people who came before this committee to testify as to the faults in this program. And yet I know throughout America in each city there are many people who have seen firsthand the ineffectiveness of the OEO and the OEO employees.

I think it is quite legitimate as we come before this body that we do have debate today to discuss the pros and cons of the best method that we can possibly have to eliminate poverty throughout America.

We have heard many discussions already today—and I will not dwell on them any more. I only wish to talk quite briefly about an area that I am very deeply concerned about, and that is the political activities that are now so deeply entrenched in our poverty program.

It was said just recently by my colleague in the well that we have spent over \$4 billion in the war on poverty. I say that too much of this money and too much of the time spent by the Office of Economic Opportunity has been politically motivated and politically thought out by those in Washington. I can list city after city where massive voter registration drives have been conducted for some time: Durham, N.C.; Houston, Tex.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Gary, Ind.; Atlanta, Ga.; Reading, Pa.; and the list goes on and on and on. And when I speak of voter regis-



tration drives, let me give this body an example of what happened in Durham, N.C.

An antipoverty agency in Durham, through three of its employees, spent over 3 months copying the registration books in the city of Durham. They went out in a nonpartisan election and carried people to the polling places to register. They then carried them back on election day, and provided them with marked ballots telling them exactly which candidates to vote for. In this city election, this nonpartisan election of the city of Durham, N.C., in an election that the mayor won by a 2-to-1 majority, these precincts in which the OEO workers were deeply involved carried for the opposite number by as much as 10 to 1.

I feel—and I have never had anyone to be able to convince me otherwise—that massive voter registration programs will in no way help the poor or bring up their level of living. I think everyone in this House knows that we have many honorable groups who are making a major effort to impress on every American citizen that they have a right and a responsibility to participate in local governments, the junior chambers of commerce, and many, many other agencies that spend many long hours trying to get people to go out to register and to vote. But I think we tread on very thin ice, and we are setting a very dangerous precedent, when we have a Federal agency, sponsored by the American taxpayers' dollar, out conducting massive voter registration drives.

In the city of Houston, Tex., it has been told that OEO agencies there have registered over 50,000 voters. And I would only point out to this House that if we had another national election like 1960, the Office of Economic Opportunity could very easily control the political destiny of America.

This brings me to another very dangerous precedent that I think the Office of Economic Opportunity and the war on poverty has been engaged in, and this is massive protest movements and picketing that employees financed by the American taxpayer have been doing in far too many cases. I have brought here today stacks of material that came out of newspapers, not only in North Carolina, but throughout every section of America, and I would only take a brief time to read you a few.

This is from the Baltimore paper: "Top U.S. Official Backs VISTA Group Picketing."

It says:

George Lord, National Field Representative of Volunteers in Service to America said VISTA workers in Baltimore broke no rules in organizing a picket against a citizen and taxpayer.

One of our own Members of Congress, speaking in California, was heckled and interrupted numerous times during a speech by OEO employees.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., we find OEO employees staging a massive downtown demonstration that disrupted business and traffic.

We go back again to VISTA and we find the regional director, James Cox, in Austin, Tex., said:

VISTA volunteers here can participate in marches and demonstrations.

We go back again to Houston and find testimony by the Houston police chief, who testified riot attempts by OEO employees had been attempted and set a dangerous precedent.

Again I quote from a letter I received on November 3, 1967, from two members of the Newark, N.J., City Council.

I am quoting certain parts and I will put the entire letter in the RECORD.

The United Community Corporation took a public stand against the proposed medical center in the City of Newark after conducting two surveys . . . which showed that the people wanted the center.

They also went into descriptions of how the area board of UCC demonstrated in picketing against a local grocery store, and that because of this, this man was forced to go out of business.

The letter I referred to follows:

NEWARK MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,  
Newark, N.J., November 3, 1967.

Hon. JAMES C. GARDNER,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARDNER: If what happened within the Poverty Program of the City of Newark is in relation to political activities is similar in other cities and communities across this nation, then it is imperative that amendments to prohibit political action by O.E.O. formed agencies and its employees be enacted.

1. Many militant individuals have used the Poverty Program in the City of Newark to further their own political ambitions and foment unrest. James Kennedy who is a Community Researcher of Area Board 2 of the United Community Corporation called a mass meeting in front of the Fourth Precinct Police Headquarters after he was advised that such a meeting could set off trouble in the City of Newark. He disregarded the advice. The meeting was held on July 13, 1967 and the riots ensued. All printed matter subsequent to this event was printed by his poverty board. Mr. Kennedy's statements were on television and can be verified through C.B.S., Channel 2.

2. Kenneth Gibson, a Vice President of the United Community Corporation, used the Poverty Program as a means of obtaining political projection and then ran for Mayor of the City of Newark on a so-called negro ticket with the help of Poverty Program officials.

3. George C. Richardson, a very active Trustee of the Poverty Program, used the program as a means of obtaining projection and ran for Councilman in the Central Ward in the City of Newark. Mr. Richardson who opposed the creation of a medical center in the City of Newark fought the City Administration again using Poverty Program staff and distribution. Mr. Richardson is presently running for Assembly in the state of New Jersey and is using the Poverty staff to mimeograph his campaign literature.

4. Earl Harris, a member of the Trustee Board and presently Co-Chairman of the Personnel Committee of the United Community Corporation, ran for Councilman in the City of Newark and used the Poverty Program as a means of projection and used the printing facilities of Area Board 3 to print literature.

5. William Payne, a member of the Board of Trustees and the Poverty Program, used the program to gain projection and ran for Councilman in the City of Newark.

6. The United Community Corporation took a public stand against the proposed medical center in the City of Newark after conducting two surveys (using the Poverty

Program staff) which showed that the people wanted the center. They used the mimeograph equipment to circularize the community and try to incite the people to protest the medical center. When this failed, they brought people in from New York City and other communities to load the hearing room and protest the center. On the attempted appointment of a new Secretary to the Board of Education, they used the mimeograph machine to cause social unrest in the City of Newark.

7. The U. C. C. voted to grant amnesty to all those arrested during the riots in Newark.

8. U. C. C. through its Legal Aid Program supplied lawyers free to defend the rioters.

9. The U. C. C. staff has involved itself in every business action taken by the Council, example K-9 Corps, rent control.

10. Area Board 3 of the U. C. C. is dominated by Students for Democratic Society. They decided a local grocery store merchant was overcharging his customers and they picketed him out of business. Ironically, at the same time eight negroes lost their employment and many people who depended upon this merchant for credit lost their source of help.

11. Area Board 3 has gone out of its way to provide any and all welfare information to prospective welfare clients to aid them in getting every possible dime "due them." They encourage welfare.

12. Area Board 3 has set up a Corporative Food Program to compete against the same grocery stores in the neighborhood which ironically are now primarily negro operated.

13. Small business administrations under the Poverty Program sent individuals around; to help the merchants. Instead, they tried to organize the merchants at a \$10.00 membership charge contrary to O. E. O. intent. Thurmand Smith was the paid staff man involved.

13. Play Street Program has been accused of sending children to camps that have Communist ties. Funds were cut off by O. E. O. for this aspect of the Play Street Program this summer, apparently for this reason.

If you desire any further information or personal presentation, we will be happy to appear in Washington.

Cordially,

LEE BERNSTEIN,  
Councilman, South Ward.  
FRANK ADDONIZIO,  
Councilman, West Ward.

I go again to our committee report, prepared by the majority and minority investigators, who went in, and on section 5 they said:

Whatever the intention, the facts concerning the role of UCC personnel in publicizing and organizing a "Police Brutality Mass Rally" at #4 precinct the evening of July 13th did significantly contribute to the volatile climate which prevailed.

I have a copy, before us today, of the literature that was passed out by poverty workers, printed at poverty headquarters, which says:

#### STOP! POLICE BRUTALITY

Come out and join us at the Mass Rally Tonite at 7:30 p.m., 4th Precinct, Located on 17th Avenue and Livingston Street.

From this mass rally the riots in Newark, N.J., were sparked and started.

At the appropriate time, I plan to introduce amendments I feel are absolutely necessary if we are to remove poverty workers in the future from voter registration, from picketing, and protesting, areas I feel they have absolutely no business in. I hope by doing this we will be able to help redirect this program so the people living in the poverty areas will be able to better their conditions.



# ADMINISTRATION ENDORSES A "SOAK THE POOR" POLICY

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD some remarks I had prepared criticizing the Johnson administration for endorsing a Senate Finance Committee plan to increase the payroll tax about \$6 billion above the increases set out in the House-passed social security bill.

In the meantime the Senate Finance Committee—if not the Johnson administration—has backtracked to a considerable degree. However, I think some of the reasons for abandoning the payroll tax increase plan should be set out in the RECORD. Accordingly, I am placing in the RECORD these remarks that I originally had prepared:

## TEXT OF PREPARED REMARKS

It is ironic that the same Administration that launched the so-called "war on poverty" now is endorsing a plan which would soak the poor.

No other conclusion can be drawn from HEW Under Secretary Cohen's endorsement of the Social Security bill reportedly approved by the Senate Finance Committee last week. Secretary Cohen is reported to have called the bill "excellent" and "a great job." This endorsement came in spite of the fact that the Senate bill differs substantially from the Administration's original proposals as well as from the House bill, which the Administration had earlier approved.

The benefits under the Senate bill would be increased \$5.1 billion in 1968, or nearly 70 percent more than under the House bill, and about 20 percent more than the President's original proposal. The payroll tax increase would also be higher—about \$6 billion, or roughly three times greater than provided in the House bill, and substantially in excess of the President's original recommendation for new financing in 1968.

Why the change of heart by the Administration? Why the apparent endorsement of a bill that would provide for a massive increase in the most regressive tax we have—an increase that would go as high as \$150 a year for the worker earning \$8,800? Even in 1966, as Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institution has pointed out, the Federal payroll tax was the highest tax paid by at least 25 percent of the nation's income recipients and \$350 million was paid by persons officially classified as living below the poverty level.

The answer seems to be that the Administration hopes to get its tax increase via the social security route instead of through the now-dead 10 percent tax surcharge. The Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee said as much following the Committee's action last week. If this is the Administration's intention, it is bad public policy on several grounds.

First, it would not be anti-inflationary. In fact, it might even increase inflationary pressures. The poor—including the 1.4 million that President Johnson promised to lift out of poverty through this legislation—ultimately would suffer the most. Not only would many of the poor be required to pay higher taxes, but they also are least able to protect themselves against inflation.

The benefit increases provided under the Senate bill would almost completely wipe out any anti-inflationary impact of the payroll tax increase. The tax increase would hit those taxpayers who save a portion of their incomes and thus help dampen inflationary

pressures. At the same time, those who would receive higher benefits under the bill are the social security recipients who save little or none of their income.

The bill would also contribute to the pressures for higher wages—perhaps our most serious economic problem today—by reducing disposable income of a large segment of the American public. It would also raise business payroll costs directly and thus add to current pressures on profit margins and the temptation by business to increase prices. Whatever one might say about the Senate bill, it cannot be maintained that it would reduce inflationary pressures. The outlook is for price increases of about 4 percent next year in any event, or a reduction of about 25 percent in the purchasing power of the benefit increases approved by the Senate Committee.

Second, the Senate bill is also bad public policy because it is unjust to ask moderate and low-income taxpayers to carry the burden of fighting inflation. The average worker has already been hard-hit by higher taxes, shorter workweeks, and higher prices. The purchasing power of the average worker's weekly paycheck was actually lower this September than it was in September 1966. These are the same individuals who have also been hard-hit by the Administration's high interest rate policy that has sent rates on mortgages to more than 40-year highs.

Third, the Senate bill is also undesirable because the social security system is an inefficient and inequitable device for stabilizing the economy. Social security benefits should be voted on their merits, and the payroll tax should be adjusted to maintain a sound and secure system. The social security system is already required to play a welfare role, for which it was not designed. It is too much to expect that we can maintain a healthy system if it is also required to serve as an economic stabilizer.

Mr. Speaker, if the social security bill is sent to the Senate floor, with the provisions reported in the press, I hope the Administration will reverse the endorsement made by Secretary Cohen. The bill would soak low and moderate income taxpayers without having any anti-inflationary impact. By increasing pressure for wage increases and further squeezing profit margins, it could even add to price pressures. The chief victims, as is always the case, would be the unprotected poor.

## OBSERVATIONS ON MY RHODESIAN VISIT

(Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, the Honorable E. Richard Barnes, 78th District assemblyman, representing part of San Diego County, Calif., and a retired Navy captain, recently returned from a tour which included a thousand miles by automobile through Rhodesia, South Africa.

I believe his observations are most interesting, in view of his extensive background, and serve to illustrate that the Honorable Ian Smith is not the black-hearted slavemaster that he is characterized to be by our State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I include his comments to be printed following herewith in the RECORD:

### OBSERVATIONS ON MY RHODESIAN VISIT

(By Hon. E. Richard Barnes)

I found it necessary to cut short by three weeks my around-the-world trip due to the special session of the California Legislature

called by Governor Reagan for 6 November 1967. This necessitated a choice as to my itinerary: "Should I omit my visit to Rhodesia or drop the European portion of the schedule completely?" My wife and I chose to visit Rhodesia, and we are very pleased that we did. We have spent six wonderful days here, traveling by auto through about 1,000 miles of countryside, villages, and the capital city of Salisbury.

We have been really thrilled with our visit to this young vigorous nation. It is a land where the sky is high and wide, natural resources bountiful, the economy dynamic, the people open, friendly and enthusiastic. On all sides there is every evidence of an orderly, peaceful, prosperous program for all Rhodesians, both black and white.

The overseas media which has engaged in painting a distorted picture of Rhodesia as a grim, tense, explosive police state has, by my own observation, perpetrated a massive fraud! Nothing could be further from the truth. The government has placed 413 agitators, bomb throwers and terrorists into detention (the number as of now). I can attest that terror and fear are not known. City streets and country roads, day time or at night, are used by friendly, happy people of both races with absolutely no evidence of fear or trepidation. The white policeman and the African constable with a total of less than 6,000 are very little in evidence, yet you see here an orderly, law-abiding nation of nearly five million people.

I have noted a total absence of racial discrimination in public places. Mrs. Barnes and I, staying in an excellent modern hotel in Salisbury, the Ambassador, found that both white and black hotel guests were living peaceably together in the same hotel. The same is true of restaurants, movie houses and other public facilities.

We attended, as visitors, a session of the 60-member Rhodesian Parliament and found 15 duly elected African members sitting in that legislative body.

Highlighting everything else was my visit with Rhodesia's Prime Minister, the Hon. Ian Smith, a man of quiet dignity, keen mind, deep conviction and complete dedication to the basic fundamentals of Freedom with Responsibility, Justice and Fair Play for all. He and his associates in leadership whom I met, such as His Excellency Mr. C. DuPont, the officer administering the government, Lord Graham, Minister of External Affairs and Defense, and the Hon. I. Lardner-Burk, Minister of Justice, Law and Order, are the outstanding type of statesmen of whom any nation could be proud. They have a clear, factual understanding of their country, its people, economy and situation in relation to the grotesque external pressures being used against them.

They have no intention of permitting Rhodesia to be bulldozed into the cauldron of chaos, murder, rape, bloodshed and tyrannical disaster visited upon other parts of Africa to the north. And something else which is true which the world needs to know is that the 4½ million black African Rhodesians, as well as the 250,000 white African Rhodesians are irrevocably united behind Mr. Smith and the present government. In talking with many, many Rhodesians, both white and black, I found these observations and attitudes everywhere I went.

As an example I cite my visit to the home and headquarters of one of the very great Africans of Rhodesia, Chief Mzumuni Masuku. He is located some 65 miles back country from Bulawayo. Here you have an African leader of great dignity, wisdom and ability. A big man both physically and in leadership qualities, he is Vice-President of the Rhodesian Council of Chiefs of 16 to 20 members. This highest council is chosen by the 600 man Council of Chiefs representing the 4½ million blacks. He speaks quietly but with authority. He and his people are



bright Negro youngsters on the road to profitably satisfying careers."

Our adult seminar program has been expanded and now provides an extensive curriculum. Since our last report, ICBO councils in four cities have held more than 85 seminars and workshop sessions attended by over 300 clients. These range from down-to-earth instruction in accounting procedures, marketing, tax requirements, and credit criteria, to insurance needs, legal matters, public and customer relations. Among the outstanding new courses introduced in New York last year, for example, were the "Advertising in Action" workshop conducted by the advertising firm of Handman & Sklar, Inc., and seminars in franchising, and on the Fashion Industry. In all ICBO seminars, clients receive specific answers to their individual business problems, and have a chance to discuss these problems with their fellow students under the professional guidance of their instructors.

#### CONSULTANTS TO SMALL BUSINESS

When a client first comes to an ICBO office, he may be faced with any one of a dozen problems ranging from pricing policies to inventory control. A beginner may not have clearly in mind the sort of enterprise he hopes to launch. He may be going into the wrong business, or the right business in the wrong way (purchasing new equipment, for instance, instead of leasing it). If he lacks experience, it will probably be suggested that he attend ICBO seminars in his field. In any event, an unsentimental, informed appraisal of his chances to succeed must be made by the consulting panel.

Whether the client is a newcomer or already operating a business, an ICBO panel of specialists evaluates his enterprise in depth. The counseling group will nearly always include a white or Negro businessman who has made good in the same field. But the ICBO formula for counseling does not stop here. Should a man or woman want to open a dress shop, for example, there will not only be a successful dress shop owner on the panel, but also in many cases an accountant, insurance executive, a lawyer, and if need be, a real estate broker, public relations specialist, or marketing expert. Frequently the consulting team will hold a number of weekly two-hour sessions with the client to explore all areas of his business... his accounts, pricing, inventory, approach to sales promotion, etc. This approach brings to bear the creative energy of many specialists on a single project. At the same time, continuity is assured by having the originally assigned volunteer consultant maintain close contact with the client through the entire period of assistance.

Through this method, ICBO clients obtain counsel and assistance free of charge from the equivalent of a management consulting firm. The service, we believe, is unique in the field of non-profit counseling in that our volunteer specialists are able to offer practical guidance at no charge for almost any type of small business.

#### BANKING AND CREDIT

Is the minority businessman a "bankable" risk by conventional credit standards? Sometimes, but with depressing frequency the answer turns out to be no. The ICBO experience has established that obtaining funds for clients remains one of the most crucial problems for the Interracial Council. As one ICBO consultant observed: "All the excellent management advice in the world cannot put a businessman in business without money."

During 1966, our affiliates in every city reported difficulty in this regard. In Washington, D.C., where operations were just getting underway, results were negligible. ICBO clients in Newark received loans totaling \$20,000; in New York, \$105,700; in Los Angeles, \$223,100. But considerably greater amounts were needed by other clients—and were not obtainable.

No other problem has engaged the energies of ICBO national and local board members more intensively. Our representatives have been in close touch with the banking community and a growing number of banking executives have become members of ICBO, some of whom have been elected to our boards of directors.

It seems apparent that there may be more than one answer to Negro businessmen's needs for commercial loans: possibly selective relaxation of credit standards, guarantees of loans by private individuals, and the ICBO Fund which we hope will be a major innovation to help spearhead the changes so desperately needed in the traditional pattern of the established financial community's relationship with the Negro businessman.

Many months of hard work have resulted in the development of a unique lending program supported by commercial banking institutions, the ICBO, and a new lending system. The hub of this system will be the ICBO Fund, which is in the process of being established. The fund will be a non-profit entity with the sole purpose of guaranteeing in part loans made by the cooperating commercial banks to Negro businessmen.

The key to this program is that it will enable the ICBO to combine credit with business counseling. Our purpose is to create sound bank loans and to enhance the effectiveness of our consultant services by providing clients with opportunities for financing, without which they cannot derive optimum benefit from ICBO services. An essential aim of this program is to develop a personal, direct, and normal relationship between the lending bank and the borrower. The Fund's assets are to be derived from tax deductible contributions. We are grateful to the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation for making it possible to initiate this Fund with its grant of \$50,000 in capital and \$15,000 for operating expenses over a three year period. The pilot Fund will be available for minority businessmen in New York City. Hopefully it will serve as a prototype which can be duplicated in other ICBO cities. It may well be that this project will, in due course, establish a new relationship between the Negro business community and the commercial banks of the nation.

#### POVERTY WARRIORS AND COMMUNITY DISRUPTION

(Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter today and thought it would be of interest to the Members:

Hon. WILLIAM AYRES,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: My name is Paul H. Rittle. I am president of Rittle-Rosfeld Company, a real estate and insurance firm on the North Side of the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, specializing in property management. Last year I served as President of the Greater Pittsburgh Board of Realtors, and I have been active in civic and community betterment for over two decades.

I am addressing you because I would like to enumerate the experiences I have encountered with the local functionaries of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the local Community Action Program, and other persons or organizations supported entirely or partially by federal tax funds. These experiences go back over the past year, and today, my business continues to be harassed in one manner or another by personnel working under O.E.O. direction.

I therefore ask of you the opportunity to be heard, as I am prepared to testify, under

oath, regarding the extent to which United States tax-funded or tax-supported agencies and instrumentalities are being used to foment disrespect for the law, contribute to neighborhood unrest, and pursue a course of conduct which I cannot feel is sanctioned by the Congress which enacted legislation governing their activities.

I am prepared to introduce documentary evidence of my allegations, including photographs, identifying O.E.O. functionaries engaged in these dubious activities, circulars prepared and distributed through local O.E.O. or C.A.P. offices, which have the effect of fomenting civil disobedience and appearing to incite disorder by mass demonstration and protest.

In October of 1966, a group of demonstrators picket my place of business on at least seven occasions, among whom were Richard Ridenour and Barbara Gilbert, both of whom were assistant coordinators of the Community Action Program. These demonstrators assembled in the nearby Community Action Program Office, where they stored picket signs, stacked in full view, and bearing such provocative statements as "Rich Landlords—Poor Homes"—"This Is The Man"—"Slumlords Traffic in Human Misery"—"Would Riddle Live Here?"—all calculated to hold me in contempt and odium among the general public, as well as my office and the profession to which I am dedicated. Pickets were seen assembling and leaving this local office, as well as another nearby Community Action Office, on several occasions, thus leaving the inescapable conclusion that an agency of the federal government was being used as a staging area to create mass demonstrations and to harass and defame an individual businessman, his office, and his colleagues. It was necessary, on each occasion of the demonstrations, to request police protection to prevent outbreaks of disorder, as well as protect our clients and office personnel.

In August of 1967, another incident occurred, when about twenty to thirty youths, again under the direction of Mr. Ridenour, who is now the coordinator of the Community Action Program in this area, (Salary at \$17,000.00 per annum) stormed into my place of business, during business hours, and proceeded to shout, employing abusive language and uttering threats, again to the distress of my office staff, with the distinct possibility of fomenting a disorder in the neighborhood. After two requests to leave, they continued to block the front of the office, and after a third and direct appeal to Mr. Ridenour, they refused to leave until a call was made to the Mayor's Office and the City Solicitor, at which time Mr. Ridenour was summoned to the scene and was apparently requested or directed to leave the office, together with his employees. These same youths were being used under the Summer Youth Mobilization Program, under the guise of taking a poverty census, to approach tenants throughout the area citing alleged housing violations, and instructing them to pay their rent into a newly legislated Rent Withholding Fund, in many cases, prior to any recorded violations from either the County Health Department or the Building Inspection Department of the City of Pittsburgh.

Congressman Ayres, I certainly am not opposed to legitimate federal programs to alleviate poverty, even though it is my own belief that the present program is a monstrous fraud. I submit when tax funds are being used by local O.E.O. functionaries for purposes which presumably were never sanctioned by the Congress in setting up these programs, that the citizens have every right to demand redress of grievances from their Congress, and should further insist that an immediate investigation be made as to the extent to which local O.E.O. funds in the intricate and interlocking poverty programs contribute to neighborhood unrest and threats to civil disorder. I fail to understand why my tax money, and that of my associates



in the real estate industry in Pittsburgh, as well as my clients, can be legitimately used to foster an assault against our very own business by people and organizations who appear to have no sincere interest in truly ameliorating the plight of the poor people, and who in most instances are inexperienced and seem disposed only to indiscriminate programs of provocation of unrest among heretofore peaceful neighborhoods. I fail to understand why we must continue to endure these continuous assaults on our property, our employees, and even our own mental anguish, where we are constantly at the mercy of radical agitators wherever and whenever their whim so dictates. I cannot believe that it was intended that the tax-supported O.E.O. programs envisioned handbills, pamphlets, or brochures which were patently partisan and which attacked those who legitimately opposed certain governmental programs, and which conversely acted as a mouthpiece for legislation which they favored? This comes pretty close to paid government propaganda.

In sum, I respectfully request an opportunity to appear before your committee or a constituent group thereof, in order that I may present documentary evidence of what I have alleged in this communication. I do not believe an investigation of O.E.O. involvement in local civil disorder would be complete without a detailed account of our experiences in Pittsburgh.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL H. RITTLE,  
President.

#### A TOAST TO THE ENEMY

(Mr. DUNCAN (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night I visited a family of a deceased serviceman from my congressional district prior to his burial at Arlington National Cemetery today. This serviceman, T. Sgt. James C. Krause of Lenoir City, Tenn., was killed when his plane was shot down over North Vietnam by anti-aircraft weapons. On my way home from the mortuary I heard on the radio news that three more American planes were shot down yesterday over North Vietnam.

After reaching my home I was shocked to read in the newspaper the message of heartfelt best wishes which the President of our country and our Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces had sent to the Soviet Union in connection with the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Soviet Government. I was also tremendously shocked to see a picture of our Secretary of State drinking a vodka toast to the Government of Soviet Russia.

I wonder how our young men who are fighting and dying in the jungles of Vietnam will react to such best wishes to the enemy, the same enemy who just announced recently a sharp increase in aid to North Vietnam. Russia continues to pour huge amounts of material into Vietnam. Must we condone the fact that Russia is in this war up to her neck? They are supplying, among other things, anti-aircraft guns, machineguns, missiles, radar detection equipment, and rifles which are killing American boys in Vietnam. When our own Government sends best wishes and drinks toasts to the

enemy how can we expect the American people to realize the seriousness of the war in Vietnam and Russia's involvement? It is a disgrace and an insult to every American fighting man.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that while the House is debating the Economic Opportunity Act, commonly called the poverty bill, the New York Times should launch a disgraceful and unjustified attack on our colleagues, Congressmen GOODELL and QUIE, who are respected Members of the House.

In its lead editorial of Tuesday, November 7, the New York Times attacked Representatives GOODELL and QUIE for offering crippling amendments and in seeking political advantage in a situation that all Members of both sides of the aisle consider one of deep concern—that is, the presence of poverty in our affluent society.

It is especially distressing because for many years the New York Times has been loud in its criticism of the Republican Party for not offering constructive alternatives which in fact we have done and are doing with increasing regularity. Now, we find that when we do offer these alternatives, we are viciously criticized for attempting to cripple a program which almost everyone agrees can stand a lot of improvement. It is little wonder that meaningful debate is all but dead in this country. To the extent that it is, the New York Times surely qualifies as one of the principal pallbearers.

A constituent of mine sent me the editorial from the Times, expressing his approbation. I enclose the editorial and my answer to my constituent, together with those portions of my two biweekly reports which I called to his attention.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for all Members of this House who resent unjustified criticism of our respected colleagues, Congressmen CHARLES GOODELL and Congressman ALBERT QUIE. In point of fact, 90 percent of my heavy mail on this subject refers to "crippling amendments"—the 10-percent cash donations are—offered and adopted by members of the majority—Democratic—party.

The material referred to follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 7, 1967]

WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed

arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the \$30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of \$50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for pre-school youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievement of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now underway in the House.

Representatives Goodell of New York and Quie of Minnesota, the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty bill, insist they are all for the aims of the program but just want to improve it. But their voting record makes their substitute "Opportunity Crusade bill" look suspect.

In every year since the antipoverty program started in 1964, Messrs. Goodell and Quie have voted against final passage, for recommitment, and for every crippling amendment. The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

DEAR MR. —: If the editorial from the New York Times which you sent me speaks for you I want to make it clear that you and I are in total disagreement.

That editorial from the New York Times is one of the most shocking and discouraging editorials that I have read and, as you know, coming from New Hampshire, I have read some beauts.

There isn't one person in the United States House of Representatives that questions the sincerity and integrity of Congressman Charles Goodell of New York and Albert Quie of Minnesota. They are dedicated and hard-working Congressmen. They are deeply concerned about the problems of the poor and the problems of our country. They have an unquestioned record for developing constructive alternatives and creating the proper atmosphere for meaningful debate.

People like you and the New York Times should be ashamed of yourselves. You are quick to criticize Republicans for not suggesting constructive alternatives and then when we do you say that we are playing politics and that our alternatives are simply to "cripple."

You undoubtedly do not read my reports, but I do ask you to read excerpts from two of my recent biweekly reports in which I quote Mr. Moynihan. It appears that you and the New York Times are behind the times and I suggest that you ponder Mr. Moynihan's suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,  
Member of Congress.



EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND'S  
REPORT NO. 19

## FROM A LIBERAL: A SIGNIFICANT CONFESSION

One of the most significant statements that I have recently read was made by Daniel P. Moynihan, of M.I.T., a noted liberal. Speaking to a convention of the Americans for Democratic Action on September 23, Moynihan stated bluntly, and I quote: "Liberals must divest themselves of the notion that the nation, especially the cities of the nation, can be run from agencies in Washington." Moynihan went on to tell his audience of liberals that they must "see more clearly that their essential interest is in the stability of the social order, and that given the present threats to that stability, it is necessary to seek out and make much more effective alliances with political conservatives who share that concern, and who recognize that unyielding rigidity is just as much a threat to the continuity of things as is an anarchic desire for change." Mr. Moynihan was even kind enough to chide his liberal colleagues for having been "too long prisoners of the rhetoric that Republicans don't know anything about the social problems of the Nation, or in any event don't really care."

## AT LONG LAST: MEANINGFUL DEBATE?

The reason these remarks are so significant, is they may pave the way here in Washington, and indeed throughout the nation, for some true debate and some meaningful discussion about our social problems. One of my chief disappointments during the past five years has been the lack of real debate and meaningful discussion. On issue after issue when the minority party has come forth with constructive alternatives and carefully documented minority views, they have been almost totally unreported and brushed aside with charges of negativism, obstructionism, etc. Hopefully, we can now debate our problems in a constructive and meaningful manner, and get on with the job of solving them.

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND'S  
WASHINGTON REPORT NO. 21

## PROGRESS REPORT

In my Washington Report No. 19 I commented on what I consider to be a significant confession by a noted liberal, Daniel P. Moynihan, of M.I.T. I quoted his remarks that "liberals must divest themselves of the notion that the nation, especially the cities of the nation, can be run from agencies in Washington." He also warned liberals that they have been "too long prisoners of the rhetoric that Republicans don't know anything about the social problems of the Nation, or in any event don't really care." My reason for feeling these remarks were important was my hope they would pave the way for honest debate and that our questions, suggestions, and alternative proposals would not be brushed aside and ignored simply because Republicans made them. There is now some evidence that my hopes were well founded.

WFBG, ALTOONA, FAVORS COMPEN-  
SATION FOR CRIME VICTIMS

(Mr. SCHWEIKER (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, an important television and radio broadcaster in Pennsylvania, WFBG, of Altoona, has recently gone on record as favoring compensation for innocent victims of violent crimes.

In a persuasive editorial aired on both television and radio October 11 and 14, the station has called attention to the

"forgotten man in our society, the innocent, law-abiding citizen who becomes the victim of crime."

WFBG wisely urges that while efforts must be made to prevent crime and rehabilitate those convicted of offenses, more should be done by society for those who suffer injuries, medical expense and loss of income due to crime.

I was honored, Mr. Speaker, that WFBG mentioned in its editorial my recent bill, H.R. 13208, which would set up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission. I include in the RECORD at this point the text of the editorial:

## HEY, WHAT ABOUT ME?

We believe in rehabilitating the law violator . . . especially if he's a young one. We know the money, time and effort to put him back on the right track are well spent. We know if we don't rehabilitate him, we'll pay for his support in jail . . . on and off . . . for the rest of his life, and that he'll be a threat to society while he is free. So, we're all for backing every effort to restore him to useful citizenship.

But we're also among those who are getting just a bit fed up with the concentration on the criminal, while we ignore the innocent citizen he victimizes.

We're beginning to hear the protests of, "Hey . . . what about me?"

"Who's going to reimburse me?" What does he mean, reimburse? It depends. But included are costly medical care, lost earnings, the family that loses its breadwinner through some criminal act of violence. While society houses, feeds, and attempts to rehabilitate the guilty, no one provides for the innocent.

That's why we are in favor of legislation introduced last month by Congressman Dick Schweiker of Pennsylvania's 13th District. His bill provides for up to \$25,000 compensation to the victims of violent crime. This particular bill applies only to crimes committed in the District of Columbia and Federal installations, but would serve as a model for states to set up their own compensation plans for crime victims.

In our concentration upon the prevention of crime, and our efforts to turn the criminal from the error of his ways, we have ignored the plight of the "forgotten man" in our society . . . the innocent, law-abiding citizen who becomes the victim of crime.

Isn't it about time to pay some attention to his needs?

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KUPFERMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE THOMASITE TEACHERS IN THE  
PHILIPPINES

(Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines. These teachers were in their day precursors of today's Peace Corps.

To those pioneer teachers who left the security of their home shores to embark on a teaching mission of great uncertainty, this Nation and the present-day

Republic of the Philippines owe a debt of gratitude.

These brave teachers established the initial foundation for public education which has helped the Philippines become a bastion for democratic government and ideas in the often turbulent South Pacific area. The history of the Thomasite teachers is an interesting example of the worthwhile efforts of our Nation to help others in an earlier day.

At the close of hostilities ending the Spanish-American War, American military authorities laid the groundwork for a public school system in the Philippine Islands.

Under Spanish rule the education system of the Philippines provided training only for a privileged elite and was conducted in the Spanish language. This was changed as the American military authorities moved into the Philippine Islands.

Within 3 weeks of the American occupation, seven large schools in Manila were opened with instruction being provided by American soldiers who had previous teaching experience.

Enlargement of this program of public instruction was an immediate goal of the American Government and the professional American civilian schoolteachers were sought to supply the instruction. With the full support of President William McKinley, an education bill for the Philippines was passed by the Congress as Act No. 74 of the 56th Congress, January 21, 1901. The role of the special Civil Service Commission to carry out the provisions of the act were:

It will be the duty of the Commission to promote, and as they find occasion, to improve the system of instruction already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this, they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free for all and which shall tend to fit the people for duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocation of a civilized community. This instruction should be given, in the first instance, in every part of the islands in the language of the people. In view of the great number of languages spoken by the different tribes, it is especially important to the prosperity of the islands that a common medium of communication be established and it is obviously desirable that this medium should be the English language.

In carrying out this act, 508 young American teachers were selected by a national competition to establish the new public school system in the Philippine Islands. This group sailed for Manila on July 23, 1901, aboard the U.S. Army transport ship named the *Thomas*. This group became known in the Philippines as the Thomasites and they are still remembered today by that name.

A month later, on August 23, 1901, they arrived in Manila Bay. They soon departed for their posts in cities and villages scattered throughout the Philippine Islands.

The young Thomasite teachers faced many problems in their new life in a tropical country so different from previous experience on the American mainland. Health and medical care were primary problems. Many succumbed to malaria and other tropical diseases and several are buried in the old South Cemetery near Manila.



The Thomasites went into many places where there had been no previous schools or school buildings. They had to rely on their own resources in locating or constructing a suitable schoolhouse and in going about the many community development activities which are associated today with the work of the Peace Corps in underdeveloped areas.

Their activities, much to the surprise and often to the dismay of the natives who thought educated persons should not labor, ranged from the rudiments of family and community sanitation, nutrition and gardening, construction, athletic activities and, of course, teaching school. The teaching itself was to be considered a full-time job by many.

Classes were held for primary grades 5 hours a day, Monday through Friday, and adult education classes were held an hour and a half a day 3 days a week. The Thomasites found it necessary to improvise and prepare their own textbooks and teaching needs.

They succeeded in their endeavors to an extent far greater than was hoped for.

The Filipinos had long been divided by use of 87 dialects of their Malayo-Polynesian languages. As a direct result of the Thomasite endeavors in English instruction and in establishing a broad-based public education system, the Filipinos are not united with English as the official language of the Government and the common language of a broad range of social groups.

The Thomasites left behind a heritage of good will which is still kept alive. General Romulo, Secretary of Education and contemporaneously president of the University of the Philippines, the oldest and most important state university in the Philippines and a leader among universities in East Asia, has written:

The American school teachers joined with us in creating the literature, the knowledge, the self-confidence, and devotion to democracy on which it was possible to establish our Republic.

In an article entitled "From the Thomas to Santo Tomas," a Thomasite student, a former Secretary of Education, Dr. Cecilio Putong, wrote of this accumulation of good will for the Thomasites:

I consider the development of the ideals of democracy, and of high regard for democratic institutions as the best contribution of the early American teachers to Philippine education.

Mr. Pilar Hidalgo Lim, president of Centro Escolar University at Manila, and a veteran social worker, wrote of the Thomasite teachers:

They carried out the implementation of English language all over the Islands so that the Filipinos could understand each other in spite of all the many dialects.

A former president of the Philippine Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Concepcion M. Henaes, wrote the following of the Thomasites:

They popularized education, which is no longer a privilege of the rich.

A former Associate Justice of the Philippine Supreme Court, the Honorable Alejo Labrador, wrote of the Thomasites:

They made the school attractive to the students.

The last known surviving member of the original group of 508 Thomasite teachers is Mr. Henry H. Balch, of 512 Eustis Avenue, SE., Huntsville, Ala.

Mr. Balch has pointed out that the work of the Thomasites, like the work of today's Peace Corps volunteers, is also an exercise in international diplomacy. In a letter to the American Embassy in Manila Mr. Balch wrote:

The Filipinos opposed United States assuming control of the Philippines at the end of Spanish rule in 1898, and fought us bitterly. The Thomasite teachers did much to heal that serious breach between Filipinos and Americans. As we ponder now over Vietnam, it may be well to know that in the end the Filipinos were our friends—not our enemies.

On his arrival in the Philippines, Mr. Balch was assigned to teach mathematics and English at Lucena, Quezon—then Tayabas—Province in southern Luzon, serving also on occasions as substitute music teacher and choir conductor. Among his former students were former Philippine Chief Justice Ricardo Paras, and Mrs. Paz M. Benitez, who recalls that one day toward the end of World War II when she and her family were camped out in a tent, an American Army officer, Capt. Jackson Balch, searched her out on the instructions of his father. The old Thomasite teacher had asked his son to see if there was anything that could be done for his former pupils.

Henry H. Balch will be 91 years old on January 6, 1968. He joined the U.S. Foreign Service in 1913 after 12 years of teaching in the Philippines. He served his country with distinction. In the Philippines and in Foreign Service posts throughout the world he was abroad for more than 40 years. He retired from the Foreign Service after achieving the rank of consul general.

He is dedicated to the memory of the Thomasites and to the spirit which they expressed in service to their native country, as well as to the foreign land to which they were assigned. One of his most treasured possessions today is the original log of the transport Thomas which carried the Thomasites to the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, I have submitted, for appropriate reference, a resolution to extend the greetings of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Congress of the Philippines in commemoration of the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

#### MICRONESIA: THE FORGOTTEN ISLANDS

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 of this year, I called for congressional action to determine the wishes of the Micronesian people as to the future political status of their islands. At that time I introduced House Joint Resolution 594 to set up a nine-member Commission which would, within 1 year, make a full and complete investigation and study of

the ways in which we could best ascertain the views of the Micronesian islanders on their own political status. On July 17, the Micronesian Senate formally approved my resolution and urged its adoption by the U.S. Congress.

I was delighted when Senator FONG, who had already introduced his own resolution dealing with the future relationship of a number of our territorial possessions to the United States, welcomed my approach to this problem. Subsequently, on July 18 the majority leader of the Senate introduced Senate Joint Resolution 96 to create a 15-member Commission for the same purpose.

In a message to the Congress on August 21, the President gave renewed recognition to our obligation to foster the economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territory and to promote their development toward self-government and independence. Pointing out that in 1966 the Micronesian Congress had asked the President to create a commission for study of the island's future status, President Johnson submitted a joint resolution to the Congress for creation of a 17-member Commission to study and assess all factors bearing on the future of the trust territory. Under the terms of the President's resolution, the Commission is directed to submit its recommendations to the President and Congress on ways to provide for the free expression of the Micronesians' views on their political future.

I feel strongly that the attention we are now focusing on the Micronesian Islands is overdue. Our mandate stems from the strategic trusteeship agreement executed between the United States and the United Nations in 1947, and, as Senator MANSFIELD very candidly admitted in a floor speech introducing his resolution, "the American record of administration has not been a good one." Although we were charged with heavy responsibilities for the welfare and progress of these islanders, we did little more at first than maintain the status quo. During the 1960's, we have significantly improved our efforts to promote the advancement of the islanders; and just this year Congress approved the administration's request for a 100-percent increase in authorization from \$17.5 million to \$35 million.

Recently, Robert Trumbull of the New York Times has written a series of articles summarizing his observations on the situation in Micronesia after several visits to the islands. These articles clearly portray the many problems to be overcome in moving toward self-determination for the Micronesians and also underline the urgent need for beginning what is bound to be a long process.

The articles follow:

MICRONESIA: 2,141 ISLANDS FORGOTTEN BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Robert Trumbull)

SAIPAN, MARIANAS ISLANDS.—Leaders among the more than 90,000 Micronesians under United States rule are demonstrating growing disenchantment with the American administration of the United Nations trusteeship.

Peace Corps workers and other Americans—officials as well as visitors—also voice



In order that the Congress may be fully informed in the premises, I quote the indicated letter to the editor and the editorial, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1967.

The Editor,  
Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: The editorial, "Disappointment in Panama", in the September 7 issue of the Washington Post, is significant not only for what it states but also for what it does not say about one of the gravest questions now before the Nation. The Panama Canal, including acquisition of the Canal Zone, its construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection from 1904 to June 30, 1966, represents an investment by U.S. taxpayers of \$1,951,600,000. With defense added, the total becomes \$4,889,051,000, involving budgets of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

As historically developed, the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States, now embodied in treaty and law, has these objectives: the best site and best type of canal for the transit of vessels of all nations on terms of equality with tolls that are just and equitable and under the exclusive control of the United States. Under this policy our country has full sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone to the exclusion of the exercise of any such rights, power and authority by Panama as well as ownership through purchase from individual owners of all land and property in the Canal Zone, making this territory a U.S. Government reservation.

Experience has shown that such control is indispensable because Panama is an area of chronic political instability, endemic revolution, and altogether unable to defend either itself or the canal enterprise. Furthermore, it must always be borne in mind that Panama, located on a narrow strategic Isthmus, is a country deeply coveted by predatory powers. Its security absolutely depends on the presence there of United States armed might for defense. Realistic thinking can lead to no other conclusion.

In resolving the canal problem the key issues that must be considered are:

(a) Safeguarding our indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Canal.

(b) Increasing the capacity and the major operational improvement of the existing canal, on which project some \$75,000,000 have been expended, mainly on excavations for larger locks at Gatun on the Atlantic side and Miraflores on the Pacific.

(c) Constructing a new Panama Canal of so-called sea level (tidal lock) design to replace the existing canal.

(d) Building a second canal at a site other than the Canal Zone, including Nicaragua as a possible location.

The so-called Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, authorized under gag rule legislative procedure in 1964 that precluded adequate debate, is not an independent, broadly-based body that the situation requires but merely a part time consulting board for an inquiry rooted in the Executive Branch of our government and limited by statute to the consideration of one predetermined objective—a so-called sea level project. This undertaking is supported by the manufacturers of heavy earth-moving machinery and related industrial and professional interests and has a glamorous appeal not justified by its inherent merits.

The three mob-incited treaties, recently negotiated between the United States and Panama, are not based upon the relative values of the issues involved but were formulated on the erroneous assumption that the positions taken by the U. S. negotiators are a fait accompli because their main points were in a Presidential pronouncement.

Linking the negotiation of a treaty for the existing canal with treaties for a new canal of so-called sea level design and defense bases has endangered our control over the Canal Zone and present Canal, jeopardizing the security of the Western Hemisphere. Moreover, the chairman of the study group and of the U. S. treaty negotiating team is the same person, Hon. Robert B. Anderson of Texas, who apparently has ignored Clause 2, Section 3, Article IV, of the U. S. Constitution, which gives the Congress (House and Senate) sole jurisdiction over the disposal of "territory or other property belonging to the United States." As a result, some 150 members of the House have supported resolutions opposing the projected giveaway of the Panama Canal and its indispensable protective frame, the Canal Zone.

Thus, the "stall" on the treaties and delay in extending the life of the sea level canal study group are real blessings that have enabled the Congress to go more deeply into the subject while there is still time to avoid tragic error. As to the House being the "seat of hard shell opposition", this is true because many of its members have studied the subject and understand it. The statement that the opposition of the House invites crisis is utterly without foundation.

The additional facilities needed for the Panama Canal are a two-way ship channel across the Isthmus, with ample lock capacity, a summit level anchorage at Pacific end of the canal to match the arrangement at the Atlantic end, the elimination of the locks at Pedro Miguel, and the consolidation of all Pacific locks south of Miraflores.

The two-way ship channel will be completed, according to official estimates, in 1971 and the needed modernization can be supplied by the Terminal Lake Third Lock Plan. This plan is the obvious, simple, tested and comparatively inexpensive method for increasing capacity and improving operations; and it would leave intact the great value of the present canal to the economy of Panama. In addition, it requires no new treaty with Panama, which factor has been fully shown to be a paramount consideration.

It is clear that the ultimate goal of the radical elements in Panama is to drive the United States entirely from the Isthmus upon the specious arguments that our presence there invites attack on the Canal and that this danger would be entirely obviated if Panama should come into complete control of the Canal enterprise. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The history of communism in the Western Hemisphere, including Panama, clearly shows that only the presence of the United States in Panama today prevents a Red takeover of the Canal as it exists, Panama itself, and, ultimately, and the remainder of Latin Americans. What has taken place in Cuba will certainly repeat itself at Panama. The transcendent issue is not U.S. control over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian but U.S. sovereignty over the Zone versus Communist control.

These are some of the reasons why this response to your editorial is written and it is to be hoped that its publication can be made without change or abridgement.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1967]

#### DISAPPOINTMENT IN PANAMA

Panama's president, in negotiating new treaty arrangements for the Panama Canal, committed the classical error of getting out too far ahead of his legislature and electorate. The unfortunate result is that the new treaties—for the existing canal, defense, and a new sea-level ditch—in effect are dead until after the Panamanian elections next May and the American elections next November. What the political climate will be in 1969, now seen

as the earliest time when ratification could be broached, is beyond forecasting.

The failure to move on the treaties is, if not a disaster, a major disappointment. The United States loses, for the time being, the diplomatic fruits of the enlightenment which led President Johnson in 1964 to agree to abrogate the old unequal treaty and negotiate a fair new one. Panama loses, for now, the opportunity to set straight the central element of its national existence. Both countries lose the specific commercial, financial and military advantages the new treaties were intended to bestow.

The pity of it is multiplied by the apparent fact that Panamanians have voiced no concrete disagreement with the substance of the treaties but rather have enveloped them in a mist of nationalistic bitterness. Personal and political backbiting has added a heavy increment to the inevitable burden of small-country frustration which the treaties have had to bear. Panama now talks of "renegotiating" them. The United States is willing to inspect revisions the Panamanians may have in mind but to "renegotiate" an accord, itself the product of 2½ years of negotiation, is obviously another matter. The United States has proved its good faith. The next move is Panama's.

Although there is little demand for occasion for the United States to do anything now, this country has good reason—in commerce, defense, diplomacy and self-respect—to secure canal arrangements acceptable to Panama. This need exists apart from Panama's own hang-up. To have major interests vulnerable to unsettled and antagonistic currents in another country is not only a dagger but a reproach. Over time, the United States must try to encourage Panama's cooperation. It can do this by treating Panama with tact and sympathy and by following wise policies in Latin America as a whole.

The stall on the treaties forces the United States to look harder outside Panama for other possible sites of a sea-level canal. (This necessity is, of course, a form of pressure on Panama to collect itself and come around.) Here the immediate problem is to assure the continued life of the agency planning the new canal; the legislative mandate of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission expires next June. The Senate has passed a bill to extend this Commission but the House, seat of the hard-shell opposition to the new treaties, has not. It should. To balk a new canal, while the status of the old is uncertain, is to invite crisis.

#### WOMEN'S JOB CORPS DOUBLES POPULATION OF UPSTATE TOWN

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear reports of the successful fulfillment of some of the goals of the war on poverty, and it is especially encouraging to hear of the healthy and strong relations that have been established between the Office of Economic Opportunity projects and the communities in which they operate.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a story which appeared recently in the Philadelphia Bulletin about the town of Drums, Pa., and the Keystone Women's Job Corps Center in my congressional district. This is an encouraging and wonderful report of the kind of good relations that have grown around the Keystone Center—a report



which my colleagues may profit from reviewing. I place this article in the RECORD at this point:

**WOMEN'S JOB CORPS DOUBLES POPULATION OF UPSTATE TOWN**

(By Doris B. Willey of the Bulletin Staff)

**HAZLETON.**—The town of Drums in the coal country upstate has a normal population of 365.

Since March, the population has more than doubled with the arrival of 475 girls at the former industrial school for boys at nearby Kys-Lyn.

The girls, between the ages of 16 and 21, have not only increased the town's size, they have integrated it racially.

And, according to Joseph R. Corcoran, director of the Keystone Job Corps Center for Women, the experience has been a mutually pleasant one.

**SEVENTY PERCENT NEGRO**

Corcoran explained that 70 percent of the 475 girls at the job center are Negro. Drums, six miles north of Hazleton, is an all-white community.

"The community response has been great," Corcoran said. "Not only have we not had any ugly incidents, it's been quite the opposite.

"Our girls have been invited to private homes, they have been overnight guests, they share in church functions, have helped in a tree-planting program to beautify an industrial park and are working in a number of places."

**VARIED JOBS**

In Hazleton and in Wilkes-Barre, 22 miles to the north, he said, they hold jobs in hospitals, banks, supermarkets and the county courthouse.

The girls have taken eagerly to the wide-range of vocational and academic courses provided by the center. "They're waiting at the door before classes start," Corcoran said.

The result has been training in productive skills and in some cases a desire to continue their education.

Four of the girls, Corcoran said, have taken examinations given by the Luzerne County Board of Education to earn high school diplomas.

**COLLEGE COED**

Another girl, who already had her diploma, has enrolled this fall as a freshman at Allegheny College. Still another intends to continue living at the center while she attends classes at Wilkes College in Wilkes-Barre.

"The girls are absorbing classwork surprisingly quickly," Corcoran said. "What we expected to take a year is handled in half that time. They are given a challenge, appreciate it and look for greater challenges."

The dropout rate is 6.2 percent. The biggest reason for dropping out is homesickness occurring in the first few days or weeks.

The trainees come from farmlands in the Deep South, from crowded sections of northern cities and as far away as the Virgin Islands.

**GAP IS BRIDGED**

"They have to get used to a whole new set of people and a new environment," Corcoran said. "It's quite an adjustment."

He calls the dropout rate "one of the lowest of the centers," and attributes it to the 12 counselors at the center and to the town's Community Relations Council "which bridged the gap between the center and the community."

The council, Corcoran said, is a group of local citizens including the mayors of Hazleton and Cunningham, doctors, clergy and businessmen "all interested in the kind of objectives we are trying to achieve."

He called it "a grand opportunity for the girls" and added, "Most of the people feel it's also a grand opportunity for the town."

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FLOOD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FLOOD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FLOOD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

**THE DAYS OF HIGH IDEALISM**

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on November 11 the Nation will pause in memory and in honor of the veterans of all our wars who have unselfishly and bravely fought to maintain our independence, preserve our liberty and perpetuate our freedom. At this time, I come before the House with my salute to all American veterans, to express to them my gratitude for the heroic courage with which they fought their country's foes on many a farflung battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn back the tide of time to our first observance of November 11 in the year 1918. I remember well the day when the 11th minute after the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month marked the end of World War I. All over the earth people went mad with joy. Men everywhere momentarily forsook their tasks. Doctors left the sick, lawyers the courtrooms, students the academic halls, merchants their counters, clerks their desks, workmen their jobs, women their homes—all to flock into the streets of little towns and the avenues of cities everywhere, and there give way to a joyful, carefree carnival of happiness—because the end had come to the most frightful armed conflict which had occurred in the annals of human history.

As I am grateful for the unselfish service of all our veterans, in like manner I can never forget the heroic veterans of World War I. Their day in our history records a time of high idealism. I am proud of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS and other Veterans organizations who have kept burning bright the fires of patriotism renewed by the courageous soldiery of World War I—men now grown old in faithful service to their country, men whose feet once in unison quickened to the march, men whose strong hands grasped the rifle and upheld the banner of its cause. They now pass on to the veterans of World War II, Korea, and

Vietnam the sacred trust of guarding the sentry post of liberty and of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, such men, the Kaiser thought, would not fight. The teutonic allies deluded themselves by thinking that a supposed frenzy of materialism with dollarmaking as its god had possessed the soul of the United States. They little reckoned that the patriotism first aroused by Patrick Henry, sustained by Daniel Webster, flamed to red-hot heat by Thurston's plea for Cuban liberty, had been outraged by the heartless sinking of the *Lusitania*, and the destruction of American life on the open seas. Germany and Austria were soon to learn how sadly they had miscalculated the spirit of America. Having goaded a peace-loving, but mighty democracy into the conflagration of world war by a submarine blockade unfair and reprehensible, cruel and unmerciful, at a time when the allied armies were exhausted, they found the power of America alined against their monarchical militarism and their tyrannical ambitions of conquest.

As the Colonials under General Washington at Trenton surprised the trained Hessians fighting the battles of a British King, so did the Americans under General Pershing surprise the picked regiments of the German Empire on the battlefields of the world war. With an energy that was both amazing and wonderful, the United States poured its materials and its men into the gigantic struggle. The Allied Nations found new hope. Lloyd George, wartime Premier of Great Britain, declared:

I rejoice that the advent of the United States into this war gives the final stamp and seal to the conflict as a struggle against military autocracy throughout the world.

The Belgian Minister in the United States rejoiced.

The entrance of the United States into the war gives us new courage.

Within a period of 6 months after Congress had declared war, the Nation had expanded billions of dollars for guns, weapons, and ammunition. It trained millions of men for the greatest conflict in the history of mankind. Back of this stupendous preparation was the American love of liberty and of free government. President Woodrow Wilson, a great idealist, declared that for us the war was a struggle to make the world safe for democracy. Men everywhere were thrilled by the idealism of the United States when President Wilson declared that we sought only peace, a peace without victory, a Christian peace without revenge or retribution. This superb idealism, this wonderful national altruism united the people in every section of the country. Labor and capital forgot their differences. Democrats and Republicans joined hands. They combined their epithets against the common enemy. Great industries were taken over by the Government. Ammunition, food, clothing, and every necessary supply was furnished by our country to the Allied armies. America's idealism and patriotic energy became the sustaining morale of the Allied Nations at the most critical hour in the awful carnage and conflict.



as: First, overall cost of the program; second, employee participation; and third, types of awards being made.

This report, House Report No. 885, reveals such findings as these:

Program controls and procedures appear excessive, resulting in frequent undue delays in evaluating suggestions.

There are too many awards committees.

Departments and agencies report measurable benefits of some \$6 for every \$1 spent on the incentive awards program. However, in very few instances did the subcommittee find "saved funds" actually returned to the U.S. Treasury.

The departments and agencies often use a quota system in making awards, instead of the awards being given to employees on the basis of merit.

The Civil Service Commission's monitoring of the program is inadequate.

Several of the departments and agencies—especially the military departments—have two or more duplicating programs aimed at the same general objective—to improve operations.

The subcommittee has made several recommendations in the report aimed at improving the effectiveness of this program. These include: A "more positive and active role" by the Civil Service Commission in monitoring the program; and, the General Accounting Office and Bureau of the Budget should more closely review and audit, according to their separate interests, the financial aspects of the awards program.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### HEMISFAIR 1968

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, from April to October, next year, people from around the world will come to San Antonio, Tex., to enjoy the wonders of HemisFair '68, in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio. The theme of HemisFair is: "The Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas." HemisFair is an official international exposition, approved by the Bureau of International Expositions, and accordingly, more than one hundred foreign governments have been invited by the United States to participate in this "Fair of the Americas." In addition to Federal assistance, the city of San Antonio, the State of Texas, and local businessmen and other citizens have made a substantial commitment of funds and resources to help assure the success of HemisFair. Cooperation from interested groups, both public and private, at all levels, has been nothing short of tremendous. For example, the U.S. Travel Service, an agency of the Department of Commerce, has included HemisFair in its promotional efforts to encourage overseas visitors to come to America. Last month, the Travel Service arranged

for a presentation and the showing of a movie on HemisFair to a delegation of some 400 American travel agents, meeting in Athens, Greece. With this kind of constructive partnership, there is every reason to hope that HemisFair will rank with the finest international expositions of this century.

#### ANOTHER FACE OF POVERTY

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, poverty, wherever it exists, is ugly. Its effect on children is hideous. Quite rightly, the desperate plight of slum children has been spotlighted in the search for answers to the urban crisis. But the crush of poverty is just as ugly and just as devastating in some of the less-often-seen rural areas. This is especially so in the case of the hundreds of thousands of rootless, often hopeless children in the families of migrant farmworkers. A recent editorial in the AFL-CIO News reminds all of us of this other face of poverty. Under unanimous consent I place it at this point in the RECORD, and recommend it to the consideration of all of our colleagues:

#### ANOTHER FACE OF POVERTY

Grinding poverty and deprivation has many faces including the quarter of a million children who lead the rootless life of migrant farm workers.

They are members of migratory families that follow the picking season across the nation. They leave school in the spring when seasonal farm labor is on the rise and do not return until two or three months after the regular school term has begun.

The result, according to the Dept. of Agriculture, is "a lower educational attainment than any other group of American children."

Half of all migratory workers were in families with an income below \$3,000 a year. The short work year and low wages spell deadend for these mostly white workers.

In the overwhelming concern for solutions to the urban crisis, the migratory farm workers must not be forgotten. Their poverty and the fate of their children call for the same attention as that given those in the slums and ghettos of the cities.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### VETERANS DAY, 1967

(Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, 49 years ago, on November 11, 1918, the warring nations signed an armistice that ended the fighting in World War I. For many years the anniversary of this date was observed as Armistice Day. More recently we have set aside the day as a day of

recognition for all those, living and dead, who have served in our Armed Forces.

Since the birth of our Nation each generation has had to demonstrate its dedication to the ideals of freedom and peace. When necessary, our heritage has been heroically defended on battlefields around the world. This is the price we have had to pay for liberty.

We can never really repay our veterans for the hardships they endured and the sacrifices they made in the service of their country. Those who made the supreme sacrifice are with us today in spirit. Those who are spared have known the horrors of war and starkness of tyranny; they have returned to civilian life determined to build a better world that their comrades may not have died in vain.

Veterans Day, then, is a day when we visit the graves of our heroic veterans and express, in a small way, our gratitude to those who fought in the forces of freedom. It is a day on which we remember with pride their courage, devotion, and sacrifice. It is a day on which we reassert our dedication to the principles that have guided our Nation and reaffirm our determination to continue the struggle to bring freedom and lasting peace to the world.

#### PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

(Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, accomplishments in aeronautics, science, and space occur so frequently and swiftly in our time that we often take these accomplishments for granted. I find it hard to believe, for example, that Pan American World Airways was 40 years old on Saturday, October 28.

Few of us who were old enough paid much attention when a small, light-weight Fokker trimotor slipped into the waters off Key West, Fla., and flew 90 miles to Havana, Cuba. That was the first Pan Am flight, Mr. Speaker, on the 28th of October 1927. Whether skepticism prevailed on the part of prospective passengers, or within the operating organization, will never be known for certain, but beyond its crew of three the plane's manifest consisted of seven bags of mail.

All at once, Mr. Speaker, U.S.-flag international air service was born, and, less than 2 years later, Pan Am had established an air route around South America.

In the last 40 years, it has flown more than 70 million passengers, approximately equal to the combined populations of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Denmark. From its first eight-passenger Fokkers, through the famed ocean-spanning flying boats to today's 575-mile-an-hour jetliners, its clippers have flown more than 2 billion miles. If you got in the family car and traveled at a steady 60 miles an hour, 24 hours a day, it would take you about 3,800 years to cover 2 billion miles.

By the time Pan Am was 20 years old, it had won world fame for its pioneering



efforts in spanning the Pacific—1935; the Atlantic—1939; and providing the first round-the-world air service—1947.

In 1958, it introduced to the world scheduled jet air service, and it will be the first airline to use the 747 Superjet, in the fall of 1969. It was also the first airline to order a supersonic airliner—the Anglo-French Concorde—and has placed orders for 15 American-flag SST's to be produced by the Boeing Co.

The Pan American pioneers are to be saluted on their memorable 40th anniversary, Mr. Speaker, and I take pleasure in doing that in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. To its chairman and founder, Mr. Juan T. Trippe; to its president and pioneer pilot, Harold E. Gray; and to its 35,000 dedicated employees scattered to the four corners of the world, we say "well done" as we look forward to its next chapter of exciting pioneering.

#### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my deeply felt privilege today to be able to note the absence of the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and to call the attention of this body to the distinction which is being conferred upon him—and upon us—at this moment in New York.

We are all aware, from our service with him, of the great and unusual qualities of mind and heart which have made him the winner of the Albert Lasker Public Service Award. These qualities have made him a forceful advocate of many major pieces of legislation which have worked and continue to work to improve the life of the people of this great Nation.

In his first year in the Congress—when he took his seat as the 36-year-old junior Senator from Florida—he made one of his great concerns the fight to conquer disease and extend the useful and meaningful span of life. As a new member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and a close friend of our great President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was an effective cosponsor of the legislation which established the first of our National Institutes of Health—the National Cancer Institute.

Later, in the difficult days of the Second World War, he plunged both his boundless vitality into the task of assessing the wartime health and education of the American people as chairman of a Senate Labor Subcommittee established for that purpose. Out of the mass of information of the shortcomings of our health and education facilities, which was developed under his leadership, the basis was laid for the creation of additional National Institutes of Health in the immediate postwar years. And out of the work of that committee came the national concern for better insurance which led ultimately to the adoption of

medicare program upon his return to the Congress as a distinguished Member of this body.

The distinction being conferred upon our colleague at the Albert Lasker Awards luncheon today honors this body and the work on behalf of medical legislation in which so many Members have played an outstanding part. I am sure we are all pleased at this recognition of our colleague's long record of achievement in this vital field of public policy, and I am personally pleased to be able to consider him a loyal and wonderful friend.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a New York Times editorial published November 4 contains a paragraph of warning for groups interested in the future of the Public Broadcasting Act signed this week by President Johnson.

The act is a good beginning, the Times says, but then warns that:

It does not create a noncommercial network. It may not be immune from government as well as indirect commercial network pressure. Here is where citizens' groups may serve a continuing watchdog role.

Mr. Speaker, I think the warning is timely and appropriate. I believe many of us are hopeful, as the Times says:

TV may yet attain its potential as an instrument of informational, cultural, and educational programming for adult minds and tastes.

I hope that citizens' groups will play an important role in promotion and oversight of public broadcasting. I hope, too, that the private foundations that contributed so much to getting public broadcasting off the ground will retain their financial stake and interest.

I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### TELEVISION FOR ADULTS

In the eyes of the American TV public, the major development this season is that old Hollywood films are bigger than ever. These have been enjoyable, though not necessarily educational. Now there are hopeful signs that TV may yet attain its potential as an instrument of informational, cultural and educational programming for adult minds and tastes.

Congress has approved the Public Broadcast Act of 1967 and the President is expected to sign it into law. The act—which covers radio, too—extends funds for the construction of educational broadcasting facilities and orders a major study of instructional television.

Its key title sets up a nonprofit Public Broadcast Corporation with a modest one-year, \$9-million authorization. Noncommercial stations will be allowed to take tentative steps toward interconnection for major events, and programming "primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes" will be underwritten as grants—but not produced by the Government corporation itself.

There are some compromises in the act which could seriously affect public broadcasting. For one, the corporation's fifteen-member board, all Presidential appointments with the Senate's consent, includes a balancing

section between the political parties; politics should have been left out altogether. For another, there is an ambiguous caution against editorializing which could result in undue timidity.

Two other encouraging developments are the foundation-financed Public Broadcast Laboratory, which begins a two-hour Sunday experimental series on educational stations (Channel 13 here) this Sunday, and the establishment of the private, nonprofit International Broadcast Institute, including distinguished broadcasters from five continents which will help to promote knowledge about use of satellites and exchange of the many fine programs produced around the world.

The Public Broadcast Act is a good beginning, though it is a far cry from a B.B.C. for the United States. It does not create a noncommercial network. It may not be immune from Government as well as indirect commercial network pressures. Here is where citizens' groups may serve a continuing watchdog role.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective parts of the war on poverty has been the Job Corps program. Yet few elements of the work being done by the Office of Economic Opportunity have been belittled so regularly or so vehemently. I recommended the following article, written by an editorial writer for the Minneapolis Star, to all those who would cut back or eliminate the Job Corps:

#### ON A JOB CORPS "CAMPUS" (By Harold Chucker)

LINCOLN, NEBR.—It takes six months, in a trade or vocational school, to teach a youngster to become a meat cutter. Here, in the Lincoln Job Corps Center, the same skills are taught in from 20 to 30 teaching days.

The difference is even more striking when the nature of the "student body" is considered. Most of the 1,100 Job Corps trainees at this former Strategic Air Force base are Negroes from urban ghettos or poverty-stricken rural areas. There are smaller numbers of whites, Indians and Spanish-Americans, but all share one thing in common: they are dropouts or push-outs from school, with no technical and few social skills.

That they can learn certain jobs skills swiftly, despite a lack of basic skills and often an initial lack of motivation, is clearly demonstrated at this Job Corps camp. A systems approach to education, plus liberal dosages of "carrots", are being used by Northern Systems Co., a subsidiary of Northern Natural Gas Co., to prove the point.

Northern Systems is one of 10 corporations operating Job Corps camps. Although it was the last to enter the field, it believes its plan of programmed learning makes it the first from the point of speed and thoroughness of training.

The Lincoln center teaches cooking, carpentry, electrical work, bricklaying, heating and air conditioning and automotive mechanics on three "campuses," with vocational training, residential living and general education integrated on each campus.

In the technical training, job skills are broken down into their simplest component parts. On the culinary "campus," for instance, a youth is first introduced to meat cutting knives, and is shown how to hold them and sharpen them. At the next step,



or station, he learns how to clean the tools and work area, and even how to wash his hands. At successive stations, he progresses to cutting, weighing, and packaging meats, for supermarket counters or for use in restaurant kitchens, and then on to preparation of food.

Trainees progress from station to station at the rate at which they learn, and can "graduate" into the job world at any place on the line. There is no timetable, and there are few instructors in view. Instead, there are monitors—trainees who have advanced through a number of stations and then are sent back to help others.

Nothing is taught in isolation. Trainees use the same tools all along the line, continually building up their skills. As monitors, the students learn responsibility and how to deal with others, especially those with anti-social attitudes.

Along with the work at the stations are "backup" classes, where instructors—all of them skilled craftsmen rather than teachers—talk each step of the job through with the trainees. The youths are encouraged to talk about the work.

In addition to the technical training, there are visible incentives throughout the camp. Signs at successive training stations, for instance, tell the trainees that "if you have advanced this far, you can get a job paying \$1.85 an hour."

There are also certain amenities which are held out as "carrots." When the trainees arrive at the camp, they are assigned to bleak cubicles in the former barracks. As they advance in training, they progress to consistently better living quarters, until as seniors, they find themselves in comfortable, well-decorated rooms comparable to a good motel.

Those who get into trouble, for fighting or destroying property, find themselves in a "readjustment area"—a featureless room with eight cots and little else. After individual counseling, about 85 per cent of these "problem" students return to the "campus." The rest leave the center permanently.

"It's a real world here," Welcome T. Bryant, director of the center, commented. "These kids have been through it all, and now they're getting a chance to make it. They're finding, for the first time, that it doesn't hurt to work with a system."

Bryant, a Negro and a former assistant superintendent of schools in Omaha, enjoys a close rapport with many of the trainees. "You have to be real with them," he said. "You can't be phony, trying to show how much you like them. They don't believe it."

Relations with the communities of Omaha and Lincoln are correct, if somewhat cool. The camp officials have rejected invitations to become involved in teen-age affairs in those cities. Organized social activities for the trainees are restricted mostly to parties with trainees at a Job Corps center for girls in Omaha.

There are attempts, however, to involve the center with the townspeople. Open houses are held frequently. The gymnasium and swimming pool—built by the Air Force when it occupied the base—are opened regularly for children.

"The only people we have trouble with are those who won't come out to take a look," Bryant said.

The Job Corps Center is advantageous for all concerned. Northern Systems operates it at a profit, on a cost plus fixed fee contract with the federal government. Lincoln owns the land on which the camp is located; without the center, the community would have to enter the costly industrial development competition. Gaining most of all are the trainees, who are learning marketable skills.

The systems analysis approach is working so well that Northern Systems is branching out into other areas. It has three contracts to train hard core unemployed adults in Houston, Detroit and Los Angeles.

The company is negotiating with the government of Bolivia to train peasants; with the welfare department in Los Angeles on a project to train welfare recipients for jobs; with officials in Detroit on planning the reconstruction of the riot-destroyed areas, and with California penal officials on a program for training prisoners.

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRASER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SCHEUER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in 1907 the Congress incorporated the National Child Labor Committee—NCLC—which had been formed 3 years earlier in New York City by a group of distinguished citizens. We directed this voluntary, non-profit organization to consider and develop "along practical lines such things as might obliterate the evils then arising in the employment of child labor."

Since its incorporation the committee has dedicated itself wholeheartedly to this task. For the occasion of its 60th anniversary, to be celebrated November 16 at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, it is fitting that we should review and note the accomplishments of this outstanding citizen group. It exemplifies the contributions to social progress that can be made by concerned citizens participating freely in the development of national programs and policies directed toward the solution of major social problems.

Consider the conditions in child labor when the committee came into being in 1907: within a population of 82 million, some 800,000 children between the ages of 10 and 13 were employed. An additional million between the ages of 14 and 15 were also at work. If there were employed children under age 10, which was likely, nobody bothered to count them.

Many of those children worked 10 or 12 hours a day, often in sweat shops. They rarely breathed fresh air, and were denied the opportunity to play or attend school. Added to these conditions were the rampant dangers of unsafe, primitive industrialism. According to one report of the time: "Not a day passes but that some child is made a helpless cripple."

By 1932, after its first 25 years of activity, the committee could look with justifiable pride to a considerable list of accomplishments. Where only 17 States

had prohibited minors under 14 from working in factories when NCLC was founded, a quarter-century later there were 39 States with such laws. The 8-hour day for workers under 16, virtually unheard of in 1904, prevailed in three-fourths of the States. The number of States which banned night factory work for minors under 16 had increased from five to 36. The Federal Government, at the suggestion of the committee, set up the Children's Bureau in 1912.

By 1957, when the committee was 50 years old the list of achievements in which it had had a hand was even more impressive. The Walsh-Healy Act of 1936 contained minimum age standards for employment in the production of goods for the Government. In the following year the Sugar Act made beet growers ineligible for benefits if they failed to observe minimum standards regarding age and hours of work. In 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act provided comprehensive regulation of child labor in interstate commerce. In the States, there had been additional strengthening of child labor laws.

But by this time, in a rapidly changing industrial climate, the conditions affecting young people in employment had altered markedly. To be sure, violations of child labor laws were and still are a problem. Among migrant farm laborers, children of school age and below were and are employed by the thousands under primitive conditions. However, new priorities involving young workers were appearing on the national scene. School dropouts and juvenile delinquency were emerging as the pressing youth problems of the day.

To the committee, acutely sensitive to the current and approaching problems of young workers, it was apparent that the tremendous increase in the proportion of young people in the population as a result of the "baby boom" that followed World War II would produce teenage unemployment of unprecedented magnitude. Within this group, the problem of minority discrimination in education and employment would be of particular concern.

The National Child Labor Committee responded flexibly and imaginatively to these changed conditions. In 1959 it created the National Committee on Employment of Youth, directed at helping young people get a proper start in work through improved preparation and expanded job opportunity. In 1963 it set up the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, which seeks to eliminate the damaging effects of child labor in the migrant farm labor group and to substitute the constructive influence of proper schools and day care centers, and strengthened family life.

Through these agencies the National Child Labor Committee continues to provide critical analysis of policies, programs, and services related to child labor and youth employment. It devises new and better policies and programs for dealing with problems as they arise, and new approaches to dealing with youth problems for conditions it anticipates will become critical. It helps keep the public, as well as the specialists, alert to current



and upcoming issues. It assists, where it can with the development of employment, education, and training programs, and development of the personnel needed to staff new programs.

Congress made a wise choice in 1907 in selecting the National Child Labor Committee to "promote the welfare of society with respect to the employment of children in gainful occupations, and thus to aid in securing for them an opportunity for elementary education and physical development sufficient for the demands of citizenship and the requirements of industrial efficiency." The committee's implementation of this mandate, its responsiveness to the changing character of young people's labor problems and the changing needs of a developing industrial nation whose industrialism, as it declared in 1904, "should not be allowed to degrade humanity," is commendable.

We should congratulate the National Child Labor Committee for its 60 years of service to youth—our most valuable natural resource—and wish the committee many more years of success in its important work.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days, debating the Economic Opportunity Act amendments, we have been barraged and bruised by the empty defeatism and meat ax hyperbole of those who seek a unilateral withdrawal from the war against poverty. These "domestic doves" preach peace and withdrawal in the face of an enemy whose battalions are comprised of joblessness, hunger, illiteracy, and desperation.

Instead of poverty itself, they appear to regard the poor as the enemy.

Yesterday we were entertained by talk of "Ivy League bleeding heart liberals"—talk that rather should have focused on the individuals this legislation is attempting to assist.

This morning I received the following letter from Lucille Murray, president of the 140th Street Block Association in the Bronx. She is doing her utmost in her nonbleeding heart, non-Ivy League way to fight poverty. She does it by giving splendid leadership to a neighborhood program which takes welfare mothers off relief and trains them, and employs the unemployable.

Gentlemen of the opposition, domestic doves, meet your enemy:

THE 140TH STREET BLOCK ASSOCIATION,  
Bronx, N.Y., November 8, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: I tried to reach you today, but you were in a meeting. I am sure and hope that you were handling the same issue in which I am about to write. That is saving the poverty program or to do all that is in your power to avoid the drastic cut in the programs.

Our organization is very proud of the fact, that summer 1966 we took 15 welfare mothers off of the relief roll by training them as nurses aides. Two of them have gone on to Practical Nursing training.

Summer 1967, we employed neighborhood people that had been unemployed for 16 years. We have had many accomplishments. We are presently operating on an extension, we are the Only Information and Referral Center, that is open from 9 A.M. to 9 P.M. If we are able to continue year round our schedule will include 4 hours on Saturday. We are engaged in quite a number of services to the community. Just think of what this will do to the people of our community. As a resident, a leader in the community, and most of all one of your constituents I appeal to you, do all in your power to save the poverty program. If you need my voice in Washington or a lobby group, call on me I will be there.

Very truly yours,

LUCILLE MURRAY,  
Director.

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### AIR CONTROL

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published recently by the Baltimore Sun makes an important point concerning the air quality bill which has been passed by both houses of the Congress.

As Members know, the bill places much responsibility upon the States to set emission standards for air polluters. The bill does not provide for uniform, national emission standards.

This means the Federal Government may move only after it can show that a State has not complied with the intent of the Congress, as expressed in the bill.

I believe that air pollution is a regional problem, and I agree that the States should be required to set emission standards. This may take a little more time, but it is a logical, orderly, governmental process.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Baltimore Sun editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### AIR CONTROL

The Air Quality Act of 1967, as passed by the Senate and House, does not give the Johnson Administration what it wanted. The original bill would have permitted the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to set national emission standards for industrial polluters. But that was scrapped and in its place was substituted a provision placing considerable responsibility for establishing emission standards on the states. The Federal Government can move in only after it shows that a state has not lived up to the intent of the act.

This doesn't mean the bill is a failure. On the contrary, Senator Muskie of Maine, per-

haps the leading congressional exponent of clean air, argued convincingly that pollution is essentially a regional problem and that uniform national standards, while effective in some areas, might not be effective in others.

Unfortunately the regional approach means that progress will be slow and agonizing—this because of the complicated and time-consuming procedures which must precede Federal action. The redeeming feature is that, ultimately, the standards will have to be as stringent as the Secretary thinks necessary. If he wants to get tough, he can give the nation clean air despite the obstacles Congress has thrown in his path.

#### REMARKS OF HON. HENRY H. FOWLER

(Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the people of Virginia are proud of the contributions to our national life which Virginians, over the years, have made. We are proud of leaders in many walks of life whose outstanding achievements are recorded in the history of our United States. None of these has served our country with greater integrity and greater dedication than the present Secretary of the Treasury.

His dedication to and his awareness of his country and its problems was again evidenced in his address on October 28 before the honors convocation of his alma mater, Roanoke College. Because of the depth of his remarks and the reality with which he faces our current problems and our future, I include in the RECORD the remarks of the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury:

#### REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER

As a proud alumnus of Roanoke College, may I congratulate the faculty, Trustees, students, and all those responsible, for the perceptive program marking this 125th Anniversary Celebration of the educational contributions of Roanoke College to the State, the nation and the world.

How fitting—instead of looking back with satisfaction—to look forward to a fuller achievement of the ancient dream of the founders.

Today, in this Honors Convocation the college—this community of intellectuals—does honor to some of an older and passing generation of its alumni for their performance in this work-a-day world.

But our real concern today is that tomorrow's students have the opportunity and equipment to move boldly into the decades ahead. As the program notes, Roanoke College is concerned with "preparing students for the developing world."

For those of us in the older generation who are privileged to participate in this Honors Convocation, we are grateful.

We treasure this mark of your regard.

But, it is a bittersweet moment.

With it comes the reality to be faced—our time is rapidly passing. Soon a new generation will take over. What we now on the top-side of fifty think and do will not matter too much for too long. But what this new generation does or does not do will matter terribly for as long as we dare contemplate.

It is my passionate conviction that what the new generation of Americans do and think—particularly those who are university and college trained—will determine the future course of world affairs.









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 14, 1967  
For actions of November 13, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 184

### CONTENTS

Air pollution.....11	Fertilizer plant.....8	Property.....32,33
Appropriations.....2,13,34	Foreign aid.....19,24,29	Recreation.....6
Awards.....3,20,23	Foreign trade.....4,26,30	Research.....25
Census.....17,31	Freedom of information	Rural development.....21
Commodity reserves.....16	.....9,18	Social security.....7
Continuing	4-H Clubs.....6	Taxes.....32
appropriations.....34	Job Corps.....12	Textile imports.....30
Cropland adjustment.....10	Meat inspection.....1	War on hunger.....19,29
Economy.....22	Military construction....2	Water pollution.....27
Farm prices.....15	National Grange.....14	Yearbook.....6
Feed grain.....15	Poverty.....5,12,28	

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported cropland adjustment bill. House debated poverty bill.

### SENATE

1. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Montoya spoke in favor of his bill S. 2147, to modernize and further strengthen the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and urged that this bill be enacted instead of the House-passed bill. pp. S16312-3
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 13606, the military construction appropriation bill. pp. S16351-7

3. AWARDS. Sens. Nelson and Mundt congratulated Dr. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of SCS, as a recipient of this year's Rockefeller Public Service award for Administration. pp. S16290, S16305
4. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Pearson disagreed with an overall restriction on import quotas and inserted an article, "Lot to Lose." p. S16291
5. POVERTY. Sen. Hart urged the continuation of the war on poverty and inserted an article on this subject. p. S16306
6. AGRICULTURE YEARBOOK. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted two articles from the 1967 Agriculture Yearbook which relate to recreation and 4-H projects in W. Va. pp. S16306-8
7. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Hartke outlined the actions of the Finance Committee on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. p. S16283
8. FERTILIZER PLANT. Sen. Gruening inserted an article describing the construction of a large fertilizer plant in Alaska. pp. S16270-1
9. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION. Sen. Griffin inserted the report of the 1967 Sigma Delta Chi Advancement of Freedom of Information Committee. pp. S16314-30

#### HOUSE

10. CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2375, to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to allow a producer to place a farm in the cropland adjustment program if the farm was acquired by the producer to replace a farm from which he was displaced because of Federal or State acquisition (H. Rept. 913). p. H15160
11. AIR POLLUTION. Received the conference report on S. 780, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 (H. Rept. 916). pp. H15112-120
12. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill (pp. H15065-111, H15125-6, H15128-31, ~~H15137~~, H15142-3, H15145, H15153-6). Adopted, 136-130, an amendment by Rep. Gurney to provide an authorization for the period of only 1 year (pp. H15078-9). Rejected the following amendments: By Rep. Goodell, 149-159, to reduce total authorization to \$1.4 billion (pp. H15066-78). By Rep. Erlenborn, 116-164, to transfer the Job Corps to HEW and eventually phase it out (pp. H15082-93). By Rep. Gardner, 89-135, to permit State operation of Job Corps facilities through State vocational boards (pp. H15094-7). By Rep. Green, Oreg., 53-55, to end discrimination against women in the Job Corps program (pp. H15097-101). By Rep. Quie, 105-125, to put a limit on the Job Corps appropriation (pp. H15101-4).
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Mahon inserted a "comparative summary of appropriation bill totals, 90th Congress, 1st Session, as of Nov. 13, 1967." pp. H15063-4
14. NATIONAL GRANGE. Rep. Dole paid tribute to the National Grange in celebration of its centennial anniversary. p. H15065
15. FARM PRICES. Rep. Findley stated that the income of Illinois farmers "is being hit disastrously two ways as the result of unwise Government policy," and criticized the corn and wheat programs. pp. H15123-4



State of California. The naval career of Joe Gurule, HMC, will have come to a close, but the career of Joe Gurule, the humanitarian, will continue on toward even greater heights.

The many friends of Joe Gurule on Capitol Hill will miss him, but we all join together to wish him well.

#### RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH GURULE

(Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. GUBSER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] in his remarks relative to the retirement of our good friend, Joseph "Joe" Gurule, the physical therapist in the office of the attending physician.

I am delighted to extend my congratulations and best wishes to Joe on this occasion. He has served his country with distinction and I know that many of the Members in both the House and Senate will always be grateful for the service and assistance he has rendered to them from time to time. We will certainly miss Joe and his ever readiness to make the extra effort for our own comfort and convenience.

It has been a real privilege for me to know Joe Gurule and I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with his many friends in wishing him future success and happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

#### SEVENTY-EIGHTH BIRTHDAY OF WASHINGTON STATE

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, November 11, the State of Washington, observed its 78th birthday, pointing to the rapid strides the State has made in the last three-quarters of a century.

The State of Washington was carved by the hands of rugged pioneers from the untamed territory of the Pacific Northwest. The railroad and Alaska's gold were the two most outstanding turning-points in the young State's life, causing population to move West, settle, and begin forming the industrial base now supporting the State's populace.

But, Washington's statehood did not come easily, nor did anything in the hard struggle to tame the Pacific Northwest. In fact, the first petition for statehood was turned down by Congress in 1878, but it created an enthusiasm in the territory that would not be quieted so easily. A dozen years later, statehood was granted after all congressional conditions were fulfilled, and a formal proclamation was signed by President Benjamin Harrison.

Incidentally, the first administration in the State of Washington, Mr. Speaker, was Republican, and I might add, that today, the State is headed by a young, progressive Republican Governor, Daniel J. Evans.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Washington's First Congressional District, and to call to the attention of my colleagues, the 78th birthday of the great State of Washington.

#### EXPERIMENTING ON THE INDIAN RESERVATIONS

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe everything you read nowadays, but when I saw a picture on the front page of one of the local papers of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall with his arm around Robert E. Simon and the quote, "Bob won't be working for you anymore—he'll be working for me" in studying whether "new towns" can be built on Indian reservations.

According to the story, the Secretary of the Interior is hiring Simon to visit Indian reservations in Arizona, New Mexico, and other States as a consultant for the Interior Department at a salary of \$75 or \$80 a day plus expenses. Simon was the mastermind of the swanky Reston development in Fairfax County with its high-rise apartment, its manmade lake, and elegant homes. According to the report, the Secretary said he had long been pushing the idea that the Indian reservations might be used for new-town projects like Reston. The first requirement, the Secretary has reported, is land, and that is the one thing the West has plenty of.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that the Secretary of the Interior, who was raised in Arizona and who should know a great deal about Indians and Indian reservations, could make a statement like this even at a cocktail party. The more serious thing, however, is, will the Secretary throw hard-earned taxpayers' money into a \$75 or \$80 a day job for a builder like Simon to experiment on the Indian reservations?

This is about the silliest thing I have heard of in my long experience of listening to bureaucratic ideas. I hope that this thing can be stopped before the money is squandered. If we really want to give the Indians a break, let us give them the money that Simon will otherwise get, to buy shoes for the Indian children.

#### SALUTE TO THE GRANGE

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today signals the opening of a very special convention—the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Grange, the Nation's oldest farm and rural organization. Grange members from 38 States have gathered in Syracuse, N.Y., to mark this historic occasion.

I take great pride in saluting this fine organization which has 199 active Granges in Kansas. The record clearly shows the development of the Grange

since 1867 has paralleled the remarkable achievements of American agriculture.

The Grange's legislative achievements are well known. To name just a few: A full 53 years before this Nation ratified the 19th amendment to the Constitution, the Grange, at its national session, passed a resolution supporting equal and full rights of women, including their rights to the ballot box. In addition, they have championed Cabinet status for the USDA, vocational agricultural programs in the schools, the Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and the rural telephone system.

It is my feeling, however, their contributions to another area are less heralded and perhaps equally significant.

This area is that of individual and family participation and involvement. In an age when many people lament local concern and involvement, Grange members stand out. Grangers across the Nation are involved; they do participate; they are concerned. Through their community progress program and their women's activities, as well as their legislative discussions, members strive to upgrade their communities, their States, and the Nation.

In addition, one of their most notable achievements lies in maintenance of family togetherness. The Grange believes, whenever possible, the family should work and play together as a unit. In these days of the fractured family, the century-old teachings of the Grange take on added urgency: The family is the most important unit. The family farm is the most efficient and healthy rural economic foundation. Through encouragement and participation of youth in all areas of the Grange activities, clear-headed young people are produced—young people with a distinct sense of what is just and what is unjust; young people who know the difference between what is merely passing fad or fancy and what has lasting value; young people who understand why it is essential to be active in community affairs.

So it is today that I offer my congratulations and best wishes to National Master Herschel D. Newsom and to Kansas State Master James W. Ingwersen, as well as to all Grangers everywhere. I feel confident the Grange's second century will reflect the same vision and determination in rural affairs which has characterized the group's first 100 years.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.



## IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, November 9, 1967, the Clerk had read through section 2 of the committee substitute amendment ending on page 128, line 21, and there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 128, line 6, strike out "\$2,060,000,000" and insert "\$1,400,000,000"; line 8, strike out "\$874,000,000" and insert "\$421,500,000"; line 10, strike out "\$1,022,000,000" and insert "\$825,000,000"; line 13, strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$10,500,000"; and on line 14 strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000".

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment pending before the Committee of the Whole at the present time is the amendment offered by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. I think we should analyze the result of the amendment if it should be adopted, reducing the authorized amount to \$1,400,000,000. If that should happen, the Headstart program, which concerns children, would be reduced by about 40 percent. The Neighborhood Youth Corps would be reduced by at least 50 percent. The amendment would reduce the medical program, under which wonderful work is being done also, by over 60 percent. It would reduce the Domestic Peace Corps by approximately 50 percent. It would reduce the Upward Bound program for high school students from 25,000 to about 12,000. It would reduce about two-thirds the legal aid program, a program that has been doing outstanding work, and which is supported by the American Bar Association and others. In fact, the American Bar Association has recommended that the legal services should be increased by threefold over what is being conducted now. So we want to have clearly in mind just what the Goodell amendment would do if it were adopted.

In other words, it would so drastically reduce as to constitute a fatal attack upon this most worthy program.

It is unnecessary to argue the reasons for this program. In America today, with all our wealth and with all our extraordinary national income, we have millions of persons who are living under underprivileged conditions. This program is aimed not only to give them hope but also to give them assistance in enabling them to meet the journey of life and to

take care of and assist in the proper way the many problems that confront the underprivileged of our country.

I might say that only the other day Governor Volpe, who is a personal friend of mine and whom I like very much—I wish he were a Democrat—issued a proclamation. I call this to the attention of all the Members of the House. If I might without appearing presumptuous, I address myself particularly to my colleagues on the Republican side. This was issued only a few days ago, a proclamation of 1967 by Governor Volpe.

Without reading it in full, he said:

Government has a basic responsibility for the economic well-being of all citizens in this State and Nation, and the State has the unique potential to effect necessary changes through cooperation with and coordination and utilization of the resources of the Federal and local governments as well as the private sector.

I will include this in my remarks, and obtain permission when we go back into the House.

Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim Friday, November 3, 1967, as Economic Opportunity Day and call to the attention of all our citizens the achievements which have been made thus far in our endeavors toward greatest employment opportunity, and the outstanding challenges which lie ahead in this area to which we shall dedicate our continuing and determined efforts.

Much has been said about mistakes made by the antipoverty program. I recognize that. But it is human to err. We cannot have complete perfection in our own lives, never mind in the administration of a law. None of us is perfect. All we can do is approximate perfection to the fullest extent humanly possible. That same thing applies to an agency in the administration of the law.

There are critics who will crawl out of some corner and complain about the Office of Economic Opportunity from the time it was set up in 1964, that it failed in this aspect of its endeavor, or missed out in this or in that regard. Well, there are lawyers who have made mistakes. Are we going to convict 100 percent of the lawyers in the country for what less than 1 percent might do?

Are we going to convict 100 percent of the bankers of the country for what less than 1 percent might do?

Are we going to convict any segment of American society, economic or otherwise, 100 percent, for what less than 1 percent might do?

So let us try to keep in our minds a proportionate mental state. Let us separate those who do things they should not do from the great majority, the 99 percent who are trying in a dedicated way to make this program work effectively.

Would we eliminate General Motors Corp., for example, from the American economy because only the other day it had to recall hundreds of thousands of cars in which there were mistakes, making them dangerous to the owners of those automobiles on the highways and the dealers of our country?

Would we do the same thing to the Ford Co.? Would we wipe it out because

of mistakes, which they admit? They have recalled cars because there is danger to the owners of the cars and to those who use the cars.

Is all business wrong because we may have, here and there, administered prices or things done by some which should not be done?

Should we eliminate the legitimate business of labelling merely because of deceptive labelling and dishonest packaging?

Of course the Office of Economic Opportunity has made mistakes. There have been individuals there who have made mistakes. It is bound to happen. It will be happening 100 years from now.

But are we going to destroy what is good because of what a few might do? I say let us put the Office of Economic Opportunity and all it has done and tried to do since 1964 before any comparable governmental, industrial, manufacturing or service enterprise in any area of American life and then say that the OEO has not been ably and brilliantly administered. It is carried in the newspapers. It is news because there is controversy as to what this or that individual does. It is not news what a good person does. The controversy is on what somebody of an evil mind does or what somebody does when he does something that he should not do. Yet the great majority of people in all walks of life are doing what they ought to do, that is, doing the right thing. The great majority of those in the Office of Economic Opportunity and those benefited by it are doing the right thing. So, my colleagues, let us keep in mind first that this is an important program. This means so much to millions of Americans. This is a morale builder, a hope builder, something that represents a meaningful aspect in the life of America in these days and in the days that lie ahead. This is particularly so for those of us who when we were youngsters lived under substandard conditions. We well know the situation that exists. This is true of many in this chamber whose families when they were youngsters were not possessed of much of the world's goods. So let us remember, those of us who have gone through that period, and let us see the other side of the coin and realize that this is a program which is of vital importance. This is a proper program and a sound program. Let us not be influenced because of the actions of 1 percent or less and convict and indict and hurt the entire 100 percent.

So I urge you, let us put through an effective bill. I urge the defeat of the Goodell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I will include the entire proclamation issued by Governor Volpe:

PROCLAMATION, 1967, BY HIS EXCELLENCY,  
JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR

Government has a basic responsibility for the economic well-being of all citizens in this State and Nation, and the State has the unique potential to effect necessary changes through cooperation with and coordination and utilization of the resources of the Federal and local governments as well as the private sector.

Human dignity is based upon the individual's ability to work, to learn and to enjoy



life. A weekly paycheck, a full stomach, and the knowledge that his family has a chance to make it in life can eliminate the hostility, frustration or despondency which might reside in any man.

This Commonwealth of Massachusetts has committed itself to ensuring the fullest economic opportunities for all of its citizens. There is much work to be done toward increasing and raising the level of employment through improvements in vocational counseling, widespread job recruitment, and manpower redevelopment and training. In this expanding scientific, technological and industrial age, we are not so much faced with fighting poverty as with spreading opportunity.

This Nation and this State have seen great advancements in this vital area, with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the first Federal agency to address itself directly to the needs of the poor and to involve them in planning for and working toward improvement in their lives; the Commonwealth Service Corps and its related State agencies, which have taken great strides in betterment of economic welfare and opportunities for Bay Staters; and the program of our Capital City, Action for Boston Community Development, which is recognized as one of the best administered programs of its kind in the country.

Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim Friday, November 3, 1967, as Economic Opportunity Day and call to the attention of all our citizens the achievements which have been made thus far in our endeavors toward greatest employment opportunity, and the outstanding challenges which lie ahead in this area to which we shall dedicate our continuing and determined efforts.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, today we are deciding whether the richest and most abundantly blessed civilization in the history of mankind can afford a real and earnest effort to help its disadvantaged citizens.

By our action on this amendment, we will express our judgment as to whether a nation that spends 75 cents of every tax dollar for defense and the implements of war can afford one and one half cents for an assault on poverty.

By our individual judgments we will be judged. By our collective judgment our Nation will be judged—both in the eyes of the contemporary world and in the unforgiving verdict of history.

For it is not really a question of whether we can afford a truly decent, humane society which genuinely cares about its humblest and most improvident citizen. By any measurement known to man, we can afford it better than any nation in history.

It is quite simply a question of whether we really want such a society—and want it enough to pay for it.

It is a question of what value we place upon that little child of our land, created in the image of God but born through no fault of its own of unfortunate family circumstances. Do we value that child enough to give it a more nearly equal break in school—and thus in life—by preserving the Headstart program against the ravages of false economy?

It is a question of what value we place upon that confused American teenager, victim of a deprived environment, who has dropped out of school with no marketable skill and been branded a "failure" in our society. Do we have enough

confidence in him to give him another chance by keeping the Job Corps alive with an opening to accommodate him?

It is a question of how much we care about the widowed American mother, striving alone to rear five children with the minimum advantages and keep them free from the psychic scars and lasting pockmarks of poverty. Do we value her struggle sufficiently to save the family services and day care features of the antipoverty program?

The Goodell amendment would cut the funds which the bill makes available for each and all of these services by approximately one-third. From every three deprived Americans which the committee bill would assist, the amendment would eliminate one.

The Goodell amendment would eliminate 12,200 Job Corps openings. It would do away with 165,000 constructive summer jobs provided for needy youth under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It would eliminate 8,800 college students from the Upward Bound work program, reduce by 24,000 the number who could be trained under our manpower programs, and close the door of opportunity to 20,000 adults by restricting our adult education program. In addition, it would strike some 44,000 children from the rolls of the Headstart effort.

It would be a tragic indictment indeed if we should perfect an industrial base without parallel and a military machine without peer, tap the wonders of science, probe the ocean depths and conquer outer space—but lose the soul and spirit of individual concern.

The vote on this amendment, therefore, is a crucial test as to whether, in our providential and unprecedented affluence, the American civilization has become calloused and blind to the needs of the less affluent.

It is a test as to whether the shrill sirens of fear and greed have deafened our ears to the quieter calls of conscience.

Yes, we can well afford an adequate war against poverty. The question is whether we care enough to want it.

By voting down the Goodell amendment, we can answer that question with a resounding affirmative.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I just wonder if we can reach some agreement as to when we could cease debate on this amendment and any other amendment thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky restate his request?

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the minority if we could agree upon 2:15 to close the debate on this first section on the Goodell amendment, and any other amendment thereto. I ask unanimous consent so to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that

all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:51.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, generally, I agree with the desire on the part of the gentleman from Kentucky to set a time limit. Would another 5 or 10 minutes make any difference to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let us make it 2:25 or 2:30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No; it would not make any difference at all.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] has already been recognized prior to the unanimous-consent request, so his 5 minutes will be allotted to him.

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to substantially alter the present course of the war against poverty. I have arrived at this conclusion only after long and careful deliberation, marked by a searching, in-depth analysis of the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the programs under its jurisdiction.

Perfection is an elusive goal for which we must continually strive, knowing full well that it can never really be achieved. But try we must.

I am mindful of the criticism that has been directed at the OEO and recognize the need for adjustments to certain of its policies. Also, it is evident that there must be improvement and a general tightening-up in the administration of the overall operation. Reform characterized by refinement is required.

We should make policy adjustments. So too, should we demand improvement. And by the incorporation of specific directives in the act, we can eliminate guesswork regarding what we mean when we call for a "tightening-up" in administration.

Such moves will receive my support, but I will oppose any attempt to abandon the war against poverty or to drastically change its direction.

That I should now advocate the continuation of a program which did not initially have my endorsement may come as a surprise. Such a reaction is understandable when one considers the stormy, often controversial history of the anti-poverty programs and the agency which administers them.

When the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was before the 88th Congress, I expressed strong reservations about the manner in which the effort to assist the poor and underprivileged was being launched.



While the revelations of widespread poverty in this land of plenty were indeed disheartening, and the desire was strong to do something constructive in addition to that which was already being accomplished through programs authorized under the Manpower Training and Development Act and the Vocational Education Act, I could not, in good conscience, lend my support to the proposed legislation. Too many questions remained unanswered. Specifics were lacking. A sense of direction did not accompany the sense of purpose.

Despite all of these obvious deficiencies, we were asked to accede to the President's request for nearly a billion dollars to get the program off the ground.

Rather than such a massive undertaking rife with uncertainty, I preferred the "seed money" approach to establish pilot programs. Try a Headstart project. Underwrite a community action effort. Establish a Job Corps center. By so doing, the wrinkles could be easily ironed out along the way and then, following a reasonable trial period, those policies and programs which failed the test, could be cast off. Those proved successful would receive more attention and additional funding. Unfortunately, this view did not prevail.

It did not require extrasensory perception to foresee the problems and difficulties ahead. There was waste. There was lack of proper coordination and organization. Mistakes were made, not on a modest scale, but in grand fashion and the misfortunes of the OEO were well known. But progress was made. Lessons, admittedly expensive, were learned. Change was forthcoming.

Hindsight is always 20/20. I recount briefly my earlier thoughts on the war against poverty not because of any desire to assume an "I told you so" stance or to suggest that the present debate would have a different tenor if the course I favored 3 years ago had been followed, but to place in proper perspective my present thinking.

It is time to forget about the past and concentrate on the future. We must be constructive, not destructive. The necessity of such action was clearly documented earlier last week by the U.S. Department of Labor report that the unemployment rate is at a 2-year high, despite a booming—though perhaps shaky—economy.

There is a substantial number of our fellow countrymen living in utter despair. Their future is bleak and will be one of continued frustration unless we can offer some hope, some encouragement, some indication that we are willing to assist in alleviating the cause of poverty, not by being our brother's keeper, but by providing tangible evidence that we wish to be a helper to those who truly wish to be helped. We will demonstrate our sincerity and good faith by continuing the battle, by moving ahead with the programs under review.

The principal issue should be over the direction, not the duration, of the war against poverty.

In my judgment, the Office of Economic Opportunity should be permitted to get on with the job and given ade-

quate funds to perform its vital assignment. In this regard, I believe the administration's budget request and the legislation reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor—with some modifications—to be reasonable and deserving of our support.

I have followed closely the course of the war against poverty, not only in my district, where substantial progress has been made, but throughout the country and I am convinced of two things.

First, the programs, individually, are sound. Headstart work experience, Upward Bound, community action, VISTA, legal services, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the others are successful if they have proper leadership. Leadership is the key.

Second, the major defects of the various antipoverty programs are identifiable and can be corrected.

I cannot stress enough the importance of leadership to the success of this overall effort. Let me cite what I feel is a dramatic illustration.

For 2½ years the Oneida County, N.Y., Department of Social Services, under Commissioner Michael J. McGuirl, has operated a work-experience program. Three Federal grants, totaling \$818,214, have been awarded to help finance this facet of our local war against poverty. The funds have been used to train unemployed heads of families who lacked sufficient education or basic work skills to become employable. The results achieved are most impressive.

To date 379 individuals have "graduated" from the work experience program and are now on the job, laboratory technicians, shoe repairmen, heavy equipment operators, groundskeepers, custodians and helpers to skilled tradesmen, such as masons, plumbers, and carpenters.

These 379 individuals have 1,825 dependents, including themselves. Prior to participating in the work experience program they were receiving \$90,202 per month, or \$1,082,424 per year, in welfare payments. They were being supported by the taxpayers.

Now, these same 379 individuals are working. They are earning \$112,942 per month, or \$1,355,304 per year. They are taxpayers. They have found new meaning in life, new direction. They have dignity and pride and we are proud of them.

There are presently 240 enrollees in the program and they are headed down the same path. Soon, they too will be earning their way.

All this was made possible by antipoverty grants, by a program that places its greatest emphasis on "opportunity." We are receiving and will continue to receive very sizeable dividends from what, by comparison, must be termed a modest investment.

This is not an isolated success story, but one that has been duplicated in other areas of the Nation. What better testimonial is there to the value of this phase of the war against poverty than to provide such concrete evidence of what has been and is being accomplished?

The work-experience program does not have a monopoly on results. Headstart

has been acclaimed by just about everyone who has been exposed to its operation and objectives—objectives that are being achieved as is clearly demonstrated by the thousands of underprivileged youngsters who, because they had the advantage of a headstart, have caught up with their more fortunate classmates.

Upward Bound has opened the door to higher education for many. VISTA, patterned after the Peace Corps, has proven the similarity extends beyond style and intent. Results are being recorded.

The Job Corps, perhaps more than any other antipoverty program, has been severely criticized. It has been raked over the coals with good reason. Investigations have revealed that most of the complaints were justified.

But the Corps' early days, marked by organized confusion, are over. The Corps has hurdled many obstacles. It has profited from its mistakes—and there were many. A maturity is apparent. Significant progress has been made.

More than 70,000 economically and culturally deprived youths have concluded their training and are now employed and earning their way; or continuing their education; or serving in the Armed Forces. Prior to being given a new opportunity, in many cases the first opportunity, many of these Corpsmen now gainfully employed were not able to fill out a job application or follow simple directions. Others who now proudly wear the uniform of their country, could not pass the minimum induction test.

An antipoverty program, made possible by those who cared, has changed their lives. They are the better for it and so are we.

I could go on and cover every program in detail and provide interesting and impressive statistics about the more than 1,000 community action agencies that, through local initiative, are waging individual wars against poverty and winning, battle by battle. I could tell about the estimated 172,000 poor who have been assisted under the legal services program and the 300,000 youths who have benefited by participation in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, but a detailed accounting of what has been done is not nearly as important as what can and should be done.

Medical care, job training, specialized education, employment, legal aid, and a host of other services readily available to most of us who live in this affluent society have been made available for the first time to millions of impoverished Americans because of the war against poverty. Millions more remain to be assisted.

I mentioned earlier that the major defects of the various antipoverty programs are identifiable and can be corrected. Most prominent in this category are the following significant changes in the act proposed in the committee-reported bill—

Requires the Job Corps to improve screening procedures and to refuse admission to those applicants whose antisocial orientation or medical disability is so great that they are unlikely to benefit from the program or whose disruptive



influence will tend to spoil the Job Corps for others;

Directs the Job Corps to reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct;

Requires that direct operating costs per enrollee in the Job Corps be reduced from \$7,500 to \$6,500 per year;

Prohibits political activity and participation in voter registration drives by officers, employees, and enrollees;

Places greater emphasis on programs for rural Americans;

Tightens auditing requirements for community action agencies;

Requires each community action agency to establish detailed accounting procedures, including rules to assure full staff reporting, the establishment of specific standards for salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, to assure that employees are hired, retained and advanced on a merit basis, and to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interest;

Provides Federal criminal penalties for certain kinds of misconduct in the administration of the program. Theft, kickbacks, and willful misappropriation of funds or property are covered;

States that "a person will not be deemed to meet the poverty requirements if his lack of income stems, not from handicaps normally associated with poverty, but simply from refusal, without good cause, to accept employment commensurate with his health, education, age, and ability."

Provides for pilot projects to develop new approaches to further the objective of the program, with increased emphasis to be given to the role of private industry.

There are many more committee-recommended changes designed to improve the overall operation of the anti-poverty programs and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

However, not all change is progress. Two proposals, in my estimation, are more retrogressive than progressive and I am hopeful they will be scrapped. Both are in title II of the bill which deals with community action agencies. Specifically, I refer to the amendment requiring community action agencies to be State, city, or county governments or specially designated bodies and the amendment adjusting the provision regarding the non-Federal share of the cost of community action programs.

The debate on these two proposals has been lengthy. The pros and cons have been thoroughly reviewed so there is no need for me to repeat what has been said. However, I do wish to make clear my feeling that we should do everything within our power to divorce politics from poverty. Let us retain the community action agencies as private, nonprofit structures with adequate representation of those who are to be helped—the poor. Poverty knows no party; let us avoid at all costs partisan activity in connection with this endeavor—we do not want Republican action agencies or Democratic action agencies—we want community action agencies.

With respect to the non-Federal contribution to the cost of operating community action agencies and their pro-

grams, I think it wise to require the local agencies to increase their share of the burden, to make a greater contribution, to become more deeply involved and committed. But let us not be so hasty in our effort as to force many agencies to curtail their activities because they cannot raise the cash for their fair share. It is fine and appropriate to increase the local share from 10 percent to 20 percent, but let us continue the policy of allowing this contribution to be "in kind." The individual community action agencies are able to provide volunteer help, facilities and equipment, but it is difficult, in some cases impossible, to raise sizable sums of money and if they are required to do so I am afraid many will have to close up shop.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let us make policy adjustments, let us demand improvement and let us require a "tightening up" in administration of the war against poverty. But above all, let us continue this worthy effort.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, it is known to everyone who reads the papers or listens to current commentary inside or outside the House that a great many amendments are going to be offered to the current structure and administration of the war on poverty. It is also well known that many motivations, both destructive and constructive, will be brought to bear on this program during the course of debate which these amendments will precipitate. I regret that the sequence of the sections of the bill before us bring us first to the question of money, because the money the Nation can and should dedicate to this effort, with its experimental and coordinating impact on the total national effort to alleviate poverty, is bound to be affected by the final results of our debate on how the Office of Economic Opportunity should be administered and what its goals should be. For instance, I would have considerably less confidence in the program, and hence be less willing to commit substantial sums of money to community action, if the final legislation we enact this week includes the Green amendment.

I have voted to cut a great many programs this year, Mr. Chairman, and I will vote to cut this one also rather than see the Nation's dwindling treasure wasted in the manipulation of voting blocks or the political exploitation of our harassed and beleaguered poor. But I am reluctant to cut without knowing what I am cutting, because a well-run poverty program should have a high priority in our scale of national needs. I am ready and willing to vote for the changes which I deem improvements in this program, and if these are successful I would regret having placed a ceiling on the financial effort at this stage in the debate. For this reason I do not plan to vote either for the Goodell \$1.4 billion ceiling or the Ayers continuing resolution which is also designed simply to reduce the entire issue to the matter of money. If the changes for which I hope do not materialize in the later stages of this amending procedure, I shall then without hesitation vote for a necessary limitation of funds when the

appropriation bill for the OEO comes before us in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would only point out that the various statistics that have been cited here as to the impact of the cut to \$1.4 billion are based upon a comparison with the \$2.06 billion in the committee bill, which is not the present operating program. They are now operating with the basic figure of \$1.6 billion.

Everybody has indicated, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on the other side of the aisle has indicated, they are going to approve appropriations of about \$1.6 billion at the top and quite possibly a little below that figure.

So the comparison cited here is false from the very outset. They are not comparisons as to the way the program is operating today, they are comparisons with a mythical projection as to how it might operate under a \$2.06 billion program.

In addition to that, comparisons are false in another respect because they assume that the cuts will be made arbitrarily where the individual speaking wants them to be made in order to scare people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and to point out that it would be disastrous out our way if it were to be adopted.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the author of the amendment. It has been so clearly indicated by testimony in debate he speaks of how painful these cuts will be no matter where they are assessed.

One thing is undeniable—we know what the cut is going to mean to New York State, where he and I originate—and there are no ifs, ands, or buts about that.

As to the present program versus the suggested amendment by the gentleman from New York, this amendment will cost the State of New York taxpayers \$40 million. I say it will cost the State of New York taxpayers because the Governor of the State of New York has indicated that he does not intend to abdicate his responsibility to the poor, and in fact, is advocating an increase.

Furthermore, the mayor of the largest city, the city of New York, Mayor Lindsay indicates he will not jump ship and drop the burden where the poor are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.



(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mrs. KELLY, the time allotted to her was granted to Mr. CAREY.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, in fact the mayor of the city of New York has said he intends to augment the program, as the city has long been doing.

What this means, if the Federal Government cuts down its share, is that this money is going to be supplied by the taxpayers of the cities and of the State of New York in terms of increasing welfare and unemployment costs. This means a now direct Federal responsibility will be transferred to the New York taxpayers of a minimum of \$40 million to as high as \$75 million, depending on whether you cut from the existing level or the new level recommended by the committee.

I take a dim view of these so-called economy amendments which save money for the Federal Government by passing the whole tab on to the people at State and local levels.

I do regret that a gentleman from New York, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, sees fit to place this new burden upon the already heavily strained shoulders of the New York taxpayers by offering this amendment.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. I thank my distinguished colleague from New York. May I say I agree completely with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]. I am unalterably opposed to the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from the State of New York [Mr. GOODELL.]

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose any cut in the authorization for the anti-poverty program. The figure of \$2.06 billion authorized by the House committee is the minimum we should approve. I am opposed to the Goodell amendment which would cut back the program to \$1.4 billion, as opposed to the \$2.06 billion which I support. This is no time to cut back on a program with a successful beginning. I say we can eliminate tax loopholes, take a second look at our billion-dollar space program, reconsider the multimillion-dollar subsidy for the supersonic transport program. Will it be billions for the Apollo program to reach the moon and only half that to reach the Nation's poor?

I have seen what can be accomplished through the community action programs in my congressional district in the southeast Bronx. CAP centers are providing family services, health services, job counseling, day care centers, educational programs, consumer education, and other services geared to the local community needs. These programs are reaching the poor and helping them to plan for themselves. Youngsters have been given a chance through Headstart; would-be dropouts have been encouraged to stay in school; young people who otherwise might have been pressed into lives of crime have been given training and job opportunities; the elderly have been afforded health services heretofore unknown to them. These programs in New York City, now operating at a level of

\$17.5 million annually, could be cut as much as \$6 or \$7 million under proposed amendments. The slash would be from 30 to 40 percent and would affect many thousands of poor people.

When Congress first passed the Economic Opportunity Act, we faced up courageously to a problem we could no longer ignore. We pledged our efforts to alleviate poverty in America, and the conditions that breed poverty, despair, and frustration. Now, in the wake of this past summer's violence, we need more than ever to fulfill the commitments we made 3 years ago.

Poverty in America impoverishes all Americans. It is a national problem, the burden of which must be borne by all Americans. If we do not, we pay the consequences: crime in the streets, the growing burden of welfare, illiteracy, and unemployment. The alternative is far more costly than the poverty program itself.

There have been some errors, yes. Changes will be required from time to time. But we must not abandon the war on poverty. And we must not render it ineffective by drastically slashing its funds.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the provisions of section 211(c) to change the structure of the antipoverty boards at the community and neighborhood levels. Under this section, a community action agency would have to be either the State or local government itself or an agency, public or private, designated by the State or local government. Each community action agency would run its program through a community action board, one-third of its members to be public officials, one-third poverty area representatives, and one-third representatives of business, labor, civic, and charitable groups.

Communities throughout the country have established satisfactory antipoverty operations using the 1966 formula. To dismantle and restructure operations as proposed in section 211(c) could throw community action programs into chaos. Certainly this would be the case in New York City, where for over a year people in 15 poverty areas have worked to establish community corporations and have elected governing boards to plan, approve and coordinate antipoverty programs. None of these boards meets the requirements of this section. In each case, members were selected in communitywide, democratic elections open to all residents, and a ruling that the boards must now be restructured would lead to disillusionment among those who have worked so hard to make the corporations a success.

For Congress to reduce the participation of the poor in the programs they have created is tantamount to turning our backs on a promising beginning. We have, in very large measure, succeeded in involving local persons in the development, administration and evaluation of local antipoverty projects, and we have received the cooperation of responsible citizens in advising these programs. To redirect and reorganize at this time will only delay our commitments to the poor. This is no time to revamp; this is no time to cut back on the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the provi-

sion that requires localities to double their contribution to the program and that they pay, at the same time, the new assessment in cash. The bill before us increases the amount of money a local community shall contribute to community action programs from 10 percent to 20 percent and requires that half the local share be in cash. Existing law permits the entire local share to be in the form of noncash contributions such as volunteer services, office space, or utility expenses. This provision should not be changed.

In addition to existing programs such as Headstart, legal services, Upward Bound, and neighborhood health centers, I am pleased the bill has four new programs which are commendable and which I support. These are the food and medical services program, a family planning program, a program to meet the needs of the elderly, and a special day care program for children.

(Mr. GILBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE.]

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. At the outset I would like to say that I have voted for every reasonable cost-reduction amendment or program change that has been offered in this Chamber so far this year, including the recent expenditure limitation. I have opposed the space program, the public works pork barrel, and the foreign aid program because they are too costly at this time and ought to be given back-burner priority. But I am opposed to reducing this program below \$2 billion. We must do all we can to help our people help themselves.

At the same time, there is clearly a need for economy in this program. But the economy that I believe is needed should take the form of savings in administrative costs, of cutting out high-salaried bureaucrats, and an overhaul of inefficient and expensive programs that are failing to help the poor.

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REM], that if we do not make the necessary changes in this program later in the debate when amendments are offered, I do not think we are going to be able to sustain a program of any size, let alone one in the amount of \$2 billion.

So I would hope that if we could keep these needed dollars in the bill, and can make the necessary program changes that can make this program one that will work and get the job done, certainly there is a desperate need to make this program effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I would like to point out that while it is easy to talk sometimes in terms of cuts somewhat exceeding \$600 million, it is often very difficult to attempt to visualize what happens in terms of human lives. I want to point out that if the amendment



were adopted, we would lose 225 community action programs, 48,000 fewer young people would have the benefit of Headstart, and some 20,000 people would not receive the basic adult education which they would receive under the committee bill.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, some 9,000 young men and women in this land would not have the chance which they are now receiving under that fine program Upward Bound.

In sum total, this is an investment in people, and the proposed cut would take away the incentive which this program gives them. I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] is recognized.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I think the example that the Speaker cited earlier of the automobile manufacturers is an excellent one. The question is not whether we should wipe out the manufacturing plants. The question is whether we should improve the manufacturing process. If an industry were putting out defective merchandise or operating in a way that was basically defective, what it would do would be to change the manner of its operation, and this is exactly what we propose to do here.

Unfortunately, the question has become confused. The question is not whether we want to eliminate the causes of poverty. We do. But the question is how to go about doing it, Mr. Chairman, and how to go about doing it in a way that we can afford.

I regret that speaker after speaker on the other side of this issue has apparently risen without having read the committee report, without having listened carefully to what has been said on this side of the aisle. The gentleman from Florida has not only once but twice spoken on the other side and said that today we have only two issues here: numbers of dollars and the question of one amendment. This is incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon is recognized on his own.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may go on with what I was saying, the basic point that I would urge of every Member here who will be called upon to vote on this bill is to look at pages 202 and 203 of the report, if they do not read the rest of the record, and, in addition, to look at pages 214 and 215.

This shows clearly that if we go about making the amendments to this program which ought to be made—and some of them are outlined on pages 214 and 215—we can accomplish a great deal more than is being accomplished under the present appropriations and a great deal more than would be accomplished under the proposed budget for fiscal year 1968.

Do not be led astray by the sheer discussion of dollars. It is not a case of how many Federal dollars are spent. It is a case of how they are spent. It is a case of how many dollars get through to the basic causes of poverty.

We suggest that we can make these cuts, so badly needed at this time, and unless we make some serious revisions of the program we should make at least these cuts. If we make serious revisions, which would improve the program, we can in future years ago on with some of the work so badly needed to be done in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding.

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, as has been said by the gentleman from Oregon, this should not be considered in terms of commodities or manufactures. We would not abolish manufactures for defective merchandise.

The gentleman unfortunately, I believe, relates this to defective merchandise and what we should do with respect to defective merchandise. I do not like to deal in commodity terms, where human beings are concerned. This program really is not able to be cut without hurting people, who have been too long considered defective merchandise in the marketplace of America and written off as beyond repair.

This program does a lot for the handicapped children. How do we cut back on the many deaf, blind, and retarded children who participate?

This program helps the elderly. Do we have more elderly, or fewer, than when this program was enacted? Everyone knows we have more eligible elderly persons now. How do we propose to cut their share of these benefits?

As a matter of fact, the cut which is being proposed would exact its toll upon some people who were not even in existence when this program was first conceived. The children coming into Headstart this year from the poor neighborhoods had not been born when this law was first enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] in his own right.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me on his Rhode Island time.

On behalf of New York, I would reemphasize the point that the first Headstart program began in 1964, and some children who will be coming into Headstart this year were not even born when the OEO was conceived.

Let us think of what this means. They have a right to expect that something will be done for them.

If we were to concede that mistakes were made in 1964, 1965, and 1966, is it fair to exact the toll of those mistakes on the children who need the help, who were not here when the mistakes were made?

Let us say for the sake of discussion, that this program is rife with error. The question is, should we compound the error by this denial amendment, or correct it for the benefit of people and children involved? The question is, Should we vote up the funds necessary to do the job now knowing as we do the dimension of the task we face?

No one denies that poverty in America is a bigger challenge than we first envisioned. The gap between the high-income and low-income groups is widening. Let us not desert the poor people who will have no one else on their side if their Government abandons them by a vote of denial on this amendment. If we do they may find new allies among the foes of our Government who would prey upon their agony and distress. If they do, God help them and God help us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. We are here engaged in a war on poverty yet we must also engage ourselves in a war on waste and mismanagement, such as has marked the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The proponents of this amendment do not seek to help the disadvantaged less, but to spend less while helping people more, by doing it better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a lot of statements have been made about the amount of money cut out of this program. It is unfortunate we are debating money right at the beginning of this whole consideration. It was my attempt last week to get this section passed over, so that we could do this in an orderly fashion, so that we could make the changes this House in its wisdom wished to make, but that was objected to on the other side of the aisle, so we are forced at the very outset to put the cart before the horse and to determine how much total money will be in this program.

The \$1.4 billion amendment offered by me now is the only way in which I could put forth the amount of money that we feel is necessary under the opportunity crusade which would involve private enterprise and would involve more individuals and get more help to all of these individuals through getting all elements of the community involved and not attempting to do everything with 100 percent Federal dollars. The Federal dollars would be seed money which would multiply many times because of the involvement of State, local, and particularly private enterprise in order to provide meaningful and productive jobs for the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD yielded his time to Mr. BRADEMAS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to make two or three points in opposition to this amendment.



One of the first points is this ought not to be a partisan measure. The distinguished Speaker cited the opposition to the proposed cuts from the distinguished Republican Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Governor Volpe. Only yesterday on a television program, the mayor of the City of New York, a Republican, criticized Republicans in Congress for attempting to cut back appropriations for the antipoverty program, saying:

I don't wish to defend my party on this point one bit.

We have just heard from our distinguished Republican colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], a member of the committee in opposition to the motion to cut the funds so drastically.

Mr. Chairman, a second point I want to make concerns the very sharp impact of the proposed cutback on the big cities of America. The city of New York alone, for example, would lose nearly \$18 million if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is adopted.

If one were to add up the impact of the cuts the gentleman from New York proposes on 14 of the largest cities in the country, the result would be a 34-percent cutback from the amount authorized in the committee bill, or a loss of over \$55 million. At a time when we are trying to do something significant to cope with the burgeoning problems of our major urban areas, it seems especially inappropriate to give support to an amendment like that of the gentleman from New York, which would gravely damage this program in the cities.

The third point I want to make is that local community leaders across the country are opposed to such drastic cuts in the antipoverty program. By way of example, let me here cite a newspaper article published yesterday in the State of one of the most vigorous and vocal opponents of the committee bill in the House of Representatives and one who has consistently voted against the antipoverty program. I will not indicate the State or the district, but this newspaper reports a speech delivered by a distinguished community leader in that district, a priest, as a matter of fact. I will here quote what the priest said in an address stoutly defending the war on poverty.

The antipoverty program is being crushed and stifled by one of the most disgraceful performances ever enacted in the sacred halls of our Government.

This priest, who is known as "the vicar of the rural poor," went on to note that the Representative in Congress who was so strongly opposing the program, "has never seen the poverty program of his own constituents," but "is trying to tell the Nation that the poverty program does not work."

The priest continued:

How can one representative campaign against the poverty program when he has never seen the poverty program in his own Congressional district in operation?

According to the press account, the clergyman, who spoke at a Veterans' Day observance at an American Legion club-

house, described some extreme cases of poverty he had observed in his home county. He said:

Tonight, there are millions of Americans with no horizons.

Millions are living ill-housed, ill-clad and ill-fed, some like animals despite the fact that they labor.

Tonight, millions of Americans live without the liberty that you bleed for. They are enmeshed in a degrading exploitation.

Tonight we are faced with a new peril. In Steuben County in 1967 there is a family of seven living in a house with two rooms, no windows, just a door; no drain in the sink, no bathroom facilities.

This family lost a child last winter. The infant died as they walked 10 miles to a doctor.

The clergyman declared the poverty program "has done a great job in our county." Among other things, he said the program has found a house only Saturday for an expectant mother with 11 children, the youngest a 16-month-old mongoloid, who were abandoned by the father and had been living in a barn. The priest said he personally "gave three boys in that family the first bath they ever had in a tub in their lives this afternoon."

The program also found a house in recent weeks for "a family of 16, 14 of them children, who had been living in a three-room shack with a lean-to built for the mother who is recuperating from an operation." Seven boys who had slept in a woodshed with half-inch cracks in the siding now have the first decent bedrooms of their lives.

He explained:

There are 219 such cases, concerning 403 categories of human misery, with large expanses of this country yet to be explored.

The poverty program has been "one ray of hope for the 18,000 poor in our country," he said. Among other things, it was provided a work-training program for 55 dropouts and 62 school pupils, a summer youth program and an educational program intended to help train adults for reemployment.

Finally the priest invited his Representative in Congress "to come back to his own people, poor and uninfluential though they are, to come to our poverty office and to prove to us that the program is not working." He said:

We invite him to come into our poor, humble homes and tell us poor that our program hasn't housed, clad, fed, found new jobs and given us a new horizon.

We won't accept name-calling, unfounded accusations and political jargon. We want you to come to the poor of your district and tell us about the poverty program.

Otherwise, the words you speak in Congress as our representative will be meaningless and empty, for in trampling on the nation's poverty program, you will be betraying almost 25 percent of your constituents.

We are in a new moment of peril, the peril of a dying infant, a starving child, a young boy with no horizons beyond the barn in which he lives.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the reasons the amendment before us should be debated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GARDNER yielded his time to Mr. GOODELL.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. AYRES yielded his time to Mr. GOODELL.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the amount of money that would be cut out of this program by the Goodell amendment. Virtually all of the statements and percentages given are compared to the false figure of \$2.060 billion. Everybody in this House knows it will not be appropriated by this Congress in this year. In addition to that, there have been statements that the \$1.4 billion under the opportunity crusade would cut the Headstart program. Let us get this straight on the RECORD. The opportunity crusade puts more money into Headstart than the present program or the proposed program in the committee bill. It is a question as to where you will allocate your resources. The statement was made in the well of the House at the beginning of the debate that it would cut the VISTA program 50 percent. It will not cut VISTA 50 percent but will maintain it at its present level under the opportunity crusade.

A great many statements have been made about the number of enrollees who will be cut out of the program. I say to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle that we would have more people involved in this program of the opportunity crusade than under the committee bill or under the existing program.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, under the Job Corps program, by bringing in military career centers, we would have 43,350 slots, as compared to the present 41,000 slots.

Mr. Chairman, under the work study program or in-school neighborhood youth program, we would have a total of 510,000 slots, as compared to 295,000 slots under the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is true because we involve private industry. In other words, the Federal Government only pays one-fourth of the cost of the program and the wages. We have under this program private industry involved with support from the Federal Government. In other words, the Federal Government pays one-fourth while the employers in private industry come in and pay three-fourths of the cost involved. Then, Mr. Chairman, these people would have a job with meaning and with a future.

Mr. Chairman, in the community action program we have all the money under the proposed amendment unearmarked, so the local people can make their own decision with reference to priorities.

Mr. Chairman, in the out-of-school program we have more slots available, 107,000 compared to the committee bill's 60,000. So, in each category we propose to involve private industry, with a little



Federal seed money in order to extend to these people the type of help which is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this is the critical difference involved here. It is unfortunate that we are talking about money. This program should be redirected. No one should be debating the need for a program to help the less fortunate. The question is, has this program been effective? In some areas it has. In other areas it has not been effective. We have seen regressive actions in the committee to rescind some of the most exciting features of this program. However, we wish to make constructive changes which will improve the program and get it on a new direction, a program that will really get some money to the poor.

Mr. Chairman, by investing \$1.4 billion in Federal money and making some substantive changes in the program itself, which will come later in the reading of the bill, we shall be able to generate more than the sum of \$3 billion with which to help take care of the poor. That sum is compared to the sum of \$2 billion as contained in the President's budget and as contained in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the manner in which we should approach this matter—bringing in the States and local government, private enterprise and all elements of the community to make their contributions and keep the voice of the poor in the individual community.

Mr. Chairman, I can say that these are the things which we want and desire to achieve in the opportunity crusade. Therefore, we are forced to offer this amendment at the outset with reference to the question of money involved alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH].

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated my support that a larger figure approaching \$2 billion to be devoted to this program. We must give the highest priority to our number one domestic problem. However, it is very clear the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are inconsistent in their analysis. It represents a type of brainwashing we are seeing here on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, basically, they are comparing \$1.5 billion with \$2.06 billion. However, we know they are not going to get the \$2.06 billion; rather will be something like \$1.6 billion from appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the significant point here is not the amount of funds involved, but how they are to be used. Further, the question is, do they really need the sum of \$2 billion? They probably do, for if we accept their program the private sector will not be involved—and thus more Federal funds will be needed. We have clearly indicated, and it has become abundantly clear that with the Opportunity Crusade we can generate the sum of \$3 billion in the war on poverty. That figure has not been denied in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, do we want to have the Federal Government do it all, or do we wish to involve the private sector? This is the question with which we are faced.

Let us have the foresight to involve the private sector in our poverty war, and then let us have the courage to fund it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because the amendment would seriously restrict programs that have been successfully carried out to get people off the public dole and into gainful employment. As an example, in Chicago alone we have removed some 23,000 families from public welfare at an annual saving of more than \$46 million to the taxpayers through the community action agencies and the manpower training program.

Further, this amendment would seriously and adversely affect programs covering more than 10,000 people now participating in various job-training programs financed by the antipoverty program who will also be taken off the public dole and placed in jobs when they complete their training.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were to be adopted it would result in a substantial slowing down of progress that has been made to reduce the cost of the "aid to dependent children" program.

This Nation is now spending \$2.5 billion annually on the ADC programs in America. This tragic figure will continue to increase until we find an effective program to deal with this problem. The adoption of this amendment would result in a substantial reduction in the money now being spent for family planning programs which are doing an impressive job in educating young women, who would otherwise of necessity have to be placed on the ADC rolls.

This Nation must sooner or later face up to the growing problem of children being born to unwed mothers or children who for various reasons have no breadwinner. This antipoverty program addresses itself to this mounting problem which screams out for an effective solution. I invite you to examine the educational program now in operation in the Cook County Hospital and see how effective it is in reducing potential candidates for the ADC rolls. Nothing will destroy our society more quickly than the increasing cost of the ADC program. I believe the antipoverty program is making a significant contribution toward reducing the number of children on ADC and should be given a chance to continue.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would seriously reduce funds for this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the issue is crystal clear. Each of us in this Chamber will have the opportunity to vote for a program of \$1.4 billion in Federal authorizations for the poverty program. In con-

trast, if this amendment does not carry the program will end up at \$2,060,000,000.

Within the last month we have had three votes taken where the House of Representatives was called upon to set a spending ceiling or limitation for the Federal Government in fiscal year 1968, and we have decided by a majority vote on two out of the three occasions that there should be a \$5 billion spending limitation. All of the Members who have voted for that spending limitation I believe have an obligation today to support the Goodell amendment to reduce the Federal contribution to this program. We cannot have it both ways.

The advantage of the Goodell amendment is that it approves \$1.4 billion in Federal authorizations, but it results in a far greater total for the poverty program as a whole by bringing in private enterprise, local communities, and our respective States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Today in my city of Cleveland we have elected a new mayor, Carl B. Stokes, whose first official announcement was to declare that, if this Goodell amendment were to pass, if this cutback were to be enacted, it would be a disaster to the Cleveland community.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant to note that just a few days ago I received a telegram signed jointly by Mr. Stokes and Mr. Seth Taft, who was Mr. Stokes' Republican opponent, urging the defeat of the cutbacks proposed by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone through an eventful summer in my community of Cleveland, eventful because we have made significant progress because of the success of the poverty program.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided employment and work experience to over 20,000 young people, ages 15 to 21. They have been engaged in useful work within the schools as aides in libraries, classrooms, food handling and building maintenance. Others are utilized by Federal agencies, such as NASA's Lewis Flight Research Center, Social Security, and other agencies. Thousands of young people in the Neighborhood Youth Corps serve city and county agencies. Through this program, thousands of young people in the Cleveland area have remained at school because of this program, while hundreds have been made job ready and are now gainfully employed. This program critically needs expansion. How can we countenance losing these obvious gains?

Cleveland is a host city for a unit of the Women's Job Corps. Our Cleveland facility is well managed, its goals and its achievements are well defined. The attempt to cut back this program comes at the very moment when genuine progress



can be noted. This amendment would wash out the entire Job Corps program.

This summer, under title II provisions, 8,000 young people were provided a summer workshop opportunity at Karamu House which was highlighted by a summer arts festival which attracted national attention.

To meet the special needs of completely overlooked teenagers, a special program under title II was inaugurated to provide work experience to 15- and 16-year-old children who could not, under law, qualify for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. For others in this age group, poverty funds set in motion a citywide summer camp program. Over 4,800 young people were given a first camping experience out of their neighborhood environment.

The health program under title II provided health service to 4,670 citizens, while the legal-aid serve under this special program served 4,150 clients.

Headstart provided classes for 5,200 youngsters for year-round and summer programs.

The Goodell amendment would cut Federal participation in these programs by almost 50 percent and would make a shambles of established programs.

Those who desire to destroy the poverty program must understand their commitment. To shortchange these programs now would create a situation in which we would multiply the costs later.

Let us identify the opportunity crusade for what it really is: A crusade to end opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodell amendment.

The plain fact is that it represents a cut of some \$674 million, despite the fact that it reportedly generates between \$700 million and \$1,600,000,000 depending on your figures, whereas OEO reports that their bill generates some \$5 billion, on the same arithmetic basis.

The important point I think is not the figures. The authorization in the present bill is not enough. So I would strike the arithmetic from our minds. What is important, I believe, is that we must recall, particularly on our side, that our party was born in the fight to make men free. Yet, the freedom for which our party fought and which justified its very existence will be hollow and empty if we fail to make it meaningful with the promise of a new life, enriched by jobs of substance and permanence.

If we turn our backs on our heritage, we shall be branding ourselves hereafter as the party that turned its back on the destitute and we shall have done a grave injustice to present and future generations of Americans, and most importantly, to our youth who have the right to cast off the shackles of economic deprivation.

Many Republicans, including the Governor of the State of New York and the mayor of the city of New York, and mayors and Governors throughout the United States have spoken for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge strong bipartisan opposition to the Goodell amendment. I

hope Republican votes will make the difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodell amendment, which would cut authorizations by \$602 million and would lay the groundwork for substituting the opportunity crusade for the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

These efforts to build a better mousetrap would result in chaos—not efficiency—in administration; reduce funding to an unworkable level; and sabotage the careful relationships OEO has developed with the people.

Many years ago an American President said:

It is hard to fail; but it is worse never to have tried to succeed.

This was "rough-rider" Teddy Roosevelt—not one to give up when the going got tough.

Nor should we.

If there were no OEO, there would be no war on poverty. This is the first time the poor, who previously have been without influence in the affairs of the country, have had an independent advocate to speak for them. To fragment the structure at this point or bury programs in already overburdened departments, would be to shift the focus from the disadvantaged and betray the confidence of the people.

Yet, at this very moment, programs are being shut down across the country because of congressional inaction. How long can you keep staff on a volunteer basis? How can you forecast plans without funds? How long can you keep the faith of the people?

Roscoe Drummond, writing about last summer's civil disturbances, said:

Whatever Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is to tear up the antipoverty administration and programs.

Writer Ralph McGill recently wrote in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

Whenever OEO has been given a chance to function without local sabotage, it has worked.

And, it has worked in Pittsburgh.

It has worked because Pittsburgh was ready with appropriate plans and proper leadership a year before the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Our city was able to mobilize quickly because the pattern of cooperation between the city's government and the community's religious and civic leaders was well established. The Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, which has so ably administered the war on poverty in Pittsburgh, was set up by the mayor, but is an incorporated private organization, not a city agency or a public body, and its membership from the beginning has had representatives of business, labor, Government, housing, social service agencies, clergymen, educators, civil rights groups, and, especially the representatives of the poor from eight target neighborhoods where 60 percent

of the poor, 81 percent of the welfare cases, and 80 percent of the city's Negroes reside. Our program has been a team effort—of the community working with existing agencies; it has provided a line of communication between the poor and the city; it has given the poor a voice in expressing needs and in planning; it has promoted institutional change in the social agencies themselves.

In a recent report on the war on poverty in Pittsburgh, the mayor's committee said:

The OEO antipoverty program in Pittsburgh is not relief; but redemption; it is not hand-outs; but help; it is not a program for recipients, but a program for participants.

Let me cite a few examples.

Joan J——, a Neighborhood Youth Corps girl, has a position now at Presbyterian Hospital, which resulted from her experience as a hospital escort in the ancillary program for the aged at Kinsley House, where she brought an elderly arthritis patient in every day for treatment.

Calvin R——, of the Oakland section of Pittsburgh, at age 19 had finished high school, but had no skills which made him employable. He was sliding toward a life of crime when he came in contact with the community action program. He was guided into an apprentice program for plasterers, and is now, after training, earning \$2.50 an hour. As the poverty worker who related this story to me said, "It made a man of him." Society, which probably would have had to support Calvin in jail, will now be helped by his productivity and the taxes which he will pay.

George D——, of Pittsburgh's Hill district, was a 40-year-old janitor earning \$40 per week with no future because of low reading capabilities. After training in literacy and in reading blueprints, George got a job as a stationary engineer at H. J. Heinz Co. at \$140 per week.

George M——, a 40-year-old Hill district man, had a police record, a lot of talent, but no motivation to use it constructively. After a stint with an opportunities industrialization center, George is now doing important work as a therapist at the Crippled Children's Home in Pittsburgh. As one of his friends said, "He's an entirely different man now."

Mary A——, of the Lawrenceville area, had no husband, and she and her three children were on public assistance. She had been a secretary but had lost some of her skills because she remained at home to care for her children. The Lawrenceville economic action program opened a daycare center. Mary A——'s children went to the daycare center while she went to a training center to upgrade her skills. She is now employed as a secretary at St. Francis Hospital.

Another Youth Corps success story is the case of Patricia G——, who is one of 13 children, and was unable to find a job of any kind. She is now an airline stewardess for Eastern. Largely as a result of her enrollment in the Youth Corps where she learned stenographic skills, she got a job which enabled her to later take evening classes in self-improvement.



I am convinced that jobs are the key to the dilemma of the poor. While we must work hard to improve housing, education, and health, only a job with adequate pay will give a man a sense of worth, promote family stability, and convert the receiver of welfare funds to a productive taxpayer. But the opportunity crusade is not first with this idea.

In Pittsburgh our manpower development training program has trained and found jobs for more than 3,000 men and women; and the Neighborhood Youth Corps has taken more than 3,000 out-of-school young men and women off the streets and placed them in productive jobs in city departments and community agencies—more than 50 percent of these young adults have secured full-time jobs in industry and public employment. This has been a two-way street; they have benefited the city, and themselves.

In Pittsburgh we have a concentrated employment program, planned by OEO, in cooperation with the Department of Labor, to find and develop jobs for nearly 2,000 hard-core unemployed. The city itself has pledged 350 jobs in various departments, and private industry has been asked to respond with the rest. Statistics could be cited of our progress in employment centers, health centers, compensatory education, on-the-job training, daycare centers, legal aid services, comprehensive family services, recreational facilities—all activities that did not exist prior to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1964—but more than encouraging statistics is the encouraging spirit and cooperative effort between the community action agencies—the existing private agencies—and all levels of government.

The county health department has said:

Through the activity of the antipoverty program, this entire community will be challenged to face the growing demand for comprehensive health services which have been in short supply.

The Community Chest has said:

The Economic Opportunity Program is bringing about many changes in the provision of health and welfare services in this community—and they cited the changeover of neighborhood centers from recreation to self-help and improvement programs as one example.

The Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, a nonpartisan, citizen-based coordination agency, concerned with the community's health and social welfare program, had this to say:

The Mayor's Committee on Human Resources has stimulated citizen concern regarding human welfare problems and citizen involvement in and responsibility for the development and improvement of programs and services.

The southwestern Pennsylvania chapter of the National Association of Social Workers has written:

Our services have been made more attractive and accessible to residents of low-income neighborhoods under the poverty program . . . our chapter strongly believes that the poverty program in Pittsburgh has added an important new dimension to the provision of services for those in want.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that Sargent Shriver has called our program, "a

model for the Nation." But if Pittsburgh can do it, so can other cities.

Our experience shows that by combining the resources of and talents available in every American community, the war on poverty can be won. But it is essential to have at the Federal level one independent agency—OEO—capable of concentrating the variety of Government skills and resources for the benefit of the whole program. And we must provide enough funds to do the job, leaving as much flexibility and participation in decisionmaking as possible to the local level.

Mr. Chairman, the most important and valuable assets a nation can have are its people.

The war on poverty is not welfare, it is an investment in people. It is designed to transfer individuals from the liability side of the Nation's balance sheet to the asset side, from tax-eating recipients of welfare to taxpaying productive workers.

Another American President said in 1960, speaking of aiding the destitute beyond our shores:

We must not do it because the Communists are doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. In a free society, if we cannot save the many who are poor, we will not save the few who are rich.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to exercise reason, restraint, and responsibility in voting on this legislation, so that these needed programs—programs that are an investment in people—may continue without further delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, we have before us an amendment which only considers the money. The amendment provides that we would authorize a program at \$1.4 billion.

If you would adopt later amendments which will bring in the Republican substitute opportunity crusade, this would bring about \$3 billion to help the poor; \$1.4 billion from Federal sources and the remainder from private and State sources.

If you vote against this amendment, it will mean that you support the amount of \$2,060,000,000 from Federal sources and \$2.4 billion from all sources, Federal, State, and private.

The OEO needs to be changed, the committee bill is inadequate.

An article in the November 10 Washington Star states the situation clearly, which I will read here:

Democratic supporters of the committee bill said rejection of the Goodell amendment would be a vote of confidence for the entire poverty program.

Anybody who has read anything about the poverty program knows that it has not all worked well. Let me use as an example one program in Wisconsin where Camp McCoy Job Corps Center had 3,198 enrollees, and so far in 20 months of the program, they have had 365 graduates.

The article says that this is just over 16 percent of the youths who are reported to have graduated.

That is hardly a successful program. A better program can be funded with \$1.4 billion with the opportunity crusade than to authorize \$2.06 billion under the present act.

(Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. PERKINS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, the only comment I can make on the pending amendment is to reiterate what I said the day general debate on this bill opened. We have heard a lot of talk during this debate about economy and about saving money—talk which is strangely absent when this House is passing out much larger chunks of Federal largesse to the manufacturers of hard goods. Last week, as I mentioned at the time, the United States hurled into orbit a spaceship. The cost of that ship alone and of the launching of the ship—and I am not including development costs or research costs or any pro rata share of previous experiments—was equal to one-sixth of the entire amount requested in this bill for the poverty program for the entire year—and just about one-fourth of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] would allow us to spend on all the needs of the poor under this amendment.

I find it difficult to understand, Mr. Chairman, how we can be casual about spending one-third of a billion dollars on a single spaceship flight—a flight which lasted, I believe, about 2 days, and then turn around and spend more time than that to debate how many pennies we will spend on the poor. I wish someone could explain satisfactorily why it is so much more damaging to our fiscal stability to spend a few bucks on the poor than it is to spend many times as much on exploring the heavens.

Or can it be, Mr. Chairman, that all the talk about economy is simply a convenient argument against doing anything meaningful for those in poverty?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that while I have supported, and hope to continue to support, the space program—on its own merits—I am a lot more concerned about relieving the poverty of Appalachia or Harlem or Watts than I am about maintaining the affluence of Cape Kennedy or the aerospace industry. If the talk about economy means something, let us hear about a little sacrifice from those quarters, too.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodell amendment.

It seems to me that if we are to have a meaningful antipoverty program we must adequately fund it.

The Republican-sponsored amendment would cut the funding from \$2.06 billion to \$1.4 billion. This would drastically cut the many fine programs already in existence.

This summer we have witnessed a series of tragic riots in a number of cities throughout our Nation. These riots were destructive to human life and property. No one gained by these horrible events. All America is deeply concerned over these events which were borne out of poverty and frustration. The program we are considering today is uniquely geared to reduce the causes that lead to rioting.



We must not permit the pressures of the day to cause us to move backward in our views of social problems. I urge all Americans, particularly my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize that the urban poor are saddled with serious problems—problems that men of good will must bend every effort to solve; and the only way we can accomplish that is to fully fund this program.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodell amendment.

As I said in the debate on this bill last Tuesday, I am opposed to cuts in the antipoverty program. This amendment before us would cut the program by \$663 million. This reduction from the \$2,063 million authorization reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor would seriously impair, if not wreck, many of the worthwhile and successful antipoverty programs, such as Headstart, VISTA, Legal Services, Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps and tutorial and cultural enrichment programs.

These programs have been beneficial and most helpful to the poor and the disadvantaged. We should be thinking in terms of expanding them, rather than slashing them, as this amendment would.

Mr. Chairman, thousands of disadvantaged people in my home city of Springfield, Mass., have benefited from highly successful poverty programs sponsored by the Springfield Action Commission. More than 700 youngsters between ages 4 and 12 are enrolled in the tutorial and cultural enrichment programs offered by the Northern Educational Service, with \$95,000 in funding by OEO.

Another 132 disadvantaged boys and girls are participating in Headstart programs in Springfield, 48 of them on a full-time, year-around basis, and 84 on a half-time, 10-month basis, financed through a \$169,000 OEO grant. The Springfield action program has inaugurated a legal services program with a \$72,000 OEO grant. And virtually thousands of other disadvantaged people in Springfield are being helped through the magnanimous services of VISTA volunteers working in the community, and through the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school project.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many telegrams and letters from my constituents urging me to oppose cuts in the antipoverty program. In appealing to my colleagues to vote against the Goodell amendment, I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD a sampling of the communications I have received opposing such cuts:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,  
November 7, 1967.

Representative EDWARD BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

As a growing social service agency serving poverty areas in Springfield, we believe wholeheartedly that the poor must participate in programs that serve them to effectively fight poverty. We strongly urge you to kill the Green amendment. Vote for all funds for OEO.

CASA HISPANO AMERICANA.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,  
November 7, 1967.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our people urge your support of OEO and VISTA. Please help kill Green amendment.  
Dr. CHARLES WARREN,  
Barnes Hope Congregational Church.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,  
November 7, 1967.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

OEO and VISTA vital to Springfield. Please vote against Green amendment.

Rev. D. R. TROTTER,  
Hope Congregational Church.

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,  
November 7, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD BOLAND,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: This is an urgent appeal to you to do all that you can to prevent Congress from cutting anti-poverty funds. In fact, there is a need of increased expenditures in the fiscal year ahead for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In addition, it is important that the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Community Action approach should not be eliminated or weakened.

I realize and appreciate all that you have done in behalf of the poverty program, but felt the need to urge you on.

Sincerely,

CHESTER N. GIBBS,  
Director.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN GRANBY,  
Granby, Mass., November 4, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: The War on Poverty Program which has been conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity represents one of the most creative and positive programs ever sponsored by our government. It must somehow be continued. I know that you will make every effort to see that it is.

At a time when our people are so seriously divided regarding our policy in Viet-Nam, and when so many are becoming increasingly cynical regarding their opportunity to live within equal opportunity and with human dignity in our society, we can at least afford to further disillusion millions of our people regarding the moral integrity of our government and the concern for human values by our elected representatives.

I hope that it will be possible for you to effectively use the influence of your office to see that the War on Poverty Program receives the necessary Congressional support to be strengthened and continued.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. LESLIE R. WADSWORTH.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF  
UNIVERSITY WOMEN,  
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: The American Association of University Women was among the supporters of the Economic Opportunity Act at the time of its enactment. We have followed the progress of its implementation with great interest. On the whole we are convinced that much that is good has been achieved in the short period this program has been in operation. We are equally con-

vinced that a far greater contribution to solution of the social ills that plague this country is possible if this program is extended and strengthened. Therefore we urge passage of a bill extending the Economic Opportunity Act.

We are gratified that day care, family planning, and senior opportunity and services for the elderly, as well as emergency food and medical service programs are incorporated in S 2383 now under consideration. But we are gravely concerned that the bill before the House so drastically alters the 10-90 formula of sharing between local and Federal sources that was a part of the original act.

We are certain that many communities will be forced to drop immediately many very worthwhile and even indispensable projects when required to put up in cash rather than "in kind" so much higher a percentage of the total cost.

We urge enactment of authorizations, at a minimum, at present levels and preferably at higher levels so that the war on poverty can continue.

Sincerely yours,

Miss LOIS ROTH,

Area Representative in Education.

Mrs. GLORIA PETERS,

Area Representative in Community Problems.

Miss VICTORIA SCHUCK,

Chairman, Legislative Program Committee, and Professor of Political Science, South Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: We are writing this letter to you because we understand that you are voting on the anti-poverty bill, and possibly our program and our Vista Volunteer help may be taken away.

Before this program came to be on Bradford Street, our kids had to play in the streets and some were hit by cars. After the Vista Volunteer go together with us in August, we go our kids a mini-park and arts and crafts classes. The teenagers have recently gotten together with adults' block club, and with the help of the Vista Volunteer, can offer another way of living for the people of Bradford Street. For instance, many kids weren't going to school because they had no clothes. Now we have found a place for them to get clothes. We are trying to get better housing, jobs (most adults speak only Spanish and can only find jobs in tobacco) and the adults can now take family trips with their children. And furthermore, the poor people who had no hope for better life are beginning to see that if they work together they can do a lot for themselves, and especially can trust the help from the outside, because we can decide on the problem, and then understand the problem more. Then we can see the need for help and the best way for help.

We have never had help like this before. So we the Youth Committee and the Bradford Street Block Club ask you to do whatever is possible to keep the program going the way it has been.

Sincerely yours,

THE JOINT BRADFORD STREET COMMITTEE.

Onyue Cubi, Cristino Cubi, Miguel Pedraza, Juan Pedraza, Ramon Oesola, Pedro Confrero, Runaldi Lopez, Doris M. Sanchez, Mirella Sanchez, Josefina Sanchez, Victor D. Sanchez, Carmello Lopez.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I find myself caught between anger and shame as this House debates whether to cut



deeply into an already inadequate program designed to rescue our fellow Americans trapped in the depths of poverty.

It is paradoxical that the self-same people who shed crocodile tears when the alienated in our cities participate in riots and when their children, unequipped for jobs in our economy, turn to crime, are those who voted against a rat control program. They are also the same ones who voted to press ahead with a supersonic transport to cut travel time for transoceanic plane riders.

Mr. Chairman, our cities are in bad shape and are deteriorating. Housing is wretched, educational facilities are inadequate, and the poor remain untrained even for the few miserably paying jobs that are available. How long do our more comfortably situated families believe that they can remain as an oasis in a sea of misery? Does an exodus to the suburbs any longer promise a tranquil and stable society when core cities are the spawning ground of frustration, hostility, and alienation? I think not.

Even from a narrow, selfish view, the economic opportunity program deserves support. This is an effort to help people leave the ranks of the welfare recipients and take their place as self-sufficient citizens. These huge numbers of poor people are a potential market of 40 million people which could be opened if only we have the faith and the determination to carry through on the war against poverty.

I find it absurd that so many people find the existing level of antipoverty campaign inadequate and then suggest that the remedy is to decrease our efforts.

If half an aspirin does not cure a headache, would they suggest that a quarter of a tablet would be more effective?

I find it sad that so many of our colleagues defend this attempt to gut the poverty program on the grounds of economy. It is a bitter commentary on our Nation that we are debating at great length whether an economy that boasts more than \$700 billion in annual gross national product must cut the poverty program by less than 1,000th of that vaunted GNP. The sense of priorities implicit in this argument seems to me to be upside down.

In addition to heavy cuts in the program, the Goodell proposals would give primary responsibility for the Job Corps to the Federal Office of Vocational Education and to State vocational education systems. First, it is noteworthy that there has been no revision of our vocational program since 1963, and much must be done to enable those in this field to meet their traditional responsibilities. I, for one, look forward to enactment of the now overdue legislation to modernize this program. Until we have provided the necessary assistance to the existing programs, I find it inappropriate to assign the task of administering the Job Corps centers to the Federal and State vocational education people.

Further, I find no evidence that State officials want the added burden of administering the Job Corps centers. Throughout the debate last Thursday, we saw those who supported this amendment fill the RECORD with remarks of critics of the program, but conspicuously absent were endorsements of this amendment by the vocational education officials at the Federal or State level. None have solicited this new burden and responsibility; none suggest that they are in a position effectively to discharge this responsibility; none have suggested that a shift of this program from OEO would probably either improve the quality of the program or decrease the per enrollee cost.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, we see before us a proposed dismantling of the poverty program by its opponents and a cut in its funds, defended on the specious ground that the private agencies can be stimulated to do much more than they do today. But these same agencies are loud in their pleas that the OEO program be continued.

I hope the Goodell amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] rise?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be granted to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. OLSEN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mr. PERKINS yielded their time to Mr. Boggs.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the members of the distinguished committee for yielding their time to me, and let me compliment the members of the committee for the long, tedious, and fruitful job which they have done in behalf of so many people who are genuinely seeking an opportunity in this great American society.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I think that the arguments in opposition are commanding.

First, I speak from the point of view of the kind of society in which we are living. Why do we have this problem? Yesterday I noticed again what I have seen time and time again during the past several years, and that is a compilation of the number of people who have migrated from the small towns, from the rural sections, into its great metropolitan areas throughout our country. The article observed that something like 70 percent of the population of our country now occupies about 1 percent of the land area of the country.

This has been a migration particularly from the poorer areas of the country, unequalled in the history of the Nation.

That migration has brought with it problems never faced before by the American cities.

Not long ago I attended, with the Speaker and others, a meeting called by the Urban Coalition. Present at that meeting were people like Mr. Henry Ford II, Mr. David Rockefeller, one of the great bankers of our country, and many other great industrial leaders of our country.

They endorsed not this modest approach, but they asked for a crash program which would cost something like \$4 billion. They said that we need it now.

The distinguished mayor of the largest city in our country was there, Mayor Lindsay, and he asked for it. If we had adopted that program, it would cost at least \$4 billion.

In fact, the debate in the other body was not about \$2 billion, but the main debate—and it was a bipartisan debate—was over an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], which would have increased the authorization by \$2 billion or up to about \$4 billion.

It was defeated by only three votes in the other body.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that this is a modest bill. It is a well considered bill. The idea that \$1,400,000,000 would generate what \$2,063,000,000 would generate just is not so.

Let me give you the figures in the few minutes that I have, and these have been carefully worked out by the agency and by the committee. What this does is to cut across the board. It would cripple every phase of this program. Community action agencies would under this bill be increased to 1,052. Under the Goodell amendment they would be reduced to 827.

The neighborhood centers, which have been so important—which, incidentally, help thousands of people in my city of New Orleans—would be reduced from 875 to 570. Rather than serving 3½ million people, only 2.3 million people would be served.

The manpower program, which seeks to teach people gainful employment, to give them a trade and develop their talents, would be reduced from 117,000 to 93,000.

The children who need special training, the retarded children, would have their program reduced from 33,000 to 28,000.

Adult education, which is equally important, would be reduced from 74,000 to 54,000.

Housing programs, helping people who need help so desperately, would be reduced from 55,000 families to 35,000 families.

And so on for the nonprofessional employees and the Headstart program and all the programs dealing with children. All these would be drastically affected.

I hope that the Committee will vote down the amendment.

Following is a breakdown of the effect of the amendment on the various programs.



\$2.06 billion		\$1.4 billion	
1,052 Community action agencies.		827 Community action agencies (—225)	
<b>LOCAL INITIATIVE</b>		<b>LOCAL INITIATIVE</b>	
Neighborhood centers: 875—3.5 million served.		Neighborhood centers: 570 (—305)—2.3 million served (—1.2).	
Manpower programs: 117,000 people served.		Manpower programs: 93,000 people served.	
Remedial/tutorial: 33,000 children assisted.		Remedial/tutorial: 28,500 children (—4,500).	
Adult education: 74,000 adults assisted.		Adult education: 54,000 adults (—20,000).	
Housing programs: 55,000 families assisted.		Housing programs: 30,000 families (—25,000).	
Family planning: 206,000 people served.		Family planning: 171,000 people (—35,000).	
<b>NONPROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES (POOR PEOPLE)</b>		<b>NONPROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES (POOR PEOPLE)</b>	
85,000 employed annually (actual numbers) 41,000 man-years/employment better figure to use.		60,000 employed annually (—25,000), 29,000 man-years (—12,000).	
<b>HEADSTART</b>		<b>HEADSTART</b>	
Year-round Headstart, 209,000 children.		Year-round Headstart, 155,100 children (—43,900).	
Summer Headstart, 500,000 children.		No change.	
<b>HEADSTART FOLLOWTHROUGH</b>		<b>HEADSTART FOLLOWTHROUGH</b>	
190,000 children enrolled.		3,000 children enrolled (—187,000).	
<b>COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH SERVICES</b>		<b>COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH SERVICES</b>	
1,085,000 potential clientele.		910,000 potential clientele (—175,000).	
44 projects.		39 projects (—5).	
<b>UPWARD BOUND</b>		<b>UPWARD BOUND</b>	
24,000 participants.		15,200 participants (—8,800).	
<b>LEGAL SERVICES</b>		<b>LEGAL SERVICES</b>	
700,000 served.		500,000 served (—200,000).	
850 law offices open.		630 law offices (—220).	
2,000 attorneys.		1,500 attorneys (—500).	
<b>VISTA</b>		<b>VISTA</b>	
4,250 full-time volunteers.		3,000 volunteers (—1,250).	
300 VISTA associates.		150 VISTA associates (—150).	
<b>RURAL LOANS</b>		<b>RURAL LOANS</b>	
12,000 loans to individuals.		5,300 loans (—6,700).	
400 loans to cooperatives.		200 loans (—200).	
<b>MIGRANTS</b>		<b>MIGRANTS</b>	
3,600 housing units provided.		2,400 housing units (—1,200).	
28,000 adult education enrollees.		27,200 adults (—800).	
13,000 children in day care programs.		11,400 children (—1,600).	

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GOODELL and Mr. PERKINS.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GURNEY: On page 128, beginning in line 14, strike out the second sentence of section 2.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not cause quite as much excitement as did the last one.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment proposes to do is to strike out the second sentence of the section of the bill to which reference has been made. This sentence authorizes the program for a second year. If the amendment is agreed to, Mr. Chairman, then the bill will provide an authorization for the period of only this year.

Now, I might say that this follows exactly what every other poverty bill which we have processed here in the House of Representatives has done. Heretofore, we have only had a 1-year authorization.

This 2-year authorization, as provided for in this bill now pending before us, represents a departure from what we have done before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a good number of the Members of the House, regardless of how they feel about this legislation, whether they are for it or whether they are against it, feel rather strongly that if we are going to legislate responsibly in the House of Representatives, we should take an annual look at this program. That is true of legislation that is not controversial. Yet we have pending before us here today what I suppose is fair to say is the most controversial piece of legislation that we have had before the Congress in our time.

Mr. Chairman, even those who are for the bill have great differences of opinion as to how some of these programs should be handled. As we go on here today and tomorrow and the day after, and the balance of the week for that matter, there will be arguing back and forth, by both Democrats and Republicans, all sorts of different viewpoints, as to how this poverty program should be operated.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that it seems to me people who are for the bill, as well as people who are against the bill, should

feel as though we should authorize for the period of only 1 year.

Confine this authorization to the 1 year, and then come back and take a look at it next year.

I might even point this out to those people who are for this bill: Remember, now, as we go through title after title, and provide money for program after program, that we are going to lock ourselves into a certain sum of money for the Job Corps, the community action program, and all of these other programs in this bill. But suppose that we did have a miracle strike us in which the war in Southeast Asia might be concluded within a fairly short time, if this should happen, then certainly we would want to come back and take a look at this legislation and see whether we should revise the authorization portion of it. Certainly the proponents of the bill would want to do that.

So I would say that if we are going to legislate responsibly we ought to do it only for 1 year, it seems to me that if we do this for more than 1 year, if we do it for 2 years, as the bill provides, then we are doing one of two things, we are either shirking our responsibilities by not examining the bill next year when we come back here, or else we are afraid to do it, because the bill and the programs are controversial.

I do not believe either one of these reasons is a good reason to go ahead at this time for a 2-year period.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to point out to the gentlemen that, in contrast to what he had stated, we will have an opportunity to look at the appropriations for 1969. This is an authorization. We still have to legislate on the appropriation. Therefore the House will have a chance to look at the appropriation for 1969.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes, I would say that is true, to the gentleman from Illinois, that we would have the opportunity to again look at the appropriations, but I do not believe that that is any excuse for the authorization committee, the great Committee on Education and Labor, not to participate in the authorization. That is the committee whose expertise is supposed to be in the fields of education, labor, and in the poverty war. So I do not believe it is any sound argument to say that, simply because the Committee on Appropriations will look it over next year, that the Committee on Education and Labor need not look it over also.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that this amendment really ought not be controversial. The people who are for the bill should support it equally with those who are against the bill. Therefore, I would hope the House could adopt this amendment which permits a limitation of 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.



Mr. Chairman, I have considerable personal affection and respect for the gentleman from Florida, but I cannot help but say that it is perfectly obvious and well known that the gentleman is opposed to this program, and has the distinction of being the author of the amendment to the Federal pay raise legislation which would deprive the GS-2's, GS-3's, GS-4's, and GS-5's who work honestly and faithfully in the Office of Economic Opportunity from the benefits of the pay raise legislation.

The effect of this amendment is simply to cut off next year's authorization. So, if we were foolish enough to adopt this amendment, for all of our efforts, both for and against, we would be authorizing a program to expire in only 6 months.

The gentleman from Florida talked about legislative responsibility. Mr. Chairman, it is our legislative responsibility to allow decent planning at whatever level we ultimately arrive at by the agencies which must do the planning. Look at Headstart, for instance. Under the gentleman's amendment how could they get teachers, how could they make commitments?

The gentleman must know, and I am sure the Members know, especially those who have any impacted areas or Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 money in their districts, that it takes a fiscal year of planning in order for there to be intelligent construction of any school operation, or maintenance, or construction program.

Yearly planning is obviously needed in every other educational program. Of course, the gentleman might not be for the Headstart program—I do not know.

But any of you who are for any educational programs, whether it be elementary or secondary or Public Law 815 or Public Law 874 or any other program, know perfectly well that your school administrators must hire in advance. Teachers are hired in April and May for September. Commitments—fiscal commitments have to be made.

Mr. Chairman, this would be devastating—absolutely devastating to the program.

We are not locking ourselves in. This is an authorization bill. That does not mean that any of us are locked in, if we are displeased with its operation, to committing ourselves to supporting the funding next year. That is why we have subcommittees and the Committee on Appropriations to help us with that.

This amendment is nothing more nor less than mischievous. Its obvious intent is to cut this program—such as the gentleman would support, if any of it, and give it only 6 months more of life. For those of us who want it to continue for 2 years, which is the authorization, there would devolve upon us again the necessity of coming back here and going through this agony again next year.

This amendment is mischievous—it should be defeated and must be defeated. (Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GURNEY and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 130.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

# TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

## JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

### "PART A—JOB CORPS

#### "STATEMENTS OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.

#### "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

#### "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

"(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age fourteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

"(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs, or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

"(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;

"(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and

"(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

## "SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities: shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including court, probation, parole, law enforcement, education, welfare, and medical authorities and advisers. They shall also provide for—

"(1) an interview with each applicant for the purpose of—

"(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

"(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and

"(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

"(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

"(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

## "SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addition, or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.



"(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.

#### "ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

"(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

"(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

"(d) After the Director has determined whether an enrollee is to be assigned to a men's training center, a conservation center, or a women's training center, the center to which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the appropriate type which is closest to the enrollee's home, except that the Director, on an individual basis, may waive this requirement when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the enrollee's home shall be carefully limited to situations in which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

#### "JOB CORPS CENTERS

"SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character and shall be designed and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling, and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's and women's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment.

"(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's training centers shall offer educa-

tion and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a non-residential basis to participants in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

#### "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours a week. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

"(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

"(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

"(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

#### "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

"SEC. 109. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems neces-

sary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

#### "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

"SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

#### "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Whenever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view of achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees



directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and cooperative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

#### "COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

"SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

"(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.

"(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 611(d) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to—

"(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;

"(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;

"(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and

"(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.

If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.

#### "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

"SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of

the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of higher learning, boards of education, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

"(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as described in part B of this title, in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

"(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how

communities could make maximum utilization of existing educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

"(1) a job survey be made of the area;

"(2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;

"(3) an advisory committee of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

"(4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and

"(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

#### "ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

"SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

#### "PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

"SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

"(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

"(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

#### "APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of



compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

"(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

"(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

"(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

"(3) For the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

"(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.

"(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five thousand enrollees.

"(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women enrollees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

"(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,500 per residential enrollee, or \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee.

"(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

#### "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, either partisan or nonpartisan, or in voter registration drives, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

"(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 101 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, on November 1, 1967, the following article appeared in the Toledo Blade of Toledo, Ohio:

EAST TOLEDO CENTER CHIEF RESIGNS, CITES FRUSTRATIONS—ANTIPOVERTY GOALS MET, SALVERDA SAYS—FOURTH TO LEAVE STAFF IN LAST MONTH

Harold Salverda has resigned as director of the anti-poverty program's East Toledo Neighborhood Opportunity Center. He is the fourth person to leave the center staff in the last month.

In his letter of resignation to John W. Jones, executive director of the Economic Opportunity Planning Association (EOPA), Mr. Salverda said he was leaving to accept a job in the ministry.

Mr. Salverda said today, however, that though he is looking forward to his new job, he would not have considered leaving if there was a realistic chance that things could be changed in the local anti-poverty program.

"When I took the director's job seven months ago, I thought it was possible to get some things done to help the poor and to

bring about a significant change in the program. But I wasn't able to bring it off," Mr. Salverda said.

#### SUPPORTS PROGRAM

He said he supports, without hesitation, the idea of the war on poverty but added that the directorship of the East Toledo center was a series of frustrations.

In the last month, the center's assistant director and two interviewers resigned. Mr. Salverda said it is rumored that three or four more members of the staff are considering leaving.

One objective of the social-action program is to attempt to make institutional changes, Mr. Salverda said. But the program has become an institution that is more interested in perpetuating itself than in changing things, he said.

Nine members of the center's advisory council resigned last June in protest over what they termed overlapping and duplication of services.

#### MEDICAL PROGRAM GONE

The center, opened two years ago, originally provided a full range of medical, legal, and employment services to the poor in East Toledo. Mr. Salverda said the medical program has been eliminated, an employment counselor spends only two half-days a week at the center, and legal aid is available 2½ days a week.

The center's present annual budget is more than \$100,000, but the accomplishments of the center were less than they should have been, Mr. Salverda said.

Mr. Salverda said: "I know I'm going to sound like a real sorehead, but I think the question needs to be asked: Are we really helping the poor?"

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the reasons why I am not supporting this program, because I have to answer the question that is being asked not only in my district and in East Toledo but around the country, "Is this program really helping the poor?"

When these things come to light, nothing ever seems to be done about it. Apparently Mr. Sargent Shriver is deaf and does not hear these complaints. I think it is high time that if we are going to have a war on poverty, we get somebody in who can hear these complaints. Not only is this complaint being aired during the debate but many other complaints are. I think he ought to take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the last several days to see what is going on in his own program and do something about it.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ERLNBORN

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ERLNBORN: On page 129, after line 5, strike out everything through line 6 one page 154 and insert:

#### "PART A—RESIDENTIAL CENTERS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. It is the purpose of this part to establish residential vocational education and job training centers (hereinafter referred to as "Residential Centers") for needy young men and women who, because of their family or neighborhood environments and level of educational attainment, are unable to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship, to increase their skills for employment, or to benefit from other programs of education, training, and work experience, and who require residential training to prepare themselves for jobs in a free enterprise economy. It is further the purpose of this part to provide for the operation of Residential Centers



in conjunction with vocational training facilities such as area vocational schools, in order to develop a nationwide capability to meet the vocational training needs of all Americans. It is the intent of Congress that, to the extent possible, the Residential Centers provided for enrollees under this title shall be combined with area vocational schools, technical institutes, and other training facilities, for resident and nonresident trainees, in order to avoid isolation or stigmatizing of said enrollees and to develop a concept of community and area training centers. It is further the intent of Congress that trainees shall be assigned to Residential Centers as reasonably close to their place of residence as is compatible with the goals sought to be achieved in their attendance at such Center.

#### "TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY"

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary') shall assume the administrative responsibility for the Job Corps (including personnel, property, records, contractual obligations, and unexpended balances of appropriations) operating heretofore under the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the provisions of part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

"(b) The Secretary shall promulgate and publish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his responsibilities under this title: *Provided, however,* That until superseded or repealed by such rules and regulations as may be promulgated and published by the Secretary hereunder, all rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, and in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

#### "PHASING OVER THE JOB CORPS"

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the orderly phasing over the Job Corps program into the program of Residential Centers authorized by part A of this title.

"(b) In carrying out subsection (a) the Secretary shall make a study and evaluation of existing Job Corps facilities for the purpose of determining: (1) which facilities are suited to continuation as Residential Centers under the provisions of part A of this title; (2) which facilities, if any, could best be operated by the Department of the Interior or by the Department of Agriculture as Residential Centers for the provision of vocational education and training in such fields as conservation, forestry, and the management of natural resources; and (3) which facilities should be eliminated because of their lack of suitability for carrying out the purposes of this part. The Secretary is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to implement his findings from this evaluation.

#### "AUTHORIZATION"

"SEC. 104. The Secretary shall carry out the programs authorized by part A of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year. For such purpose there is hereby transferred to the Secretary from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, the sum of \$190,000,000.

#### "ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM"

"SEC. 105. (a) The Secretary shall establish a program of Residential Centers to be administered as a part of or in coordination with programs authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended.

"(b) Residential Centers may be established in accordance with the provisions of this part by means of—

"(1) grants to State boards of vocational education for operation of Residential Centers in conjunction with area vocational-technical schools or other facilities operated in accordance with a State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended;

"(2) contracts with public or private agencies or organizations which have a demonstrated capability to conduct high-quality vocational education and job training programs in accordance with the provision of this part; and

"(3) arrangements with the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior for the operation of Residential Centers for the provision of vocational training in such fields as conservation, forestry, and the management of natural resources.

"(c) The Secretary shall promulgate and publish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part.

#### "STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL CENTERS"

"SEC. 106. (a) Any State which desires to operate one or more Residential Centers shall submit to the Secretary, through its State board of vocational education, a State plan (or amendment to a State plan under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended) which—

"(1) designates the State board of vocational education to act, either directly or through arrangements with one or more local educational agencies, as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

"(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State under section 108 will be spent solely for the establishment and operation of Residential Centers which meet the requirements of section 109, and for administration of the State plan;

"(3) makes adequate provision, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary, for the accommodation of trainees who are residents of other States;

"(4) sets forth, in such detail as the Secretary may deem necessary, a description of the program of training and education to be carried out, including methods and procedures for the recruitment, selection, screening, testing, and job placement of trainees and graduates;

"(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this title; and

"(6) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) Upon agreement of two or more States, acting through their respective State boards of vocational education, a single plan may be submitted for the joint operation of one or more Residential Centers: *Provided,* That such plan meets the requirements of subsection (a).

"(c) The Secretary may approve a plan submitted by a State or by several States which meets the requirements of subsection (a), and he shall give first priority to such plans as the preferred method of carrying out the Residential Centers program, taking into consideration such factors as (i) the readiness of the State or States to assume and continue the operation of facilities previously operated as Job Corps centers or camps under part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended; (ii) the geographic location of existing and proposed facilities; and (iii) the availability of Residential Centers in other States to meet the needs of

eligible young men and women in the area to be served.

#### "OTHER RESIDENTIAL CENTERS"

"SEC. 107. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide (in accordance with his findings under section 102(b)) for the operation of Residential Centers (other than those established under plans approved under section 106) as follows:

"(1) the operation of facilities previously operated as Job Corps centers or camps under part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, in accordance with contracts entered into by or under the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the duration of the contract;

"(2) the operation of Residential Centers under contract with public or private agencies or organizations, including the extension of existing Job Corps contracts (but in accordance with the requirements of this title), as the Secretary may find necessary in the absence of acceptable State plans under Section 106, or until Centers established under such plans are operative; and

"(3) the operation of Residential Centers by the Department of Agriculture or by the Department of the Interior which were under the jurisdiction of such Departments prior to the enactment of this Act.

"(b) In providing for the establishment and operation of any Residential Center or centers under this section, the Secretary shall seek the advice and counsel of State boards of vocational education and shall assure, insofar as may be practicable, that such centers are operated with the advice and cooperation of the State board for the State in which they are located.

#### "PAYMENT OF COSTS"

"SEC. 108. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay the costs of carrying out State plans approved under this part and for the operation of Residential Centers pursuant to contracts or delegations of authority made by him. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Secretary may determine.

#### "OPERATION OF RESIDENTIAL CENTERS"

"SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary shall assure that each Residential Center operated under the provisions of this part shall provide—

"(1) basic education designed to qualify trainees for employment;

"(2) vocational training programs, including classroom instruction and other programs such as on-the-job training or work experience under actual or simulated employment conditions designed to qualify trainees for employment;

"(3) continuous counseling, education, and activities designed to develop motivation, proper attitudes, work discipline, and habits necessary for successful and long-term employment;

"(4) effective enforcement of rules and regulations designed to govern the conduct of trainees and to maintain an environment conducive to learning, as well as enforcement of standards of safety and health for trainees;

"(5) programs designed to promote good community relations, including the encouragement of community advisory groups to consult with Center administrators, and to develop whenever feasible job or career opportunities in the community for graduates from the Center;

"(6) continuous liaison with public and private employers in the area served by the Center in order to determine which job skills are in demand in such area and to obtain employment opportunities in such area for graduates of the Center;



"(7) a program of counseling and testing of each trainee at regular intervals to follow his progress in, and satisfaction with, the educational and vocational program; and

"(8) a placement program (utilizing the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible) which shall include arrangements for postgraduate interviews or other contacts through which the graduate's employment status, progress, and needs for additional training or counseling can be determined.

"(b) The Secretary shall require each Residential Center to make available to him such records pertaining to each trainee and graduate as may be necessary to enable him to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and to provide such further services to graduates as may be necessary.

**"PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRAINEES; RECRUITMENT AND ELIGIBILITY**

"SEC. 110. (a) Each State board of vocational education (or contracting agency or organization) operating a Residential Center shall select and enroll trainees recruited pursuant to regulations of the Secretary, and shall determine the eligibility of individuals in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) In States in which there is no approved State plan under this part, the Secretary shall make arrangements for the recruitment of trainees and for their enrollment in Residential Centers pursuant to the provisions of this part (utilizing to the fullest extent possible the assistance of the State board of vocational education and the State employment security agency).

"(c) No individual shall be eligible for enrollment as a trainee in any Residential Center unless he or she—

"(1) is at least sixteen but not more than twenty-two years of age at the time of admission to such Center;

"(2) meets such low family income and other criteria of need as may be promulgated and published by the Secretary;

"(3) requires additional education, training, and related assistance in order to secure and hold minimum employment;

"(4) is currently living in an environment of such a character as to impair substantially his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance and therefore requires a substantial change of environment;

"(5) is a permanent resident of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or is a citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a non-immigrant or is a parolee under section 214(a) or 212(d) (5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"(6) evidences a desire and ability to benefit from the training and educational opportunities available at such Center;

"(7) meets each additional criteria as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by a State board of vocational education with the consent of the Secretary;

"(8) shall take or subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic': *Provided*, That this requirement shall not apply to a citizen of Cuba as described above, or to a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: *And provided further*, That the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to such oath; and

"(9) agrees to comply with such rules and regulations concerning conduct while a trainee at such Residential Center as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by a State board of vocational education with the consent of the Secretary.

"(d) No individual may be a trainee at any Residential Center or Centers for a total of more than two years, except as the Secretary may determine in special cases.

"(e) Criminal violations shall not disqualify any individual from enrollment at any Residential Center, but after evaluation of the distinctive nature of each individual's problems, provision shall be made for suitable treatment and handling: *Provided, however*, That the director of such Center may refuse to enroll any individual whose behavioral problems are likely to jeopardize the enforcement of standards of conduct at such Center, or impair the training or educational opportunity of other trainees, or endanger such other trainees or personnel at such Center.

"(f) The Secretary shall take necessary action to insure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of trainees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Secretary shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women trainees consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

**"ALLOWANCES AND MAINTENANCE**

"SEC. 111. (a) Each trainee shall be provided with such living and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital and other health services, and other expenses as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for his needs. Living allowances may be graduated in a manner which will provide monetary incentive for excellent and exceptional achievement. Reasonable transportation expenses may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Secretary may determine, for enrollees to reach a Residential Center for admission and for graduates or trainees who have discontinued their training to return to their homes: *Provided*, That such arrangements and expenses are as economical as possible, consistent with the circumstances and shall not be more generous than similar provisions available to members of the United States Armed Forces.

"(b) Upon termination of his or her participation in the participation in the program each trainee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That under such circumstances as the Secretary may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of a trainee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the trainee directly to a member of his or her family and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Secretary. In the event of the trainee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

**"OTHER PROVISIONS CONCERNING TRAINEES**

"SEC. 112. (a) For the purposes of this part, except as provided in subsection (b), a trainee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b) Trainees shall be deemed to be employees or civil employees of the United States for the purposes of—

"(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual

as such a trainee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States;

"(2) the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, U.S.C.;

"(3) the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(c) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(1) the term 'performance of duty' shall not include any act of a trainee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including any activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Center;

"(2) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of a trainee shall be deemed to be \$150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d) (1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756(a) (1)) shall apply to trainees.

"(3) compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured trainee's participation in the program is terminated.

"(d) No payment shall be made to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for services of referring the name of any individual or individuals for enrollment at any Residential Center.

**"AUTHORITY TO DISMISS; COMMISSION OF CRIME; PAROLE VIOLATION**

"SEC. 113. (a) The director of each Residential Center shall have authority to take appropriate and reasonable disciplinary measures against trainees, including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Center. Dismissals from the Residential Center shall be made in every instance in which the director determines that retention in the Residential Center will jeopardize the enforcement of standards of conduct, or endanger other trainees or Center personnel, or impair the educational opportunities of other trainees.

"(b) Any trainee who is convicted of a felony committed during the period of his training shall be immediately dismissed from the Center.

"(c) Any trainee who is charged with violation of State criminal statutes while in training at a Center shall be provided the cost of an attorney and other legal fees in circumstances where adequate provision for such representation of indigent defendants is not otherwise provided.

"(d) The Secretary shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that participation by a trainee in the program shall in no way result in a violation of parole or probationary procedures of any State. In the event procedures have been established under which the participation in the program of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Secretary shall require the Center to provide for regular supervision of the trainee and reports to the State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.

**"RELATIONS WITH STATES**

"SEC. 114. No Residential Center (other than one established pursuant to an approved State plan) shall be established under this part within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted by the Secretary to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission."



Mr. ERLBORN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this is a lengthy amendment. It is a complete substitute for part A, section 101. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this the same language covered in the gentleman's bill H.R. 13894?

Mr. ERLBORN. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, the whole war on poverty, of course, has been controversial throughout its life, but I think, without any doubt, one of the most if not the most controversial parts has been the Job Corps. There have been some very good reasons for this. I recall a good deal of debate last year on the subject of the Job Corps and its excessive costs. The testimony before our committee then and again this year has been to the effect that job placement and the utilization of training by youths that have gone through it has not been what it should be. The amendment I offer is to transfer the Job Corps from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to phase out the Job Corps as we know it. This is not to stop it but to phase it out as a total Federal program and phase it into vocational education in the States.

We have a yardstick, if you please, to test the success of the Job Corps. We have residential vocational education in some places in this country. Before our committee this year we had testimony concerning the Trumbull County vocational school in Vienna, Ohio. There they have a cost per year per student of \$4,573. There they have good results with job placement. We have testimony as to the Mahoning Valley school, which is another residential vocational school, where approximately 80 percent of their graduates are successful in finding jobs related to the education they have received in the school. We can compare the cost of these schools with the cost of the present Job Corps. These are valid comparisons.

The Milwaukee vocational school has a residential program that runs between \$3,500 and \$4,000 a year for each enrollee in direct operating cost. Mahoning Valley residential operation costs are about \$4,573 per student, as I mentioned a minute ago. Compared to this we have just a few years ago, schools like this called Job Corps centers, which are nothing more than residential vocational education schools.

The cost at Rodman Job Corps camp was \$10,517 per enrollee per year. The Parks camp was \$9,091. Albuquerque was \$12,658. Some of the centers at that time

had not been in operation as long as Rodman, Parks, and Albuquerque. They are Guthrie, \$13,238; St. Louis, \$12,203. And we can go on down the list. Lincoln is \$18,516. Just a year ago, of course, we were debating the wisdom of having expenditures at this level with the results we were getting from the Job Corps camps. And, after a good deal of debate on the floor with the opposition of the administration, finally a limitation was put on the cost of operating these Job Corps camps of \$7,500 per year.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that even this figure is too high as compared to what can be done in residential vocational training centers in the States involved in this program that have not been connected with Federal expenditures.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Are the young people who are in attendance at the residential schools from that particular neighborhood, or do they come from a distance removed from that particular center?

Mr. ERLBORN. I would say that most of the examples which I have cited of the residential vocational centers, it is true that most of them come from the immediate area where these residential centers are located.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, yes, but it is far different when they come from a distance. Naturally, the costs are more. One reason that they do that is to make it difficult for the young people to go back into their same environment, which is understandable.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. What really happens is that as soon as the Job Corps enrollee wants to go home, the Job Corps sends him home again. And, if they happen to be located at a camp on the east coast and if they want to go back to California, for instance, they are sent that long distance by air; that is why it is so expensive. Sending enrollees half way across the country has never proven successful nor necessary, just expensive.

Mr. ERLBORN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is the second amendment which has been offered in an effort to put into effect the so-called opportunity crusade, spinning off the Job Corps to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Their original so-called opportunity crusade, which was introduced earlier (H.R. 10682) and considered extensively

by the committee, specified that the residential centers should be operated by the Office of Education.

When they say the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—we know it simply means the Office of Education. Last year's version of the "crusade" would have transferred it to the Secretary of Labor. As all the members of the Committee know, since passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 our vocational schools have had the authority to provide special programs to serve the disadvantaged youngsters that this Job Corps is now serving.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a different league altogether from the vocational educational schools and the type of youngsters that they serve. The Job Corps seeks young people who for a variety of reasons can't be reached in the regular school system. It may well be that the feedback from the innovative approach taken in Job Corps will enable at a future date a transfer of these functions—but not at this time.

What we are doing here is throwing away all the know-how that we are getting from the industry-operated programs and from the conservation operations. We are trying to destroy a program that is effectively serving the disadvantaged youngsters through medical care, dental care, basic education, vocational training, and we are trying to take all of these things away from these young people and say "now we are going to turn your back to the school system and the regular programs in which you failed."

Vocational education systems, with a few exceptions, are not equipped to assume this responsibility.

The thing for us to do is to keep the Job Corps under the innovative influence of the Office of Economic Opportunity where we can carefully evaluate it with the hope that we can soon, or some of these days, phase it into our regular educational programs.

The original Civilian Conservation Corps was placed in an independent agency, and when it served its purpose it went out of existence.

Vocational education is making tremendous gains in the country at the present time. The information that will be fed into our industrial and technical schools from the Job Corps certainly will be beneficial, and will help build the know-how to deal with these youngsters.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, and am hopeful that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when you listen to statements like those of the previous speaker you would seem to gain the impression that the amendment offered by Mr. ERLBORN would, as Mr. PERKINS said, destroy the Job Corps, lock, stock, and barrel. But we must understand that these are the same type phrases that have been used over and over again;



when there are no merits to their arguments at all, the other side talks about our amendments destroying the program.

Let us look at what this program will do:

This amendment would phase the Job Corps over to HEW, or vocational education, to run the programs, that will teach these young people some skills so that they can retain the same job afterwards.

In the November 5 report on the Job Corps at Camp McCoy, Wis., that I mentioned briefly earlier, where the University of Wisconsin Chancellor Donald McNeil reported to his board of regents that this Job Corps center has been in operation some 20 months, and has graduated 365 corpsmen out of 3,196 who have enrolled.

There have been 2,180 that have left the program already, but only 365 have graduated.

**JOB CORPS GRADUATE TOTAL TO DATE IS 365**

MADISON.—Just over 16 percent of youths reporting to the McCoy Job Corps Center near Sparta have remained to complete their educational program, University of Wisconsin Chancellor Donald McNeil has reported to his board of regents.

The total cost of the program, which has graduated 365 of the 3,196 corpsmen who have enrolled at the center during the last 20 months, has exceeded \$12.5 million while the university has been associated with the program, McNeil said. Of the 3,196 Corpsmen, 1,017 are now in the camp.

The bulk of the UW-related cost of the program—all of which has been borne by the federal government—was due to the original capital equipment costs of starting the program and in the early high costs of technical education programs which are designed to run for years.

The UW ran the program on a sub-contract from the Radio Corp. of America (RCA) between March 1966 and September 1967. Since then the university has been involved only in the planning of educational program development and in staff training for the camp.

During the latter period the UW's involvement has shrunk from about 90 employees to eight, and to an educational program level costing \$832,000.

During the earlier period, in which the Job Corps Center was being organized, a total of \$11,619,000 was spent on the UW-related work.

In that period the center has turned out 365 graduates from the 3,196 who have entered the camp, McNeil said. Of the graduates, at least 253 were placed in jobs and 180 of them are still working at them.

Another 43 returned to high school, college or technical school training and another 30 qualified for military service, he said. Data is not available on the remaining 29, according to McNeil.

A total of 1,017 corpsmen are now enrolled in the camp, down considerably from peak loads which reached 1,600. McNeil said that the aim of the new method of UW association is to increase retention rates in the camp.

"We realize that the cost is high . . . and I hope that we can learn how to do things better so that the attrition rate isn't as high in the future," McNeil said.

But what must be remembered is that the students involved in job training at the center are not the same as those found in regular schools throughout the nation. Costs are bound to be higher because of the special forms and nature of the education offered.

"You just aren't dealing with the average student body," he said.

McNeil agreed with comments of Regent Charles Gelatt of La Crosse that the federal

program aimed at quick filling of the camps rather than selective screening of candidates in the early months of the program.

"There was pressure to get kids into the camps. I think they took anyone who came along."

The high dropout rate can be in part attributed to this factor, he suggested.

There have been 1,350 resignations for reasons ranging from the cold climate to a general distaste for the programs. Disciplinary problems have dropped 378 corpsmen, and 165 have been dismissed for being away from the camp without leave. Another 80 have been transferred to other centers, and two have been killed while in training.

Thirteen trainees were discharged for medical reasons and eight have been released for administrative reasons.

Of the total enrollment at the McCoy Job Corps Center so far, only 115, or 3.6 percent, have been from Wisconsin.

Only 365 graduated, at a cost of \$12.5 million.

Would not vocational education love to have that kind of money?

The previous speaker said vocational education has not done the job before. It is true. But did the Congress ever give them 100 percent of the money for residential centers? Never.

We passed a vocational education authorization bill in 1963 which included residential vocational schools, but the Congress has not given them a cent of money. That is why vocational education has not done the job now.

The vocational education people just have not had that kind of opportunity with Federal money, where they could expend on an average last year of \$8,100 for all Job Corps centers and camps and \$8,600 for men's urban centers like Camp McCoy.

The University of Wisconsin had a contract with the Radio Corporation of America between March 1963 and September 1967. Why did they drop it? Because OEO removed a great deal of the vocational educational components of the Camp McCoy Job Corp Center.

So now all that the University of Wisconsin is doing is training personnel.

What a miserable record on the part of OEO of expenditure of Federal money.

We should evaluate the Job Corp programs. Last year OEO said do not look at it, it is too new to look at. Now they say there is a new Job Corps and again it is too new to criticize.

I say, turn it over to a vocational education program. Vocational education has proven what they can do.

In the Mahoning Valley Residential Vocational Center in Ohio, where the average cost is \$3,400 per year, they have trained Job Corps dropouts. If vocational education can do a better job, with as difficult youths, at less than half the cost, why not let them?

In Milwaukee, Wis., they would like to have a residential center with their facilities for dropout kids.

Milwaukee, Wis., has a vocational school program for dropouts age 16 and 17. There are 650 boys and girls about an even number of each in that school; 550 of them are on parole indicating that they are a tough task to work with; 82 percent have received jobs in the area in which they were trained. Compare this with 365 who graduated from Camp McCoy out of 3,196 who have

enrolled and 2,180 who have left; 253 were placed in jobs and 180 of them are still on jobs.

That, to me, is the kind of record that we see where the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost and makes the decisions themselves. Before Job Corps would be operated through the States, we provide for a phasing over and it would take 3 years to do it, so none of the present enrollees would be dropped. Ample time would be provided for vocational education to decide whether any of the facilities presently being used, could be utilized.

So it is not true that the \$140 million in capital improvements made in Job Corps centers and camps would be wasted.

The program that is proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] is the kind of move that we must take now in the Job Corps program in order that we can go back and tell our constituents that we are wisely spending money to train young people in a way that the job can be accomplished. To spend better than \$8,000 per enrollee—and it is more than \$8,000 because under the limitation that we have in this legislation, all of the expenditures of the Job Corps centers are not counted. Amortization of capitalization is not counted. Recruitment selection and placement is not counted. Conservation camp cost of materials is not counted.

I want to help young people who need to have a change in environment and to be in a residential center. Such a center should serve a particular area. Then you would not have enrollees leaving a Wisconsin camp because of cold climate. The same kind of successes one finds in area vocational schools would be available to residential centers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is long overdue. We advocated it at the inception of OEO. We tried to get it to vocational education by route of MDTA last year. If we do not succeed this year, I am confident the time will soon be with us where a majority will support this most logical move.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen some startling changes take place during this session of the Congress. None can parallel the fine performance that we have just witnessed in the well of this House.

The gentleman who just preceded me in the well spent 2 days last year telling the Members of this Congress that the only way the Job Corps would ever survive and perform the mission that it has in this country would be if we would spin it off. However, they were convinced this time last year that the only possible home for the Job Corps was in the Department of Labor because that was the only agency of the Federal Government that could possibly administer the job training program and the Job Corps correctly.

Now, something has happened, obviously, and we should encourage this. There has been a great deal of thought by the authors of the Opportunity Cru-



sade, because now the "Crusaders" would once again say to you that there is a home for the Job Corps. It is not, they now say, under the Office of Economic Opportunity; it is not, as it is presently administered, with the private contractors, these corporations that are doing it so well. Now they say it must go to the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because there we will find the only Federal agency that now or forevermore will have the competence and the capability to administer this great and wonderful program.

The nice thing about the approach that is now being taken by the "Crusaders" is that they no longer seem to be arguing that the Job Corps ought to be eliminated altogether. They agree that it ought to live in a somewhat mutilated form—indeed, with its arms and legs perhaps removed, but at least it ought to have some life.

The suggestion has been made that we should immediately turn this program over to some already existing, very capable machinery at the State and Federal level for administering vocational education.

Ladies and gentleman of the Committee, there is no such machinery in existence at this time. We are in the middle of the school year throughout the United States. We are in the middle of the operation of the vocational training programs in every one of the 50 States, whether they be operated with State assistance or on a local basis. We could do nothing but contribute chaos to the programs that are being operated under the Smith-Hughes Act successfully at the present time.

The Smith-Hughes Act never contemplated at any time in its history the concept of Job Corps as a part of its operation, and we should not at this point, after the wonderful success that we have had in the more recent years of the Job Corps, change the entire concept of the residential Job Corps Center to a spunoff vocational training program, either in the Department of Labor or in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The important thing that you have to keep in mind here is this: It is not merely the spinoff that is important. It is not who administers the program that is important. The personalities, whether it be Harold Howe or Sargent Shriver, are not important.

What is important is the entire concept of the residential center. That goes to far more problems than are met by vocational training.

High school graduates and late-year high school dropouts who are benefiting so very much from vocational education are not going to benefit in the same way as the boy entering with a fifth- or sixth-grade reading or arithmetic level is benefiting from the Job Corps.

The Job Corps is not designed to take care of the same people that are being taken care of by the programs carried out under the Federal legislation in the Smith-Hughes Act or by the programs now carried on by the State vocational education agencies that are in fact in ex-

istence and, in fact, carrying on vocational education.

I plead with you to look very carefully at what the ultimate effect of this would be on your own individual States. And you do not have to take the word of anyone in this well for what it will do. Get on the telephone and talk to the people in your own State agencies, if you have not already done so, and ask them if they are ready to take over the Job Corps centers that are located in your States, and ask them what they will have to do. Ask them if the legislature in your State is prepared to give them the money that it will take to make the conversion, and ask them which of the cities in your State are willing to accept the responsibility.

This Congress is greatly concerned about saving money, yet this is an exceedingly wasteful proposal. It would authorize separate systems of centers in each State, most of which would presumably want at least one women's and one men's center. In addition, some of the conservation centers might be retained. This compares with 30 training centers, plus the conservation centers, which are in existence today.

Obviously many new centers would have to be opened in those States presently without centers. On the other hand, centers in States with more than one center, or where the center now in operation is too large for the needs of the State, might have to be closed or made smaller. There is provision in the bill for interstate agreement for the training of out-of-State youths in a center, but the Secretary would be without adequate means to compel such cooperation. Presumably some States would agree to send their trainees elsewhere; other States would insist upon having their own residential centers. The possibilities for duplication, overlap, and waste are immense.

Furthermore, much of the investment of the past 3 years would be thrown away. The centers now in use have been rehabilitated for Job Corps often at substantial cost. Presumably many would be discarded, while more money would be poured into new sites.

Then, there would be the inevitable waste of starting up the new centers. Job Corps experience has been that the early months of a center are when the full staff is needed, although the trainees have not yet all arrived, are by far the most expensive months. This higher cost period would be duplicated in every new center. Comparable waste would occur in the old centers as they were slowly emptied of trainees prior to dismantling.

The costs of administering so many plans would also be expensive. Every State would have to hire new staff to enable its State vocational education board to deal with this entirely new program. Personnel would be needed both to operate the programs, and to draw up plans suitable for submission to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Competition for the relatively few people who know about this kind of program—most of them from their work for Job Corps—would make it difficult to keep their salaries reasonable in size.

Thus, even if overhead and administrative funds alone are considered, the plan is very wasteful. But the matter is worse—there would be programmatic waste. Each State would have its own centers; each would develop its own anti-poverty program; many would repeat the experiments and the mistakes of others. The present time with its many urgent needs and shortage of money seems a poor one in which to invest in the luxury of authorizing at least 50 different programs—plus others in Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and so on—and in which to give the States Federal money to make and duplicate unnecessary mistakes.

And for all this waste and expense, it is hard to point to anything that would be achieved. Perhaps some States would do a better job than the present Job Corps. Others might do a worse one. The United States would have spent a fortune to change to a program which might or might not be better.

The House Committee on Education and Labor has heard expert testimony on the issue of transfer of Job Corps into a vocational education program under the Office of Education.

The Secretary of Labor said "No."

Top officials of HEW said "No."

Dean William Perlmutter of the State College of New York said "No."

G. C. Whitaker, board chairman of Graflex, said "No."

Dr. Spencer Smith of the Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources said "No."

Job Corps must reclaim the lives of young people.

Such a program of human renewal must integrate the following elements:

Complete guidance and counseling—someone who cares; physical rehabilitation—nutrition, eyes, teeth, diseases; educational remediation—20 percent must learn to read; social transformation—reverse pattern of failure and deviant behavior into success and acceptability; work skill training—occupational skill and work habits.

Vocational schools cannot provide this total program because—

They are not residential; they do not reach youth from all poverty pockets; they cannot provide a flexible program to meet individual needs; they replicate a structured program in which youth has failed.

Public vocational schools would not provide this total program because—

Their orientation and emphasis is heavily vocational; their direction by the States would foster conformity; their program and techniques would be highly traditional; they would emphasize training in States with large populations and industrial concentration.

The needs of our young people are many. Job Corps provides the setting and the system in which these needs can be met.

Job Corps is unique. The fact that there are proposals to transfer Job Corps to HEW and other proposals to transfer to the Labor Department indicates lack of perception of the objectives of Job Corps and evaluation of its accomplishments.



(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close at a quarter of 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WAGGONER. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman make that 4 o'clock, since there are so many Members standing?

Mr. PERKINS. I would be delighted to accept that suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, some of the comments made in the well from the other side of the aisle would indicate this amendment would do away with the Job Corps. The gentleman who last spoke said what chaos there would be if we took this in the middle of the school year and turned the program over to the States. Obviously the gentleman either has not read the amendment and is not familiar with the contents of it or is purposely trying to mislead the Membership.

This does not call for the immediate turning over of the Job Corps program to the States. It provides for an orderly phasing out of the current program.

It provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would complete the contracts now in existence and would look at the facilities which are available and see where they best could be utilized. Some might be utilized by the States in their programs. Others might not be useful for that purpose. Some could be conservation centers under the Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I believe the amendment is part of a prevailing concept that has a lot of emotional appeal; that if there is something in the poverty program which has something to do with education it ought to go to the Department of Education, if there is something that has to do with labor it ought to go to the Department of Labor, and so on. We have all of these categories these nice little pockets we can fit all of the poverty program into.

I rise to make the Members think for a moment about that kind of spin off, especially at this time. The principal success of the poverty program has been that as long as we have the Office of Economic Opportunity running all these programs we do keep the focus of atten-

tion on poverty. As soon as we spin them off we will be right back into the lethargic situation which prevailed before the poverty program was enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to say that there is a very real question, if we turn over the Job Corps program to State vocational education departments, as to whether these departments will reach the Negro youth in the slums and train them for lasting jobs. The record in the past is not reassuring on this point. Otherwise there would have been no need for the Job Corps in the first place.

The Job Corps is producing results. The Office of Economic Opportunity reports that 65 percent of the corpsmen are working or in school immediately after the Job Corps. This total remains constant 6 months later and, of those working, 85 percent had a full-time job. Six months after leaving the Job Corps nine out of 10 Corps members had held a job. Forty-two percent had held one job and 27 percent had worked at two jobs. Again, these figures are constant a year after termination. The average wage in these jobs ranges from \$1.62 to \$2.16 per hour.

Further, I think it is fair to say that the Job Corps has cut its costs by one-third, and, while further economies could be instituted, the record shows some improvement and some real progress in overall effectiveness, in job placement, and in lowering per-enrollee costs. The Job Corps record is encouraging and represents the efforts and experiences of business, labor, and government working together. To transfer it now would be a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to yield his time to the chairman. The Chair observes what is going on here today. The Chair does not believe this procedure is exactly proper. The Chair trusts that those Members, when the man in charge of the bill attempts to limit debate, who rise will be Members who will actually address the Committee rather than transfer their time.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that in contrasting the proposal of the committee bill with that which was presented in the amendment it is clear that the thrust of the amendment is to emphasize nonresidential as well as residential training centers and

to utilize the expertise found in the existing structure. I think we should recognize improvements were made in the committee in an attempt to emphasize nonresidential centers. So while both proposals emphasize residential and nonresidential, the question is can we have a more efficient means of emphasizing technical and vocational training, utilizing our present educational structure? Clearly the answer is yes. How long do we wish to maintain an "overlay" program competing with community colleges, vocational training centers, and industrial programs? That is the real issue at stake as we determine what we are going to do with the Job Corps. Let us make sure that point is brought out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the critical questions we are going to have to face here is the fact that there are 800,000 high school dropouts and the fact that Job Corps is now servicing only 40,000 supposed high school dropouts, which they are not, of course, because a number of high school graduates are now being serviced by the Job Corps at a cost that exceeds \$8,000 a year, how then do we propose to reach the 740,000 high school dropouts not now being serviced? With this waste of time, money, energy, and talent, why do we continue on the same road when we can begin to make a meaningful change in the Job Corps program? That is why I support this amendment and urge this Committee to support it. If you look at the Sar Levitan study entitled "Antipoverty Work and Training Efforts: Goals, and Realities," you will see that in this report on page 105 he says:

The available data support the idea of providing residential centers for certain disadvantaged youth. However, the Job Corps has not succeeded in motivating enrollees to remain in the centers for enough time to permit the education and training to have its effect. Only one out of three enrollees completes his course of training. Based on cost-benefit studies, the Job Corps claims that the experiment has paid off. Nevertheless too many youths drop out and the prescribed training period is itself too short.

Moreover, considering the high cost of maintaining a youth in the Job Corps—exceeding \$8,000 a year—it is necessary that youths who require residential training be identified and that other youths be assigned to alternative programs. Thus far the selection of a youth for the Job Corps, NYC or some other program is determined by fortuitous circumstances.

Unless we begin to move in the direction of opening additional opportunities we do a disservice to our young people. To continue with Job Corps deprives thousands of young men and women who could be given training under the pending amendment through our outstanding vocational and technical schools. This



amendment will open doors now closed and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN.]

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am opposed very strongly to this amendment, because in my opinion this clearly demonstrates a Republican attempt to dismember the total antipoverty program which we have established in this country, a program that has been successful as of this moment, one which has cut down the unemployment rolls in the great State which it is my honor to represent and has put many persons into gainful employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE.]

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, one of the great mistakes that was embodied in the Job Corps right from the very beginning was the fact that they transported young people all over the country and, therefore, there was no sense of responsibility in the communities themselves for these young people.

However, Mr. Chairman, we passed an amendment last year which required that the Job Corps enrollees be assigned to Job Corps camps located as close to home as possible.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the statement which has been made about Camp McCoy, as an example, a very small percentage; in fact 3.6 percent of the enrollees at that camp came from areas closest to their home.

Mr. Chairman, the Job Corps center needs to involve more people than just the staff members and the enrollees themselves. They need to involve the entire community. The young person who is an enrollee of one of these Job Corps centers, to go back from the Job Corps, across country, to his original environment, means two adjustments and two difficult ones. Conservation camps necessarily are out in the forests but urban centers should serve particular areas.

Mr. Chairman, the wasteful expenditure of money in the Job Corps is scandalous, and I wonder why we have not had this type of provision contained in this legislation long before now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of concern that I rise to speak to my colleagues on this amendment.

I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN]. But, in this instance I rise in opposition to the amendment. The jobless youth in this country present a most serious and urgent problem—one that re-

quires prompt, concentrated and specialized attention and solutions. When the antipoverty program was first conceived, the Job Corps was created as a solution to hard-core unemployment among our young men and women.

At first, the Job Corps concept of residential training centers drew a great deal of criticism—from the Congress and from citizens who came in contact with this bold social experiment. It was criticized for excessive cost, for the behavior of some of its corpsmen and for administrative disorganization. That was over 2 years ago.

Since that time, many of these problems have been ironed out—costs in most camps have been pared down, discipline among corpsmen has greatly improved; but most important, the Job Corps is building an impressive record in job preparation and job placement—it is filling what was once a vacuum of hopelessness with hope, and with needed skills.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us to transfer the Job Corps function to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would erase much of this progress. New orders of administrative hierarchy would have to be adjusted to. And tragically, the specialness of purpose of the present antipoverty agency could not be duplicated in a vast cabinet-level department which has a myriad of Federal responsibilities outside the antipoverty field. This move, at this crucial stage of the Job Corps's development, would be like changing horses in midstream.

Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to represent the 36th Congressional District of the great State of New York. Two of my constituents are Graflex and Xerox, which operate a Job Corps center for men at Breckinridge, Ky., and a Job Corps for women at Huntington, W. Va., respectively.

Mr. Chairman, at the request of my constituents, I had the opportunity to visit and to observe firsthand what is being done at those centers.

My first visit was to the Job Corps Center at Breckinridge, Ky., which is operated by Graflex/General Precision of Rochester, N.Y. The story of Breckinridge's progress since its operation was taken over by Graflex is well known to those who have taken an active interest in the Job Corps. This story is fully told in the printed hearings of the Committee on Education and Labor, part 4, pages 2471 to 2507, in the testimony of Mr. Gaylord C. Whitaker, chairman of Graflex. Let me quote from Mr. Whitaker's statement:

Like many pioneering programs, Breckinridge was plagued with problems in the early stages. In fact, during the first year under Southern Illinois University's direction, there was a riot and, according to the newspapers, very little was right. Let me quickly point out that it's easier to "second guess" than to blaze new trails. Despite their mistakes, SIU did some things very well. When Graflex became prime contractor in July 1966, we were able to profit by their mistakes.

We applied commonsense, businesslike methods, with extremely gratifying results. Let me tell you what happened:

1. When Graflex first came to Evansville to determine whether or not Breckinridge could be salvaged, we were met with mixed reactions. Nearly everyone privately believed in the Job Corps program and what it could

do for disadvantaged youth, but few were willing to be quoted as wanting it in the immediate neighborhood.

It was sort of like the observation of the English Duchess in 1860, when Professor Huxley announced that man had descended from the ape: "Let's hope it isn't true but, if it is, let us pray that it will not become generally known."

Despite this, there were some who were willing to stand up and be counted. I shall never forget what it meant to us (and the youth of the Nation) when Evansville's Mayor Frank McDonald and Janet Walker, executive director of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, announced publicly at a luncheon that we could count on their support.

This was the turning point. Before long, industrialists, churchmen, and various civic leaders representing over 50 different groups, wrote us expressing words of encouragement or pledging cooperation.

Since then, we have tried to reciprocate in behalf of the corpsmen and the center. Perhaps the best evidence of the relationship that exists just 1 year short of our coming to Breckinridge, the Evansville Christian liaison to Breckinridge, the Evansville Christian liaison group gave a pal dinner to welcome Graflex and hoped we would continue the operation we had and that they would do all they could to support the 100 corpsmen they invited to be guests at that dinner.

2. A look at Job Corps overall, and Breckinridge in particular: Since January 1, 1965, the following centers have been established:

[Approximate]

Men's conservation centers:	
Number of centers.....	91
Number of enrollees.....	15,000
Women's centers:	
Number of centers.....	18
Number of enrollees.....	9,000
Men's urban centers:	
Number of centers.....	10
Number of enrollees.....	15,000
Demonstration centers:	
Number of centers.....	8
Number of enrollees:	
Men .....	570
Women .....	750

3. Companies involved in women's centers operation include Packard Bell, Burroughs, Xerox, Avco, General Electric, Philco/Ford, and RCA.

4. Companies involved in men's centers operation include Westinghouse, Thiokol, U.S. Industries, Federal Electric/ITT, Northern Natural Gas, RCA, Litton, SRA/IBM, and Graflex/General Precision.

That is quite a list of bluebloods.

5. Miscellaneous facts on typical enrollees: Remember: Corpsman arrest rate is one-half of the national youth rate. Unfortunately, what would be regarded as a "prank" in college too often becomes "malicious mischief" for a corpsman.

(a) Reading level, 4.7 grade.

(b) Years of school, seven.

(c) Eighty percent have never seen a doctor or dentist (7 pounds underweight).

(d) Previous behavior: 63 percent no adverse record, 27 percent minor antisocial, 10 percent one serious conviction.

(e) Family pattern: 45 percent from broken home, 65 percent from family where head of household is unemployed, 50 percent from family on relief (some third generation).

It is unthinkable, but we do inherit boys who make good products who are from third generation unemployed.

(f) Earning capacity: 90 percent unemployed, 10 percent employed at less than 80 cents per hour.

I know this figure has been questioned by some, but this has been our actual experience—10 percent employed at less than 80 cents an hour.



(g) It is necessary to recruit and screen two people for each one enrolled.

6. Ratio of staff to corpsmen: Overall, 1:2.5; Breckinridge, 1:2.6.

7. Breckinridge enrollment: Now, 2,007 corpsmen (as of July 14, 1967); average, 1,900 corpsmen.

8. Breckinridge staff: Now, 700 (approximate); planned, 713.

9. Breakdown of Breckinridge staff at 2,000 enrollee population:

Administration -----	130
Training -----	360
Overhead and maintenance -----	193
Subcontractor -----	30
<b>Total -----</b>	<b>713</b>

10. Dropout rate: This dropout rate does bother us greatly. It is 30 percent, mostly in the early months—less than most colleges, even though we start with 100 percent dropouts.

The 19,200 enrollees: We have graduated, not dropouts, 1,137 in the first year of our operation; 601 of these have been placed and they are earning good money and 466, we hope, are placed for the most part, but we don't have reports on them because they are too recent in graduation.

Those who took jobs, continued school, or joined the military area about the same percentage in our experience as in the overall reported above.

The report on graduation is monthly from Breckinridge, and Chairman Perkins and some of you committee members attended one of the graduation ceremonies when you visited there; during April there were 109, May, 107, and June, 250. We estimate in July to have 150, in August, 165 and in September, 175.

Cost per corpsman-year—Congressional ceiling, \$7,300; overall, 1967, \$6,950. This includes approximately \$1,500 per year paid by OEO directly to corpsman. Breckinridge, 1967-68, \$6,700.

I might point out there is no fee with respect to what they pay directly.

For the fiscal year ending 1968, we have brought our operating costs down to \$5,200 which, with the \$1,500 added, becomes \$6,700 and for a frame of reference your bill provides a ceiling of \$7,300 on this.

I think it is interesting to make just a quick casual observation with respect to the cost to society.

The cost for the average Breckinridge graduate, because it takes less than 9 months to graduate a student, is actually \$5,025, including that \$1,500 expense that I referred to above. If we were to let these fellows just be on their own and let them become a drag on society and if they were to become prisoners, the cost of the average prisoner in most States is about \$12,000.

If they were to continue on relief and were to have families, the average cost of a family on relief for its lifetime is \$75,000. That \$5,000 is a real investment in our future and eventually will be paid back by tax collections by these very students.

To give you just a brief concept of the community cooperation which we have enjoyed and believe me, ladies and gentlemen, this works both ways. Some of the projects are listed below.

1. Welding swings for Evansville playgrounds.

2. Cleaning up and landscaping Evansville Settlement House areas and parks.

3. Bolstering Morganfield Police force. The little Morganfield Police force—which you know, Chairman Perkins, consists of three people—were in an automobile accident and were completely without a police force one morning, so we sent out security police bolstered by trainees in to Morganfield to maintain the law and order, which was required, which was a very simple proposition, but they appreciated it. Mayor Bell acknowledged

this in one of the letters that is a part of this exhibit.

4. Volunteering blood. Our corpsmen almost 100 percent have volunteered blood.

5. Community groups use Breckinridge facilities. We have a number of community people who attend our courses and are taking the regular tests in GED high school equivalency, thus expanding their possibilities as well as the corpsmen.

6. At Christmastime we have a "Toys for Tots" program.

7. Don't laugh when I tell you this one, but our corpsmen have been very successful in teaching water safety and swimming and lifeguard patrol duty to Girl Scouts. We have had no incidents or problems in that respect.

8. Our Gospel Tones entertain shut-ins and the aged.

9. There are our courses in GED to local adults as well as corpsmen.

10. We have exhibits at fairs which are manned by the corpsmen.

11. We share functions of public interest. For example, if we have the St. Louis Hawks to town and use our basketball court, we invite the community to share in that pleasure.

12. One of our dormitories has adopted an orphan, which they are supporting in Japan by proxy.

13. Cleaning up storm damage in Clay, Ky., is a typical operation.

14. Erecting street signs in Corydon, Ky.

15. Directing traffic as requested in nearby communities, and contributing to fund for cows for Vietnam.

I could carry this list on almost indefinitely, but these are the kind of young men you are helping to build at Breckinridge and at other Job Corps operations."

Mr. Chairman, I also visited the Xerox-operated Women's Job Corps Center at Huntington, W. Va. Huntington, too, stands as an example of what the Job Corps has been able to accomplish with the guidance and program-direction of OEO. I could not sum up the story of Huntington any better than did Xerox President C. Peter McCollough in his letter to Chairman PERKINS of the Education and Labor Committee last July:

Through stern self-examination and with the invaluable cooperation of OEO cost analysis, we have trimmed that \$1,198 figure to a monthly cost of \$546 per enrollee.

But much more significant in my view is the fact that from January, 1966, to the end of May, 1967, we have graduated 230 young women, the great majority of whom are now making a real contribution to the national economy rather than becoming wards of that economy.

We take into our Center girls who are out of school, out of work, really out of any sort of productive society. In six to nine months, we return them to society with the skills to command an average annual income of more than \$3,000. We teach them not only how to be employable, but how to be sought-after for employment, and we also teach them living skills vital to their personal and family lives.

We send them out in the world with a new born realization that hope and ambition are as much their legitimate possession as they are for those born "on the right side of the tracks."

For what, in the broad view, is an extremely modest cost, we take young women who might otherwise become lifetime recipients of relief—net losses to the economy—and turn them into productive contributors to that economy.

Mr. Chairman, this is a partnership between business and Government. In Job Corps centers across the Nation they

are dealing with dropouts who need something in addition to vocational education. We should not hamper the growth of this partnership.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has offered might be appropriately considered at some future date. But it should not be adopted now, based upon my personal experience, and based upon what I have seen in talking with the people at these centers and in talking to my constituents. We should continue this program and not spin it off.

Mr. Chairman, probably the best answer I have heard thus far for continuing this program, I heard from a young Negro from the Bronx. He said this about his Job Corps experience:

If I had to do it all over again, I would do it again.

Mr. Chairman, that seems to me to sum it up.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important program and it is my opinion that we do not fully appreciate what it does. Therefore, it is my opinion it should be continued intact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this particular facet of the Opportunity Crusade against the poor.

I know that the amendment is offered as an improvement, but I am unwilling to see the patient die of improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe first it ought to be made clear what this amendment does and what this amendment does not do. It transfers the Washington administration of the Job Corps over to the Office of Vocational Education. It does not require the closing of camps, it does not require the States to act in any way before Job Corps centers can be kept open. It begins to spin off the implementation of the administration of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to what the director of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, sponsored by Mr. Walter Reuther, as a speaker on this subject:

If the federal agency history is any guide, as OEO increases its direct operations (through administering bigger programs and adding new ones), it will find its ability to innovate, criticize, evaluate and mobilize decreasing. As it increases its operational "domain" its constituency will shift from the poor to the middle men, the carriers of its programs, and to those who help to designate the carriers.

Mr. Chairman, it is important if we are to have a coordinated administration that can truly meet the needs of these youngsters from the beginning to the end, and have them placed in a job at the end of the line, that we begin to



make changes in the Job Corps. The basic concept of residential Job Corps centers is sound. It is far superior to the concept of isolated Job Corps centers far from the home locations of the Job Corps enrollees to have community centers fully coordinated with existing and new vocational and technical schools. The isolated Job Corps concept is obsolete.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] suggested, it was just a couple of years ago that the minority wanted to kill this program. Last year they wanted to spin it off to the Department of Labor. This year they want to spin it off to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This may be a wrong from time to time but they are never in doubt, Mr. Chairman.

I would suggest to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that we wait until next year and perhaps by next year the minority will be over to our position, and there won't be any controversy to divide us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, considerable mention has been made here about the Job Corps at Camp McCoy, Wis., which is located in the Third Congressional District, and I visited it. I have no constituent that is managing it, but I want to show you the contrast in the State of Wisconsin between what can be done and what is being done under the Job Corps.

At the Job Corps they have 900 to 1,000 men training under what has been described here as a great program, whereas in Wisconsin we had another program under the Industrial Commission Apprentice Division and the Manpower Development and Training Act. Last year 100 firms in Wisconsin trained 911 trainees at a cost of \$791,000, or \$868 per trainee, compared with the \$8,000 per trainee that they are paying at Camp McCoy in the Job Corps center.

These boys, these 911 trainees, while they were on the job being trained, received in wages \$2,532,000—in wages which were taxable by the State and by the Federal Government. And these 911 trainees had jobs when they got through with it, in comparison with the 186 boys out of the 3,000 that went to the Job Corps.

If you want a better way there is a better way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. OLSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, and to page 14979 of that RECORD in the upper lefthand corner of which you will find a listing of just a selected few, but a representative group, of the corporations which are at this moment operating Job Corps centers.

If any of you have not seen their testimonials as to the effectiveness of the centers, we have them readily available and we will be most pleased to furnish them with respect to all of the corporations enumerated there or with respect to any one of them that you might have a particular interest in.

These are testimonials not only as to the efficiency of the centers, as they see them, and the efficiency of the program and the worthwhileness of the program, but they also testify to the job that they are doing in meshing or matching the training with their own ultimate needs in industry.

I would like to call your attention to other citations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and not of this Congress but of the 89th Congress.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] just spoke to you about how thoroughly convinced he was that the HEW is the proper place for this program.

On page 23179 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last year you will read the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. They read as follows:

... It would provide for coordination of our training programs in the Job Corps under the Manpower Development and Training Act. (Under the Department of Labor.)

What he was talking about is the opportunity crusade as it existed at that time.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], our esteemed colleague from the State of Minnesota, who has spent a great of time on this program on page 23181 of the RECORD said:

I might also point out when this proposal was before us it was proposed that the Department of Labor administer it. At that time I raised many questions, wondering whether they should or not, realizing that this had not been the case in the old CCC camps. I realized later that the administration was right when they proposed it be handled by the Department of Labor, and I have been convinced of it since.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It will not destroy the Job Corps but it will

fragmentize it. It phases the program over to HEW from OEO, it does not phase it out. The net effect is you wind up with the same program administered by the Secretary of HEW.

The amendment authorizes a study by HEW to determine which Job Corps camps might be abolished and which centers should be transferred to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior for administration. It is deceiving in that it offers grants to State boards of vocational education but it also authorizes grants to both public and private agencies. This can all be done at the discretion of the Secretary of HEW or whoever he delegates authority to. Perhaps some of you outside the South need some first hand experience with Harold Howe. Personally I have had too much already. To transfer this program from OEO to HEW will not decrease the cost one penny. Who in this Chamber ever heard of the Federal bureaucracy reducing the cost of any program. It will in the end wind up lost and unidentifiable without anyone really knowing what it does or what it costs. Let us keep it where we can at least find it and know what it costs.

You have heard reference earlier today to the fact that the best statement made about the Job Corps is that an enrollee said if he had to do it over again, he would do it again. The only thing I am saying to you is that the best thing I can think of to do is to keep all the trash in one pile, do not scatter it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROWN].

[Mr. BROWN of Michigan addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BROWN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, just for the record, the gentleman from Michigan pointed out that last year we proposed the transfer of the Job Corps under the Manpower and Development Training Act.

The Manpower and Development Training Act requires the institutional part of the program to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The net effect is exactly the same.

That proposal directed Job Corps administration to the HEW.

So it will coordinate the total of our vocational centers and technical institutes and all of their type programs.

It would be a separate 100-percent Federal program to fund residential skill centers that can be automatically coordinated with all of these programs.

There is absolutely no difference in the ultimate effect as to the administration of the program.

That is basically what we proposed last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].



(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, one of the proudest moments of my life occurred in August of 1964, when I joined with a majority of the Members of this august body to pass the Economic Opportunity Act. I felt then that I was helping to make an American dream come true—to wipe out poverty in this land of plenty. We took note at that time that although much of the country was prospering and the overall economy was growing at an unprecedented rate there were still as many as 35,000,000 Americans who did not share in the abundance and blessings of our great country.

In declaring war on poverty, the Congress, in 1964, affirmed its belief that the country can only achieve its full economic and social potential when every citizen is given the opportunity to develop to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in, and contribute to, the workings of our society. Today we are asked to reaffirm this belief.

In 1964, the vote to initiate the war on poverty was in many respects an easy vote. It was a vote for the poor. It was a vote to help our less fortunate fellow citizens help themselves. It was a vote to help open the opportunities of education and training, the opportunity for a job, the hope for a self-supporting way of life for millions of our citizens.

In other respects, the 1964 vote for the war on poverty was a difficult one for some Members to cast. It was a vote to establish a brandnew agency with no record as a basis for judgment. It was a vote for the noble idea—of eliminating the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty—but with little national acceptance. It was a difficult vote because the battle plan for the attack on poverty was only partially drawn. There were no troops in the field and few weapons beyond the blueprint stage.

But in 1964, the Members of the 88th Congress possessed the courage and foresight to begin the war on poverty. Since that time we have seen a mobilization of resources, a national determination and much progress toward the elimination of poverty in this country.

The Congress has seen fit to extend the program twice since its inception—each time with improvements and perfections. Today, after months of deliberation by the hardworking Committee on Education and Labor and after its sincere effort to perfect the bill even further and to bring a bipartisan measure to the floor, we are called on again to extend the war on poverty and to strengthen it.

Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt to say that every skirmish in the war on poverty has been successful, any more than I would vow that every shot fired in a conventional war hits the target. I would not say that every dollar has been spent wisely, any more than I would say that every space shot has hit its mark. I would say, however, that more shots in the war on poverty have hit the target than have missed; many more programs have been successes than failures; and the benefits have been significant and the returns to our Nation

very worthwhile. I would say that the bill before us now will insure even more solid hits in the future and even greater successes.

As Sargent Shriver, the Director of OEO, once remarked:

Getting the Economic Opportunity Act started was very much like going down to Cape Kennedy and trying to shoot six rockets at once.

The startup of the program was a mammoth task, but it has now been successfully launched.

Across the country some 1,100 community action agencies have been established to design programs and to administer them under the direction of local citizens. These programs, often called the backbone of the fight, are based on local needs and wishes as expressed by local community leaders and local target groups and they are responsive to local control and local initiative.

Developed through the community action program has been the very popular and successful Headstart program, from which some 1½ million preschool children and their families have already received incalculable benefits.

Upward Bound, also a development of community action, has provided some 30,000 high school students special tutorial and remedial programs designed to enable them and to motivate them to continue their education beyond the high school level.

The community action program has also fostered the development and funding of neighborhood multiservice centers, neighborhood health centers, legal service programs, programs to provide meaningful work experience for our senior citizens, and other innovative and far-reaching programs.

In addition to the actual operation of programs, many community action agencies have become the focal point for the coordination of all or most of the Federal programs within its area of operation. With the existing multiplicity of Federal and State aid programs, overlap and duplication of effort, and even waste had plagued our communities. The community action agency, through its broadly representative board, in many of these communities has coordinated aid programs and has been effective in reducing duplication and inefficiencies in various operating programs. This is one of the fringe benefits of community action that is frequently overlooked. It is an extra service that has not cost the taxpayer a penny, but it has become a major achievement in some parts of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it cannot be denied that the community action program has been one of the most unique weapons developed in the fight against poverty. Its innovativeness and its effectiveness demand that it remain a strong and vigorous part of the total war on poverty.

On the other fronts the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps have led the struggle to prepare youths from poor families to break the poverty cycle through the combination of job training and education.

The Job Corps, an improved version of the old CCC, has provided services to more than 100,000 hard core poverty

young men and women. This program has made maximum use of the private sector and in doing so has made great strides in motivating, uplifting and “turning around” young people who had very little skills, and a meager education, and who for the most part, were school dropouts, draft rejects, and unemployed. Some 70,000 of these enrollees today are employed, back in school, or are in the military—thanks to Job Corps training.

Mr. Chairman, there has been criticism on the Job Corps for its high costs. Some of the criticism no doubt was justified, but these costs have been steadily dropping, and the bill before us limits costs to a maximum of \$6,500 a year per enrollee. But, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that even if the cost were double this amount, it would be a cheap price to pay to turn an aimless, drifting, unskilled, unsure young man into a self-respecting, well-motivated jobholder—and the Job Corps has done this for thousands of men and women across the country.

In my own State of Hawaii, the community action, Headstart, Upward Bound, and Job Corps programs have been extremely effective arms in the war on poverty. These people who are directly responsible for the success of these programs have repeatedly warned against any attempts to dismantle the agency and to distribute its programs to other Federal offices. On the basis of their past experience, these poverty workers believe that dismemberment will mean the loss of a united and coordinated thrust by a single responsible agency, with resulting adverse effects on the various programs.

Mr. Chairman, the wisdom of the Congress 3 years ago in initiating the war on poverty and in creating the Office of Economic Opportunity to lead the attack and to mobilize our resources is borne out by the committee hearings this year when, during 26 days of public hearings and the testimony of numerous witnesses, only one, just one single witness, called for the elimination of OEO.

It is a fact worth noting that the opponents of this bill no longer call for the outright abolition of the fight against poverty; instead, they mask their dislike of the program in proposals to cut the authorization, to slice OEO up so that it can no longer be effective, to change the direction or to slow the effort down. But these opposition tactics will not work. The present direction is too strong, the successes too many, the support by the public too great to halt the fight for the poor that is being directed by OEO.

After 3 years, the battle against poverty, deprivation, and despair certainly is not yet won—but we have made a good beginning. We cannot afford any cutback or drastic change in direction. The battle so far has not been easy—the enemy is ancient and one not easily to be conquered—but the progress has been significant and the future looks bright. In 1964 we lit a candle of hope for the poor and disadvantaged of this country. We must now now turn our backs on them. We must not tell them we have lost faith in them. We must remind ourselves that this great Nation of ours can be only as



prosperous as its poorest citizen. If we are to prove the true worth of our American democratic system we must, with all our wit and resources, continue to wage an undiminished war on poverty. Let us, then, here today defeat every crippling amendment to the bill before us, and vote out a measure to which we all can rightfully point with pride.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ZION].

(Mr. ZION asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, we hear much gnashing of teeth about the possible death knell of the Job Corps. This death knell would be the sound of music to the outraged public that is witnessing this dismal failure.

My community is one that has had a Job Corps center inflicted on it. They teach landscape gardening at our Job Corps center, but there is not a landscape gardener who has been able to employ a single graduate of this Corps.

They teach auto repair. I know a man who has hired three of the Job Corps people, not one of whom was capable or interested in performing a job.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] would result in cooperation with the MDTA. In this program, costing but \$25 a week, local people are taught to perform a job, and they have a job at the conclusion of their program. I urge my colleagues to substitute a program that provides an employable man for \$1,000 a year in place of this present multimillion-dollar failure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The impression given to us by those who support the amendment is that the vocational education activities of the Office of Education are minimal. I would like to point out that vocational education funds currently are in excess of \$225 million; more than the Job Corps spent in the 1967 fiscal year ending June 30.

I would also like to point out that in the 1963 legislation authorizing vocational education there was specific direction given to the Office of Education to get involved in programs for youth who are deprived, and I am told that less than 1 percent of these funds were spent on these poor people. I think there is one good reason for this lack of education to the deprived youth, and that is because we are dealing with an entirely different kind of youngster.

Job Corps was established separately from the public schools with the mission of helping those youths who have not succeeded in the usual schools. Congress wanted these young people to benefit from a fresh approach. This new approach has been provided by a large number of private companies whose record is one of ourstanding achievements.

We must remember that these youths who enter the Job Corps read on the average at the fifth-grade level. Many of them are illiterate—for example, 40 percent entering the conservation centers read below the third-grade level.

I submit that our vocational education institutions are not equipped to provide this basic remedial program. In addition these youths need health services, counseling and guidance, and discipline to a degree not possible under existing vocational schools. The building of residence halls is not enough. What is needed is an entirely new program directed solely at the neediest of our young people. This singleness of purpose can only be provided by retention of the existing Job Corps program. I urge my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, again, if I may, I would urge those who are going to speak about the opportunity crusade on the other side to please stay with the facts of what it would do and what it would not do. Please read the bill. At least read what the RECORD says about it.

Briefly, corporations which are doing a good job could continue to do such a job under the proposal here, if they are able actually to accomplish well and efficiently what needs to be done.

This bill increases the involvement not only of the Federal vocational education people, but it increases the involvement of the States once again. In the areas where the States can move effectively, this measure would move them back into the program.

There has been good come from this program; there must be more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I should like to point out two things very quickly. We are asked to believe that under the opportunity crusade we could set up, service, and establish residential training centers for as many Job Corps people as we have right now for \$100 million less in this first year. I submit to this House that it cannot be done.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I point out that we have provided in the bill for the establishment of pilot residential vocational schools. We recognize the problem and we want to try to do something about it. But we are not going to crush this whole program in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Whatever there is wrong with the Job Corps, this amendment is not going to cure it by transferring it to Health, Education, and Welfare.

My subcommittee has just concluded extensive hearings on the Vocational

Education Act. We hope to bring it to the House early next year. We shall recommend an extensive increase in construction of residential skill centers. But these won't be ready for many years.

The need for vocational education in this country is so huge and so monumental that this amendment would only add to our problems and impose additional hardships on the vocational education program.

I say that the youngsters involved with the Job Corps are the hard-core problem youngsters, most of whom would not qualify for present day vocational training centers.

My good friend from Minnesota declined to yield when I wanted to ask him as to the 2,000 dropouts from Camp McCoy and whether they would have qualified for residential skill centers. He knows most of them do not have sufficient academic background to qualify.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to close debate.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the question here is whether we are going to transfer the Job Corps to an old-line agency or leave it in an independent agency.

This is the first part of an amendment that would close down 83 of our 123 Job Corps centers, including conservation centers and urban centers, and leave an enrollment of 10,000 out of the present enrollment of 41,000 if the series of amendments were to carry in this Committee.

This amendment would hamstring the Job Corps and commence to phase out the program to a point that it would be completely worthless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ERLBORN and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, yeas 164.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARDNER: On page 149, line 4, after "(a)" insert:

"(1) Any State which desires to operate one or more Job Corps center or similar facility authorized by this part shall, through the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (the Smith-Hughes Act), submit to the Director a plan which—

"(A) provides that the State board shall be the sole agency for administration of the State plan;



"(B) assures that the requirements of this part with respect to the recruitment, selection, standards of conduct, training costs, counseling and job placement of trainees, together with all other applicable requirements of this part, will be met;

"(C) provides that maximum use will be made of existing vocational education programs and facilities and that residential training will be combined with non-residential components whenever feasible;

"(D) assures that training will not be discontinued for any enrollee who is not a resident of the State as a result of State operation of a Job Corps facility; and

"(E) provides assurances that, either through agreements with other States on a reciprocal basis or through agreements with the Director, or both, adequate provision will be made for the enrollment of trainees who are not residents of the State.

"(2) The Director shall approve any plan which meets the requirements of subsection (a) (1), and he shall encourage the formulation of such plans as the preferred method of carrying out the programs authorized by this part.

"(3) The Director shall not disapprove any plan submitted pursuant to subsection (a) (1) without first having afforded the State board a full and adequate opportunity for a public hearing on the matter, and he shall not finally disapprove any such plan without a public statement of his reasons therefor, which shall contain specific citations to requirements of this part with which such plan fails to comply.

"(4) The Director shall pay the costs of operating Job Corps centers and similar facilities pursuant to a State plan approved under subsection (a) (2); and".

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes. It is my opinion that the pros and cons of the Job Corps have been effectively debated today. I only wish to talk for a very brief few minutes about what this proposed amendment does not do.

First of all, it does not cut back on the Job Corps.

Second, it does not transfer the program to any other department.

All this amendment proposes to do is to simply permit State operation of Job Corps facilities through State vocational boards, if a State wishes to do so.

If a State wishes to do so, they would, first, submit a plan to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for his approval; second, assure that the facilities would be run in accordance with all the provisions of this title; and third, assure that out-of-State trainees would be accommodated.

Mr. Chairman, the great advantage of this amendment is that it permits maximum participation of State boards of vocational education without any disruption of the Job Corps.

Today, State boards of vocational education administer the great bulk of our \$1.4 billion vocational and manpower training programs, including residential facilities in such States as Ohio, Oklahoma, and Kentucky. They do an effective job when given the chance to do so.

This amendment would bring the ability of the vocational education program to the Job Corps program in every State, if they were permitted to do so.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to state that I support the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas of the so-called war on poverty which should be amended, corrected, revised, and certain provisions of this controversial program which should be abolished completely.

I can think of no area more wanting of correction than the Job Corps. The purpose of the Job Corps, according to OEO "cheerleaders," is to train young people for jobs so that they may become useful, productive citizens of our society.

This is indeed a noble endeavor, but I am afraid the facts do not bear out the intent. This arm of the antipoverty program has been scarred by scandal from beginning to the present.

Mr. Chairman, the estimated cost of sending a student through the Job Corps training program at one of its camps runs from \$9,000 to as high as \$11,000 per pupil. This is tragic in itself—a disgraceful waste of the taxpayer's money. Therefore, I believe that the ceiling provision is a good measure.

Yet, this is hardly the half of it. The gold-lined salaries of instructors at these Job Corps centers are astounding. I would like to use an example set forth in a study of the poverty program last year by the Republican National Committee.

The 208 staff personnel at Camp Gary—San Marcos, Tex.—drawing salaries over \$9,000 got an average increase of 57 percent above their previous salaries. Twenty-two of them more than doubled their previous salaries. For instance, the manager of personnel at the camp jumped from a salary of \$5,000 per year to \$10,000. A math teacher who previously had made \$4,730 and a citizenship teacher who had made \$4,800 jumped to \$10,000. The usual explanation from OEO for paying these kinds of increases was, "We need the best people we can get." My question is this: Is it absolutely necessary to double salaries to get good people at these camps? Would not a sensible salary increase, as is the practice in private enterprise, been enough to acquire competent people?

Additionally, the Job Corps training programs have been further marred by riots and lawlessness among trainees, and the general lack of these "graduates" from the centers to hold jobs once they had been placed in them. There have been few or no substantial records to show that the Job Corps training centers, set up and staffed at incredible costs, have produced even the most meager results.

There has been at least one case where a trainee brutally beat and stabbed a fellow trainee. In one such instance—at the Mountain Home, Idaho, Job Corps camp—the assailant had three felony convictions against him and at the time of the assault was a parole violator.

This type of administration—or rather the lack of it—indicates clearly that proper screening of potential trainees is not employed. I am aware that many of these boys are juvenile delinquents, or have records, but I do not believe that the Job Corps centers should act as replacements for juvenile delinquent detention centers.

These are but a few examples of the senseless and wasteful abuse of funds and facilities provided by the taxpayer.

We—the Members of this body—should not "compound the felony" by continuing to offer our support and funds to a floundering poorly directed program that is missing the mark by a very expensive mile.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would like to say that, in my opinion, the so-called poverty war is clearly a case of poor use of funds instead of funds for the use of the poor.

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that currently there are under the auspices of the Economic Opportunity Office here in Washington various State-operated Job Corps centers?

I rise on this question because the Job Corps center located in my State is one such center which was contracted for with the State government of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could answer the question as to what effect this amendment would have with respect to the sustaining facility we now have in the State of Hawaii?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not see where it would have any effect whatsoever. They would only have to work out with the director what program they would like to see carried on.

Mrs. MINK. Does not the amendment require the participation of the vocational education board of the whole State?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. And an agreement is reached with the State?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. Then there would be a change under the amendment, in other words, an entire new program would have to be adopted.

Mr. GARDNER. I would say with reference to the particular situation the gentlewoman from Hawaii points out, there could be.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Is it not true that in a State, if they have a residential vocational education center, undoubtedly it would come under



the operation of the Smith-Hughes Act, which created the State board of vocational education, and there are State boards of vocational education in each of the 50 States?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. While there might be some difficulty, in the situation pointed out by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, that would not have any effect upon the program now ongoing in her State.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is correct in his answer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is just another way of trading the devil for a witch, so to speak. This amendment provides that the State boards shall be the sole agency for the administration of the State plan, and as I understand they will have to submit such plan to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This is the first opportunity I have had to see the amendment but I fear that it simply means that we would be just phasing the Job Corps out at a double rate of speed.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. No, first let me finish.

Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen to all the industry involvement—the some 30 or 40 industries that we have in this country who are operating Job Corps centers, such as the Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., IBM, in their research on it, the Xerox Corp., the some 20 or 30 other industries that we have operating these Job Corps?

A full list of Job Corps men's and women's centers and operating agencies follow:

#### JOB CORPS MEN'S CENTERS AND OPERATING AGENCIES

Mr. Robert J. Hadden, Director, Atterbury Job Corps Center, Edinburg, Indiana 46124, FTS-317-633-7000, (812) 526-5581. Operating agency: Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Defense and Space Center, Friendship International Airport, Box 169, Baltimore, Maryland 21203.

Mr. James Fornear, Director, Breckinridge Job Corps Center, Morganfield, Kentucky 42437, FTS-502-582-5011, (502) 389-2419. Operating agency: Grafex, Inc., Rochester, New York 14603.

Mr. Charles J. Moxley, Director, Clearfield Job Corps Center, Freeport Center Station, Clearfield, Utah 84016, FTS-801-399-6012, (801) 773-1433. Operating agency: Thiokol Chemical Corporation, Clearfield Division, Clearfield Job Corps Center, Clearfield, Utah 84016.

Dr. William W. Smith, Director, Custer Job Corps Center, Battle Creek, Michigan 49017, FTS-616-962-6511, (616) 965-7204. Operating agency: U. S. Industries, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Suite 77, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. Wallace Dockall, Director, Gary Job Corps Center, San Marcos, Texas 78666, FTS-214-748-5611, (512) EX 6-6330. Operating agency: Texas Educational Foundation, Box 1108, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

Mr. Welcome Bryant, Director, Lincoln Job Corps Center, Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska 68158, FTS-402-475-2611, (402) 799-2481. Operating agency: Management Systems Company, 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebraska.

Mr. Harry J. Mills, Director, McCoy Job Corps Center, P.O. Box 255, Sparta, Wisconsin 54656, FTS-414-272-8600, (608) 269-6052. Operating agency: R. C. A. Service Company, Camden, New Jersey 08101.

Dr. Robert K. Branson, Director, Parks Job Corps Center, Pleasanton, California 94566, FTS-415-834-4121, (415) 828-1000. Operating agency: Litton Systems, Inc., Educational Systems, Division, 4910 Calvert Road, College Park, Maryland 20740.

Mr. Theodore Nelson, Director, Rodman Job Corps Center, New Bedford, Massachusetts 02744, FTS-617-997-0721, (617) 997-0051. Operating agency: Rodman Training Center, Inc., 900 Rodney French Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts.

Mr. D. L. Webber, Director, Kilmer Job Corps Center, Edison, New Jersey 08817, FTS-201-846-4500, (201) 985-1900. Operating agency: Federal Electric Corporation, Paramus, New Jersey 07652.

#### JOB CORPS CENTER FOR WOMEN

Mr. Thomas B. Wardell, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 5th and Cooper, N.W., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107. Contractor: Mr. John Gaines, Space and Systems Division, Packard Bell Electronics Corporation, Lawrence and Arnold Drive, Newbury Park, California 91320.

Dr. Francis L. Rose, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Virginia and Summers Streets, Charleston, West Virginia 25301. Contractor: John Gaines, Space and Systems Division, Packard Bell Electronics Corporation, Lawrence and Arnold Drive, Newbury Park, California 91320.

Dr. Zelma George, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 1588 Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44106. Contractor: Dr. Larzette Hale, Supreme Basileus, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, 5211 South Greenwood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60615.

Mr. W. A. Lewis, Director, Jobs Corps Center for Women, 6202 North 4th Street, Clinton, Iowa 52732. Contractor: Mr. Francis Keppel, President, General Learning Corporation, 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015.

Mr. Joseph R. Corcoran, Director, Keystone Job Corps Center for Women, Post Office Box 37, Drums, Pennsylvania 18222. Contractor: Mr. Joseph Murray, Vice-President, RCA Service Company, Camden, New Jersey 08101.

Mr. Raymond McDonald, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Post Office Box 338, Excelsior Springs, Missouri 64024. Contractor: Dr. Paul Ritt, President, Training Corporation of America, Post Office Box 610, Falls Church, Virginia 22046.

Dr. Charlyce King, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Post Office Box 818, Guthrie, Oklahoma 73044. Contractor: Mr. M. Long, Vice-President, Philco Ford Corporation, Post Office Box 10, 515 Pennsylvania Avenue, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034.

Mr. Willard H. Duetting, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 824 Fifth Avenue, Huntington, West Virginia 25701. Contractor: Mr. Peter C. McColough, President, Xerox Corporation, 700 Midtown Tower, Rochester, New York 14604.

Miss Margaret C. Honey, Job Corps Center for Women, 591 Montgomery Street, Jersey City, New Jersey 07302. Contractor: Miss Mary Howard, Executive Director, Young Women's Christian Association, 270 Fairmount Avenue, Jersey City, New Jersey 07306.

Miss Mary Doolittle, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 1106 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California 90015. Contractor: Miss Barrying Morrison, Executive Director, Young Women's Christian Association, 722 South Oxford, Los Angeles, California 90015.

Dr. Bert Jones, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan 53233. Contractor: Dr. Edgar L. Harden, President, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan 53233.

Dr. George S. Kadera, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Box 750, McKinney, Texas 75069. Contractor: Dr. O. J. Baker, Executive Director, Texas Educational Foundation, Box 1108, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

Mr. Robert Anderson, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Post Office Box 8, Omaha, Nebraska 68102. Contractor: Mr. Bert Waller, Radnor Division, Burroughs Corporation, Box 782, Paoli, Pennsylvania 19301.

Mr. Robert Lake, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Poland Springs, Maine 04274. Contractor: Mr. John Kelly, President, Economic Systems Corporation, 1701 K. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mr. Douglas Duncan, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 919 North Taylor Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63108. Contractor: Mr. Douglas Nesom, President, Delta Educational Corporation, 721 Government Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802.

Dr. Dorothy Burns, Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oregon 97103. Contractor: Dr. Ray Hawk, Assistant to the President, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.

Mr. John Corrigan, Acting Director, Job Corps Center for Women, Moses Lake, Washington 98837. Contractor: Mr. John Kelly, President, Economic Systems Corporation, 1701 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Miss Oleta Crain, Project Director, JC-YW Extension Residence Program, 770 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10021. Contractor: Miss Edith M. Lerrigo, General Secretary, National Board of the YWCA, 770 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10021.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I would ask the gentleman to answer that question?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I simply point out to the chairman—

Mr. PERKINS. Will they go out of existence here? They will, am I not correct?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. Chairman, all this provides is that any State which desires to operate one or more Job Corps centers can ask the cooperation of the Director of OEO, it does not touch the existing Job Corps centers, it does not phase them out.

It does not touch existing Job Corps centers. It does not phase them out. It does not dismember them.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer the gentleman in this way. We can already do what the gentleman says the amendment does under the present law.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Then what is the objection to the amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. There is a lot of objection to this amendment. You would just be inviting a raid on the funds necessary to carry on the effective Job Corps system that we have finally developed. The gentleman well knows when you spread a limited amount of money we will simply impair the ongoing program.

The Job Corps people at the State agency are not pushing this concept, although I know that additional funds could be constructively used in our regular vocational education programs to adequately serve all youth.

Let us go ahead here with the Job Corps concept to serve the most disadvantaged. Good businesslike practice, prudent administration and sound management of public funds all require that we do not waste the investment we have



made in the Job Corps. The operation of the Corps during the past 12 months has been excellent. The administration has made constructive changes in the program to reduce cost, make it more efficient and make it serve the purpose we intended. The Corps is establishing a record of success in reaching the most disadvantaged who have no hope other than this program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Was there any testimony before the committee from State officials asking for this change in the program?

Mr. PERKINS. There was not. There was absolutely none. The State officials throughout the country have made the statement that they were not prepared to deal with disadvantaged children at the present time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. I am a little surprised to see the chairman stand up before this body today and say that the States are not capable of handling their end of this program.

Mr. PERKINS. I am not saying that. The State programs are becoming more efficient every year since we passed the 1963 act. Let us give the vocational education people a chance.

Mr. GARDNER. I think this will do that and help the program considerably.

Mr. PERKINS. The Job Corps program complements the regular vocational education program. All of the vocational educators that I know of are in favor of the present Job Corps program.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which has been offered is very similar to the amendment that was just defeated by this House. But if we were to take a vote and choose between the two, the amendment which was defeated would be far preferable to the one that has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment which was defeated provided for an orderly transition over a period of time.

If I understand the present amendment, it does not provide for this orderly transition.

The present amendment also leaves the Job Corps divided. Part of it would be in the hands of the State departments of vocational education and part of it would be in the hands of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I suggest that this kind of division would lead to great confusion and difficulties in administration.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is also silent as to the amount of money. One of the main criticisms of the present Job Corps program is the extremely high cost per enrollee per year.

I find the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina says that the Director shall pay

the cost of operating the Job Corps centers and similar facilities under a State plan.

There is no limitation on the amount of money that would be required by any one State.

Mr. Chairman, if the Job Corps part of this bill came to the House as it came to the committee at the beginning of the year, I would be one of those who would have to vote against it. But the Committee on Education made major changes in the Job Corps programs. We added a nonresidential feature; we put emphasis on this—that we should have more of the Job Corps enrollees in nonresidential centers which could be just as effective and at a much lower cost.

We also added language which would force the Director to put enrollees in these Job Corps centers that are closest to their homes so that we would stop this traveling from one corner of the United States to the other, courtesy of the American taxpayers.

We also put in the bill language which relates to discipline in the Job Corps camps so that much more emphasis would be placed on the discipline as far as the enrollees were concerned. There has been criticism that some of the Job Corps enrollees were in centers where there was an insufficient amount of time, energy, and emphasis given to basic education and vocational education. The committee wrote language into the bill which provides that at least 60 hours a week would be spent on this kind of training.

The gentleman who offered this amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina, I believe, was the author of an amendment that stated there would be no more use of the Job Corps or the money under title I for political purposes. I think that is a much-needed improvement in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is defeated, I have an amendment which I wish to offer. That amendment would place a further limitation on the costs of the Job Corps per enrollee per year.

I agree with previous speakers that the costs have been outrageously high. I think we need to cut the costs down, not in order to save money like King Midas or King Croesus, merely to gather it and count it, but rather with that money we would save we could help other dropouts. We could effect economies and have those millions to spend on other dropouts in this country who are not enrollees of the Job Corps.

For the reasons I have stated, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, and I hope that it will be defeated. Later I would hope that this House would put a further limitation on the amount of money that is spent per enrollee per year.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The statement has been made that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina would affect the cost of the Job Corps. The amendment would do nothing to affect the language that is in this bill other than permitting a State to set up a State plan for the operation of a Job Corps center. We have

the language in the amendment specifying the method through which the States may do so.

The difficulty we find in many of the States now is that it is impossible for them to have any part in the operation of a Job Corps center. The language which the committee adopted, with much of which I disagree, would still be intact.

What the amendment does is to assure that the requirements of this part, which means the language of the bill as it is presently written with respect to recruitment, selection, standards of cost, training cost, counseling, job placement of trainees, together with other applicable requirements of this part will be met. It states very clearly in the amendment that all the language, even the strengthening language of the present bill over the present act, will be included. The committee amendments relating to the Job Corps does include some of the language which the gentleman from New York and I tried to get included in previous years. So there is some strengthening language.

You ought to look very seriously at the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina and see if this is not the kind of step forward with possible involvement of the State that is necessary as well as acceptable.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the charge has been leveled that during the course of the hearings we did not have vocational educators who were here asking for or in support of residential vocational schools or the capability or the involvement of State and local units of government which might be interested in this idea.

I would refer the members of this Committee to part 4 of the hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, to the testimony of Dr. George Parkinson of the Milwaukee Vocational Technical and Adult Schools. I will not take the time to read completely the letter he sent to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], dated August 1, 1967, but he does say this:

During our discussion the question of the function of a residential vocational school was brought up and, as you may remember, I am strongly in favor of this, particularly since I feel that the problem before us is a permanent one and merits a long-time permanent solution.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the action of our Board authorizing me to make application for funds for such a residential school if and when the Congress sees fit to fund at least the pilot schools.

I suggest to the members of the Committee that this amendment represents an effort, if a State is willing, with all the limitations in the law and with all the limitations in the legislation and with the purpose of aiming at the disadvantaged, as proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina, by which we can in fact begin to broaden the oppor-



tunity for training the very people we seek to train in the Job Corps.

The problems are obvious. The costs are high. The service is not good. The follow-through is not good. The outreach is simply failing.

This kind of a State plan operation, with involvement by those States willing to make the effort, does seem to me to make the most sense as to reaching more of those whom we are not now reaching.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am delighted to yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman well knows that the witness from Milwaukee was one of our highly respected vocational educators in the Nation but in his testimony he did not testify against the Job Corps. He testified for residential centers, which we provided for in section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Now the gentleman is stating something that we already have authority under the present law to cover. What he is trying to do is to weaken a good law, as to something for which we already have the authority.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the language on page 149 of S. 2388 simply does not do the job. To put in subsection (b) of section 115 the language: "The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation," frankly is not going to provide the kind of meaningful redirection of the Job Corps which I believe makes sense.

I trust the amendment will be adopted. I do not believe this will dismember the Job Corps. I do not believe it will impair the Job Corps. If anything, it will strengthen and improve it so that we can serve more young men and women.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement on debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. GOODELL. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman has not yielded.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I had not understood the gentleman from Kentucky to ask anyone to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is so doing now.

Mr. ERLBORN. When I am through with my 5 minutes I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky will have an opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, it is important that we know what is in this amendment. A good deal of confusion, I think, has been interjected into

this debate as a result of some of the statements from the other side of the aisle.

Some of the speakers against this amendment would have us believe that all the provisions now relating to the Job Corps, some of which have been worked out over the years, to put limitations on expenditures and so forth, would be lost as a result of adoption of this amendment. This just is not true.

This amendment would leave in the law and would leave in the bill those safeguards that have been written into the law and are proposed to be written into the law as a result of passage of this bill. It would not remove the limitation on expenditures, as suggested by one of the speakers on the other side of the aisle. It would retain that provision.

Every provision relating to the conduct of the Job Corps, selection, recruitment and training, would remain in the law, and the programs operated within the States under State plans would have to conform to the law as it now exists and as amended by this bill.

The State's plan would have to be submitted to the Director of OEO, who would have to find specifically that the State plan would carry out the purposes of and be under the direction of the law as it exists at the time that the State plan is submitted and the amendments that might be adopted thereafter.

So do not be confused by those who would have you believe that we are changing the Job Corps and taking off the standards. I would be the last one in the world to remove the cost limitation in this bill. As a matter of fact, I think we should improve it and not remove the limitation that we fought so hard to put in last year.

There are parts of this title and section of the bill that I think are good, and we would now have under the committee bill an improvement in relating the graduates of the Job Corps to meaningful employment. There has not been this sort of followup. If the amendment is adopted, this provision now in the bill would also be adopted and continue in operation. We would have graduates of the Job Corps directed to the U.S. Employment Service and have a followup to see the type of training they receive is utilized in the employment made available to them through the USES. I think these are good and should be continued and that this amendment will not in any way jeopardize the good provisions now in the law or to be adopted by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARDNER and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 89, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN  
OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 152, strike out lines 3 through 12, and insert the following:

"(b) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that in recruitment efforts for the Job Corps, and in the selection for enrollment and enrollment of young men and women in the Job Corps there is no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. He shall administer the Job Corps in such a manner as to accommodate its programs and facilities to the make-up of the Job Corps resulting from application of the preceding sentence."

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it unmistakably clear that we intend to end any discrimination against women in the Job Corps program.

A few years ago Congress enacted a law which declared as its policy that there would be no more discrimination in employment practices on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin or sex. If we meant what we said, that we intend to end the discrimination against women as far as employment is concerned, then surely it is time that we also state it as a matter of national policy that there would be no more discrimination against women in federally financed training programs that will lead to gainful employment.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there has been a history of discrimination against women enrollees since the Job Corps program was first established. When the bill first came to the Congress, there was no provision for women enrollees in the Job Corps training program. The Congress, in its wisdom, changed this so that women enrollees would be eligible on the same basis as male enrollees. However, to be eligible, and to be admitted were two different things. We did not write into the bill a provision that no discrimination on the basis of sex would be tolerated. Then a year and a half later in the spring of 1966 when the administration testified before the Education and Labor Committee, they stated that only 1,800 girls were enrolled in the entire Job Corps program. At the same time there were about 20,000 boys enrolled.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that out of 500,000 girls in the United States who were eligible for this job training in the Job Corps program, only 1,800 girls had been accepted. This program was designed for the high school dropouts—the young people who are out of school and out of work. During the hearings that spring, it was pointed out that the percentage of dropouts in the high school was about evenly divided between the boys and the girls—about 50 percent of the total number of dropouts were young girls. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the need for job training was and is just as great for young girls as young boys. In addi-



tion, Mr. Chairman, the highest unemployment rate in the Nation is among nonwhite girls between 16 and 21 years of age. I am talking about young girls who are out looking for jobs—who need jobs.

In the original hearings on this legislation one of the administration witnesses was opposed to including young girls in the job training program on the basis that this was a program for the future breadwinners. This was hard to believe in the year 1964 because the facts are that one-third of the members of the labor force are women. This is not something to be debated as to whether women should stay in the home or whether they should be working.

The realities are that one out of every three workers in the United States today is a woman. Women are working for the same reason that men are working—to support their families. And I submit that a woman has as much right as a man to make that choice for herself. If she wants to work that is her decision and this Nation must not discriminate in providing the training to make it possible for her to achieve her full potential. I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the very girls who need this Job Corps training, are the most desperate of these girls who come from the lowest socioeconomic groups. They are exactly the ones who are entitled to the training we can provide; they are the ones who must work because in their families one salary will not provide the necessary income to support a family.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of what is fair and just and equitable that this House at this time should declare it a matter of public policy that there be no discrimination toward women as far as Job Corps training programs are concerned. And as we improve this training program; as we establish the nonresidential centers as well as the residential centers; as this country places greater emphasis on vocational education; there will be an equal need to see that women are admitted and that they are as eligible to receive the training as are any young men. Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], would be willing to accept this amendment on our side of the aisle.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon some questions about her amendment.

As I read the language that has been stricken, it is the language that I believe our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], brought in in committee, which puts the requirement that at least 25 percent of all the Job Corps enrollees shall be women, and the Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent women in the Job Corps consistent with these requirements.

You would strike out that requirement, now, and just leave it up to the Director to not discriminate, is that right?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

And if the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me that under the language which I suggest in this amendment there would be more of a certainty that the number of women admitted to the Job Corps centers would increase at a faster pace than under the language in the bill.

The Director of the Job Corps told the members of the committee that there are 6,000 girls who have been screened and are ready and waiting to join the Job Corps, and that there are 2,000 boys who have been screened and who are ready and waiting to go into the Job Corps. Therefore, if we write language into this bill that there should be no discrimination based on sex—and in talking with the other members of the committee, of course—it would mean that these 8,000 would be the first ones who would go into the Job Corps centers.

If the gentleman would yield further, the last sentence in the amendment is as follows:

He shall administer the Job Corps in such a manner as to accommodate its programs and facilities to the make-up of the Job Corps resulting from application of the preceding sentence.

In other words, these girls, the 6,000 to the 2,000, that is, 3 to 1, that they will be admitted as the first ones as there is a turnover in the Job Corps.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Oregon one more question:

Is there any breakdown now on those waiting to get in on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There is no breakdown that I am aware of. To the best of my knowledge there has never been any discrimination based on race, color, religion, or racial origin, and it is included in this to make certain that there will not be any such discrimination in the future at all, but I do believe there has been discrimination, and I believe many of the members of our committee would agree with me on that, that there has been discrimination based on sex, and this is to end this kind of discrimination.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentlewoman in what kind of time schedule does she expect to see an increase in enrollment from the 23 percent which is now the case for women? What kind of time schedule does the gentlewoman expect to see in reaching the number of women that I believe the gentlewoman wants eventually to secure for the Job Corps?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe the gentleman is responsible for the language in the present act which says that the Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent women enrollees in training in the Job Corps.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentlewoman that my amendment did not have the three clauses now in subsection (b).

The way I offered my amendment, the Director would have been required to get the 50 percent just as quickly as he can get them.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This is the purpose of my amendment. I think if this amendment is adopted, we will move very quickly to the 50 percent. That is the purpose of the amendment and I hope the House will support it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] a question with respect to her amendment.

If I understand correctly, recognizing that only 23 percent of Job Corps enrollees today are women, do you believe that under the net impact of your amendment the Director would have to take more women in than men, effective from now until he gets the 50-50 ratio?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The purpose of the amendment is to end any discrimination. If there are 6,000 girls who have been screened and who have been told that they can join the Job Corps and they are ready and waiting, and if there are only 2,000 boys who are ready and waiting, the purpose of this amendment is to end the discrimination against the young women and take those girls who have been promised this opportunity along with the 2,000 boys who also have been promised this opportunity and just simply say, We are going to treat all young people who are eligible for the Job Corps on the basis of equity and fairness. This Congress would not allow discrimination in the Job Corps on the basis of race—why, in the name of all that is fair, should we continue to allow discrimination based on sex?

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, if there were 6,000 women applicants waiting to get in and 2,000 men applicants, you would expect the director to take three women for every man to fill those vacancies as long as that ratio existed?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman that the Director was taking 10 boys for every one girl in the first year of the program. So, let us end discrimination so far as these 6,000 girls or any other girls or boys are concerned. Let us have the same rules apply to both.

Mr. GOODELL. This concerns me, because the gentlewoman includes in addition to sex, race, color, religion, and national origin. Are you expecting the director to take a reading on how many Polish people and how many Irish people and people of different ethnic background are applying and apply the same formula to them? Or how many Negroes and whites are applying? And apply the same ratio to them and say that he has to compensate for the situation based upon the number of applicants that there are?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman knows that that is not the purpose of the amendment.

The amendment simply says that the director may not discriminate on the basis of any of those five factors.

Mr. GOODELL. You cannot have it both ways, I will say to the gentlewoman. If it is the purpose, and she feels the im-



part of this is going to be with the 6,000 women applicants and the 2,000 men applicants that the director should take in women on a 3-to-1 ratio as long as that ratio obtains as to applicants, then under the amendment where she has included race and included color and religion and national origin, I just ask, Do you expect to apply the same approach to those? I do not see how you can say there must be a different approach to women than you can for the other categories that you have listed.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is exactly the point. We do not discriminate on basis of color as creed. Let us end the discrimination on the basis of sex in the Job Corps. There are 8,000 young people who have been screened and who have been found eligible and who are simply waiting to be admitted. If those 8,000 young people are the first ones lined up, it is reasonable to believe that there will be people of every race and there will be people of every color and people of every religion and that there will be people of both sexes and people of every national origin, and that there would be no discrimination on the basis of any one of those five factors.

Mr. GOODELL. And now the gentlewoman is saying that her amendment would not set up a ratio of applicants but simply to take them regardless of sex—first come, first serve?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct. I am saying that they should not be discriminated against—and that you would not discriminate against any person on the basis of color, on the basis of sex or creed. This is what has happened in times past. They have discriminated on the basis of sex. This is the purpose of the amendment. They could no longer refuse to enroll an applicant because that person was a woman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. By the terms of the amendment you are saying that, "You shall not discriminate because of sex, because of ethnic origin, color, race, creed," or whatever term you want to use. That means you just do not ask questions along that line and you take them in as they come without discrimination. That is exactly the way it works.

Mr. GOODELL. I hope they are going to ask whether they are women or men.

Mr. DENT. It all depends on where you are operating. There are some areas, they tell me, it is hard to distinguish.

Mr. GOODELL. I think we have enough problems with the Job Corps already without refusing to ask whether the applicant is a woman or a man.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Under the amendment does the gentleman understand that separate facilities would be required, or would it have to be coeducational?

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Oregon that question. Are you anticipating providing co-

educational facilities under your amendment?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I do not propose that, but I have heard the gentleman from New York say many times in the committee that he would like to see coeducational job training programs.

Mr. GOODELL. I am always confused with the gentleman from Minnesota. My first name is not "QUIE." That is my colleague, I believe, from Minnesota, Mr. QUIE.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sorry. I thought he was speaking for you, also.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I am willing to state that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon was discussed in a Democratic caucus by the committee. There was some opposition to the amendment, but as far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment and feel that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] a question from the standpoint of clarifying the record. If I am not mistaken, this amendment was originally offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] who unfortunately cannot be here today. As I recall the testimony of Mr. William Kelly, the Director of the Job Corps, he pointed out, if I am not mistaken, that the trainee costs for women enrollees were somewhat higher. In addition, women enrollees required special facilities. Therefore, the question: If that is correct, this does not reduce the total number of Job Corps enrollees if this amendment has to be implemented immediately?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The reason why women's centers are higher cost than the men centers is that usually a military base is used for the men's centers. Women's centers are usually abandoned or, I should say, old hotels or sorority houses. Therefore, it is necessary to pay for the cost of the rent of that hotel. They do not have to pay rent for the old military base. That is the reason. If you change that cost, I do not believe there would be any additional costs for women.

Mr. REID of New York. Did not the Director of the Job Corps state that the cost would be higher?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I refer to page 115 of the hearings with reference to this subject. The Director testified that the overall average from July 1966, to May 1967, per enrollee per year was \$6,950. He pointed out that the women's urban centers were somewhat more expensive. I quote from the hearings:

From inception to December, 1965, \$9,990; January to June, 1966, \$6,686; July, 1966, to May, 1967, \$8,642.

Continuing to quote—

Now we have there a slight increase. The reason why we have had it is that not only have we brought onstream about 8 women's centers in the last four or five months, but we have also expanded existing centers in order to meet the requirements of the 23-percent amendment.

He goes on to say he hopes to get the cost per woman enrollee down to the same figure as for the men. In fiscal year 1968 he says the cost will be \$7,200 per enrollee man-year in the women's centers.

Mr. REID of New York. My question of the gentleman from New York is this: If the language of the gentlewoman's amendment is carried out literally and if there is some necessary time for transition in the lowering of costs for women enrollees, would this not in fact reduce the number of Job Corps enrollees?

Mr. GOODELL. I would answer that based upon the testimony of Mr. Kelly, that he would expect any increased proportion of woman enrollees taken in in this year, to get far above the 25-percent level, would result in being considerably more expensive. Mr. Kelly strenuously opposed the 30-percent women minimum and said it would cost a substantial amount of increased money.

For the RECORD, I would like to clarify: the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman is not the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL]. The gentlewoman is deleting the Bell amendment, that would require 25 percent women by July 1, 1968, and 50-50 as soon as possible, with immediate steps to implement that.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for that correction. I had intended to indicate that the language of the present bill is the Bell amendment, not the amendment offered.

May I ask the gentlewoman from Oregon, from the standpoint of legislative history, whether it would be her hope that there would be no reduction in the number of Job Corps enrollees in the light of the discussion today?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that if we have cooperation of the gentleman's colleagues on that side of the aisle and the full amount for the OEO is funded, of course there would be no reduction.

Mr. REID of New York. I join the gentlewoman in that hope. I merely express the further hope that she will make clear to the House that her amendment would not result in any reduction in total Job Corps enrollment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my colleague from Oregon a question?

Is it the intention of the gentlewoman, and do I understand it correctly, that



under her amendment there would be a movement as rapidly as possible in the direction of having equality of enrollment in the Job Corps as between sexes?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the main purpose of it is to end all discrimination. In my judgment, there has been discrimination from the very beginning of the Job Corps program. Girls were refused admission while boys were accepted. The evidence is in the statistics. As of November 1966—there were only 4,268 women enrolled—after the program had been in operation for more than 2 years.

As I stated a moment ago, the discouraging fact is that the highest unemployment rate in the Nation is among nonwhite girls between 16 and 21. These girls must work. They are seeking jobs. They need job training.

In answer to the question, I would certainly hope that the House would go on record that we would move as rapidly as possible not only to end discrimination against minority groups but also to end discrimination so far as job training is concerned for the young girls of this country, who need training just as desperately as the young boys. What man in this House would say that high school training or college training was to be for boys only—or that we would discriminate against girls in admission to high school training work. And so for high school dropouts—I am asking that we also do not discriminate in an alternate training program—the Job Corps.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I might direct a question to the gentleman from New York. I should like to put it as clearly and as flatly as possible.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time so that I might have an opportunity to speak briefly on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be given an additional 3 minutes under the circumstances which have just prevailed so that I may have a chance to speak on this myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield briefly.

Mr. REID of New York. I do not believe that the interruption from the gallery is worthy of comment. I would merely wish to say that the valuable experience and remarks of the gentlelady from Oregon always enjoy the respect and esteem of this House and I yield to no one in this regard.

In taking this time, I simply wish to ask of the gentleman from New York, assuming full funding of the Job Corps at \$295 million, would not this amendment perhaps result in a reduction of the total number of enrollees?

Mr. GOODELL. I would have to answer the gentleman honestly based on what Mr. Kelly testified—Yes, it would result in a reduction.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, if you will, that is part of the point which concerns me about this particular amendment. I would go a step further than my colleague from Oregon in saying that there is not only equal need on the part of the young ladies of the country to be given the benefit of the Job Corps, but some of the testimony given to us would indicate they have perhaps an additional need for help.

My deep concern in this is that the amendment of my colleague from Oregon, instead of rapidly achieving the goal at least of equality within the ranks of the Job Corps might lead to a result that would be inferior to that proposed in the bill at the present time. I refer the committee to the bill. In this particular section with which we are dealing the point is made that immediately there shall be at least 25 percent women enrollees and the director immediately shall take steps to achieve the enrollment of 50 percent women enrollees on the basis of the criteria suggested by Mr. Kelly and worked out in connection with the committee's deliberations reaching to the direction of giving women as well as men equitable treatment and reaching for 50 percent women enrollees—not any discrimination, but saying that it shall be our goal to have 50 percent women enrollees. This also recognizes the point Mr. Kelly made that to move too precipitately to this goal would result actually, because of the additional cost involved, in a reduction in the total number of enrollees.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not usually get up here just to defend the administrators of the program, but I think that the record should be clear. A large part of what discrimination there was existed because Congress mandated it by requiring 40 percent of the enrollees go to conservation camps, and that was for males only. Therefore, you started out with 40 percent of the Job Corps enrollees who were male and then had to define the rest in your urban centers. That is the reason why you came up with such a large proportion of the original enrollees male. The gentlewoman pushed very hard to get a greater proportion of women and a fairer proportion of women. We respect her for that, but you have to move now on this matter with some judiciousness so that you do not destroy the program you have existing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that there are these criteria spelled out in the bill as it stands at the present time. I urge in this particular situation we stay with the committee.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to come to the well to speak against this amendment. I really came on a last-minute inspiration. After having heard the voice from the heavens, I come from my seat with some fear. First I want you to know that I have the utmost respect for the gentlewoman from Oregon. I have found

myself siding with her on many occasions. I think that the ladies who grace this House really add charm and dignity to it. Their intellect certainly cannot be doubted, and the contribution they have made here is one which is very marked. However, I do think there is an item here that should be considered, that is, the question of priorities. It seems to me that one of the first priorities we have is to train potential breadwinners.

Now, if we had all the money we needed, and if we had all of the opportunity to train all these 2,000 women to whom the distinguished gentlewoman referred to, then, perhaps, such an amendment would be in order. But we do not have and we are limited. I think our priority should be directed toward training potential breadwinners.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does my good colleague not know that one out of every three breadwinners in the United States today is a woman; and, that they are the heads of families, that they are working to support their children just the same as the men are?

All I am asking is that these people who have to work and support their families be given the same kind of a break that a man who is a breadwinner receives, with which I completely agree. But let us not exclude the women who also have to earn money for the support of their families.

Mr. ROUSH. I would only say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, that the first breadwinner should be the man. The man should have that responsibility. That is what I would like to see done first.

Many of those to whom the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon refers are women who have been thrust into that position because of unfortunate circumstances. But they were not in the first instance intended to be the breadwinner. I regret that I have to disagree with the distinguished gentlewoman on her amendment, but I do hope that the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, let us not be confused about what this amendment involves. All this amendment says is "thou shalt not discriminate." It's as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman, it is much preferable to the provision that it is designed to replace, a provision that sets an arbitrary quota, which must be met, and if you must discriminate in order to meet the quota you are required to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know about other Members of this House, but I do not intend to support discrimination in any form.

The amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] simply says that there shall be no discrimination in



the enrollment of applicants in this program.

I cannot understand what objection anyone could possibly have to such a provision and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] who just preceded me, that I read the amendment completely differently. I read the amendment as having contained therein built-in discrimination that you cannot get away from.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] talked about a quota system being discriminatory. If this amendment is adopted, the Director is going to have to take man for man and woman for woman and if he does not, he is guilty of discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, there is no other way you can handle it, there is no other way in which he can interpret the amendment and administer it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care how high the motives are—and I submit they are very high indeed—but I know of no way anyone who is confronted with this provision written into the law, is going to take on more boys in the Job Corps until he has the quota of women built up to the number of boys that are already in the Job Corps.

I just believe that you are putting a burden on the Administrator that should not be put on him. It seems to me this thing was worked out in committee, and the Members must have debated a long time on it, and you do have a quota system which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] says is discriminating. And I agree with him. But I say the amendment that the gentleman is supporting is even more discriminating because there is no other way you can administer it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would simply like to point out that the language that would be stricken sets up a 25-percent woman quota.

Mr. HAYS. At least that many, does it not say?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes.

Then it goes on to say:

The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent women enrollees—

Mr. HAYS. That is right.

But he does it in an orderly manner, but if he has this amendment to work with then I am telling you you will not see another boy in the Job Corps program until the Director has built the women up to the equivalent number of men that are already in the Job Corps.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon itself—and she says there has been discrimination. I hate to disagree with the gentlewoman from Oregon, but I doubt that there has been discrimination, because these peo-

ple are girls. There may have been some inadvertent discrimination because they did not have places where they could take them, or because they could not use them in the conservation camps, or something of that kind. But is the gentlewoman from Oregon saying that there has been on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity a deliberate discrimination against women simply because they were women; is that what the gentlewoman is saying?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I must say I cannot agree with that. I just do not believe it has happened in that way.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I noticed in the gentleman's remarks that he commented on the "built-in" differences that we must recognize.

Mr. HAYS. No, I do not believe I used that wording, but I admit those differences are there.

Mr. KEITH. Which recalls to my mind a debate that allegedly occurred in the French Parliament, where they were talking about the difference between the males and the females.

Mr. HAYS. And he said "Vive la difference."

Mr. KEITH. "Vive la difference."

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I am for that, also.

Mr. KEITH. Merci beaucoup.

Mr. HAYS. But I do not see why it is that every time I come down here somebody wants to put words in my mouth.

However, I had thought of it, but I did not say it, but thank you for giving me credit for it anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 53, noes, 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not on his feet when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Kentucky on his feet at the time the Chair recognized the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PERKINS. I believe I was, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the testimony is not strong enough; therefore the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 154, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 119. Any other provision of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, sums expended for programs authorized by this part shall not exceed \$200,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment and reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman what this amendment does is to put a limit on the Job Corps.

Last year the appropriation for the Job Corps was \$200 million and we should put the same amount in it this year. It seems to me the Job Corps could operate under the same appropriation that they did in the last year and use the same economies that they did at that time. Any additional amount that is now available under the authorization in title I in section 2 of the bill could be used for the other programs like the NYC and the adult work training and other programs.

This is an amendment which I believe all of you understand and there is no use spending a great deal of time on it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the amendment was reserved by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] insist on the point of order?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the grounds for the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is made on the ground that in section 2 we already adopted a specific authorization figure and on line 9 and 10, page 128, in section 2, there is a specific limitation of the exact title that the gentleman from Minnesota is proposing to specifically limit.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's amendment is untimely. It comes too late and it should have been offered to section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization of section 2 provides for the total amount of money for this act. Also, on lines 8 and 9 there is the figure for title I of \$874,000,000.

I offer a limitation of money only for part (a) of title I. My amendment would not affect the sum of money on line 8 of page 128, but only would be a further limitation within the \$874,000,000 authorized for title I.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel the amendment is in order.



The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has offered an amendment to which a point of order was addressed to the Chair by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

It would appear to the Chair that this is a limitation on an entirely different subject and an entirely different matter and, therefore, the amendment is in order.

The Chair overrules the point of order made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may we hear the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would seriously cripple the Job Corps, and would put it down to the figure that the minority offered in their Opportunity Crusade with a difference, I believe, of \$5 million.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The figure in the Opportunity Crusade for the Job Corps is \$190 million. The figure that I offered is \$200 million, \$10 million more, which is the exact figure that was appropriated for this last fiscal year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have in our bill \$295 million to operate the Job Corps this next fiscal year. That amount will take some 41,000 enrollees.

The effect of the amendment would be to cut the Job Corps down about one-third in its operations all the way across the board, and close down, for all intents and purposes, the majority of the conservation centers. It would close some 30 or 40 conservation centers and close urban centers for both men and women.

In other words, we would be taking a negative approach. We would say to these youngsters, "We have knowledge of the problem, but we do not intend to venture into its solution."

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. If we are talking about a full authorization reduction of \$95 million; that would in fact reduce this program by one-third or 12,000 enrollees. But we have only one-half of the fiscal year left to go, which would double the impact. It means we might have as many as 22,000 to 25,000, or two-thirds.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentleman for his contribution. It will, in fact, double the number of enrollees who will be dismissed. The impact will be much more serious than my original comments indicated.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Can the gentleman tell me where, under part A relating to the

Job Corps, the figure of \$295 million is contained in this legislation?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that we do not have that figure in the legislation. We have a total figure for title I. The testimony shows that it is contemplated that \$295,000,000 will go to the operation of the Job Corps for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CRAMER. Then, if the figure is not written in the legislation, the OEO can spend any amount it wishes for the Job Corps under the limitation of \$874 million in title I?

Mr. PERKINS. It will not work that way. The estimates have been carried out, and their estimates will not exceed the amount shown in the testimony.

Mr. CRAMER. The only way this House could then work its will on the figure would be to put a figure in the legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Of course, the House can put a figure in. I would object if there were an effort to write it in the measure.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand the purpose of the amendment is to write a specific figure in for the Job Corps under title I which is not in the bill. Now the OEO can spend any amount of money they want to.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman knows the Office of Economic Opportunity has, to my way of thinking, been carrying on an efficient operation. We should leave some latitude for them. I will say to the gentleman they cannot expend in excess of that figure in view of other limitations we have written into part A. We limit enrollment to 45,000. We limit the cost to \$6,500 per enrollee. This is an effective limit of about \$292 million on the Job Corps.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. If I may inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky, it was my recollection that some \$200 million was appropriated for the fiscal year 1967 operations of the Job Corps.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. We had a carryover. There was some \$200 million appropriated, and we had a carryover of \$95 million from the previous year. That is the reason we spent more money than in the previous fiscal year.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. Last year appropriations for the Job Corps were \$200 million, the figure that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has offered in this amendment. As I understand it, they actually spent \$211 million last year. Can the gentleman explain to us why the authorization in this bill is \$295 million in the Job Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. I understand that we appropriated \$211 million for fiscal year 1967 for the Job Corps, but much more than that was expended because of the carryover from the previous year. I believe there was a carryover of about \$85 million.

Mr. GOODELL. There was a carryover of \$85 million?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. We appropriated \$200 million last year, I say to the gentleman, according to the records I have. I do not know from where the other \$11 million came, unless transferred from some other program. This goes to the point raised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. PERKINS. We had two supplementals. There was about \$60 million in the last supplemental.

They had a carryover of \$85,845,167.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman will agree that as the bill is before us, out of the committee, there is no ceiling on the amount of money which can be expended for the Job Corps except the total ceiling in the title of \$874 million for all activities in title I.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. So by law the Director is not limited under this bill to \$295 million for the Job Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. But the gentleman well knows that that includes the adult work and training and all the work and training programs in addition to the Job Corps.

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, and the Director can transfer funds back and forth from all these programs any way he wishes, including the total of \$874 million into any one of these programs.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, but I do not visualize it would happen to the work and training programs. Authority has been delegated to the Secretary of Labor, by and large. I do not visualize that those programs would be stopped.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman does not visualize that, but this is a very poor way to legislate.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I inquire of the gentleman from New York whether it is true that under the Economic Opportunity Act authority is granted to the Director of OEO for the purpose of enabling transfer of some 10 percent of any of the funds for any of the programs in and among all the other programs?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, that is true under the existing law and under the committee bill, as I understand it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman elucidate a bit more on the \$85 million carryover for the Job Corps?

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to hear an elucidation from the chairman on the \$85 million carryover. I believe the Congress should have an explanation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. We do have a limitation in here on the number of enrollees; 45,000 is written into the bill. We do have a limitation on the cost per enrollee written into the bill I would think that is a sufficient check. No one is going to go



above that figure. In fact, on the \$295 million, they will only be able to go up to 41,000.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that point. Could the gentleman tell us the explanation for the \$85 million carry-over last year?

Mr. PERKINS. That came from previous year appropriations that were unexpended and used during the present fiscal year.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, they had \$85 million more appropriated for the Job Corps in previous fiscal years than they could use.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. I do not have the figure for this year. It is a very limited sum of money, some \$10 million or \$15 million.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the language of the bill as reported by the committee on page 151 at the bottom of the page starting on line 23 under the title "Special Limitations" and carrying over to page 152. You will find that the committee, as the chairman has already indicated, has written into the law two specific limitations on the size of the Job Corps which relate to the number of people to be trained and the maximum expenditure per trainee.

Now, there is a considerable difference in approaching the limitation of expenditures from that direction and from the direction of the gentleman from Minnesota. First of all, the gentleman from Minnesota, without regard to the number of trainees involved and the enrollee cost, would put a total cost allocation on all of the funds authorized to be expended in title I of \$200 million. That represents a \$95 million cut in what it is estimated it will take at the rate of \$6,500 per enrollee to meet the optimum number that could be enrolled in this program this year. We have 41,000 young people in the Job Corps at the present time. The new limitation would be a total of 45,000. Then we have between 6,000 and 8,000 young people who have already been screened, recruited, and are ready to go if we have the space for them. So the 45,000 limitation which we propose in this bill contemplates that if we did not recruit a single additional person to those already on hand and waiting to go to Job Corps camps, we would have to stop accepting new trainees now. The \$6,500 limitation represents about \$200 a year less than we are currently spending using the best and most optimistic figures we have on our spending per enrollee. This represents a continuing effort on the part of the committee to bring down the per-enrollee cost. But the most deadly aspect of the Quie amendment would be this: It does not make the \$95 million cut for the whole year but it makes it only for that portion of the fiscal year which is left. We are not talking about sending home one-third of the 41,000 kids in order to cut down the year's deficit in expenditures to meet the cut, but we are talking about sending home two-thirds of the young people presently in the Job Corps. Do you want to accept the responsibility here in the House for sending 20,000 of these young people we are

talking about in this program back to their neighborhoods and communities, in the Appalachia area or the ghettos of the big cities? Uncle Sam would be saying, "Sorry, sonny, we suckered you in and took you down to the Job Corps camp and told you you would get trained, but Congress has said 'Send them back home before they are trained.'"

In the last few days here I have heard a good many people on both sides of the aisle saying they wanted to see more efficiency and more job-related employment in the Job Corps. How will you get more efficiency and more job-related employment if you are going to say to Mr. Kelly, the man who is running the Job Corps, "We are sorry, but we are cutting \$95 million out of the current year's operating budget in the last 6 months of the fiscal year that you still have left. We will cut that \$95 million, and you send these young people back home with a little note saying 'Sorry, but if we get the money next year, we will have you back.'"

Mr. Chairman, we will not get these young people back, but you will hear about them. You will not hear about them in statistics of the success of the Job Corps and improved statistics on crime in the streets, but you will hear of them in the statistics on the failures of this country. And that responsibility will fall upon the shoulders every one of you who support this amendment.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ERLENBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just spoke, again, uses the same sort of comparisons that have been used in opposition to the other amendment here, saying that this amendment would cut \$95 million out of the current year's operating budget for the Job Corps. Obviously, this just is not correct.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time the Job Corps is operating under a continuing resolution at the rate of approximately \$200 million per annum.

It is only the committee bill that would raise this in the anticipation of the distribution of title I funds, to \$295 million.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Not at this time. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

But, Mr. Chairman, what the committee bill fails to take into consideration is the fact that we are presently halfway through this fiscal year.

Now, if there is anything we should have learned around here in recent years, particularly in relation to education, it is that one cannot begin a program or change it radically in the middle of the fiscal year and expect to get one's dollars' worth. Millions of dollars, literally, were wasted under the operations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because we passed the bill in the middle of the school year and appropriated for an entire year, and a number of

educators from throughout the entire country testified to the effect that they could not spend in approximately 5 months' time an entire year's appropriation.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ERLENBORN. In just a moment I shall yield to the gentleman.

I would point out that the present expenditures of the Job Corps are at a rate of \$200 million per annum and that there is \$100 million for the first 6 months of this fiscal year.

If the committee bill is adopted, this would go, then, to \$295 million per annum, or at the rate of \$147.5 million for the balance of the fiscal year.

However, if it were just prorated for the year, what happens is that you pick up the entire slippage for the first 6 months and, therefore, the entire increase for the year will be expended in the first 6 months of the fiscal year. That would mean that at the beginning of the next fiscal year, with the same appropriation, suddenly you would have to drop back and reduce your expenditures because you would not have the same funds in fiscal year 1969 that you were expending in the last 6 months of fiscal year 1968.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois makes a point that the remainder of much of the fiscal year has already expired and that for the remainder of the fiscal year we will be throwing money away. I disagree with that observation, because planning has been done in this respect for a long period of time. There have been ample funds available up to the present time in the operations of the Job Corps. But, now, we have a waiting list of some 6,000 girls and two or three thousand women. If we do not get the Job Corps up to its operating strength, at least to the point of 41,000, we will be wasting money, because it is going to cost much more per enrollee.

Mr. Chairman, this cutback, as proposed, certainly will knock many thousands of girls and boys out of the opportunity to participate in the Job Corps.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Illinois certainly will be voted down and that during the remainder of this fiscal year, we need all of this money and that it will all be put to good use.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, under the committee bill, \$100 million would have been spent in the first 6 months of this fiscal year, or a total of \$295 million appropriated and would mean that \$195 million would be available for expenditure in the second half of the fiscal year. Then that money suddenly became available, we are to spend at the rate of expenditure for the Job Corps as of the 1st of July 1968, but we suddenly then drop back to the rate of expenditure of \$147.5 million for a 6-month period. It just does not make sense to appropriate funds in this fashion. If you want to increase funds for



the Job Corps, you should do it with some perspective.

We should appropriate for this year a certain amount and increase the amount for the next fiscal year, but to raise the funds one third in the middle of a fiscal year when we have been operating at a much lower level means we will be putting too much in in the last 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. QUIE and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the House again has before it a bill, designed as stated in its title "to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs." The question is not only whether a program is necessary to bring Federal assistance to the poor, the underprivileged, the disadvantaged of our Nation, but also whether the programs which are being carried out under the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity are doing the job—whether tax dollars authorized and appropriated for programs such as those included under community action, Job Corps, VISTA, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and others are achieving the expected results, and are expanded to obtain maximum value for every dollar spent—or whether under OEO, mismanagement is resulting in widespread waste and extravagant spending which is defeating the purpose of the economic opportunity program—to eliminate poverty in our Nation.

The authorization requested in this year's bill totals \$2,060,000,000 as compared with the authorization request a year ago for \$1.55 billion.

Before approving the continuation and expansion of programs administered by OEO, a review of the facts as disclosed by the record deserves the full and careful consideration of the Members of the House.

An examination of reports as to the administration of the antipoverty program, the cost of salaries, and the projects again reveals alarming instances of inefficiency, waste, extravagance, and mismanagement.

In commenting on the OEO in their minority views as members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Representatives JOHN M. ASHBROOK and JAMES C. GARDNER, declared:

It is the highest paid, worst managed, most incompetently staffed agency in the history of the Federal Government. One out of every 42.3 of its employees is paid over \$20,000 a year; nearly one-half are paid \$10,000 a year or more. The budget of the

United States lists 416 positions in OEO with pay in excess of \$15,000 a year.

The budget also estimates that 2,800 permanent Federal employees are required to run OEO, and that another 4,772 other permanent positions are required in other Federal agencies to run programs funded through OEO. These 7,572 permanent Federal positions required to run the war on poverty from Washington—according to the budget estimates—cost the hard-pressed American taxpayer a cool \$60 million for salaries alone this year.

That is only the cream skimmed off the top. At least 75 percent of the community action funds go for "administrative costs"—almost entirely in high salaries. "Community Action," according to the majority report, "employs" 95,000 persons and has cost \$1,800 million to date.<sup>1</sup>

This last is an appalling report in view of the fact that the current bill under consideration carries an authorization of \$1,022,000,000 for funding of the community action agencies alone, almost one-half of the total authorization for OEO in this legislation.

As a matter of record, in fiscal 1967 during the 1966 consideration of the OEO authorization, the number of OEO employees was reported as 6,484.<sup>2</sup>

The Job Corps, for which funds would be authorized under title I of the bill, a title for which the authorization is \$874,000,000, the second largest authorization category in the total authorization figure of \$2,060,000,000, supplies an al-

most endless record of waste, inefficiency, mismanagement, and bungling.

Total funds allocated to the Job Corps during the first 3 years of operation reached a total of \$715 million:

Fiscal year 1965.....	\$196,000,000
Fiscal year 1966.....	308,000,000
Fiscal year 1967.....	211,000,000

For this expenditure, costs per Job Corps enrollee have been estimated as high as \$15,000, and even OEO figures have placed the price of keeping an enrollee in the Job Corps at a cost of \$9,000 a year.

But this does not reflect a true picture of the program cost as it does not allow for the overall dropout rate that even the OEO has estimated at nearly 26 percent.

A Job Corps at Camp Breckinridge, Ky., under a \$9-million grant for a maximum of 2,000 young people, produced, as of June 1966, 250 dropouts and eight "graduates." In November of 1965 the enrollees of this project outnumbered the staff by only the narrow margin of 358 to 350.<sup>3</sup>

It has also been stated that at another camp, Fort Custer, of the 1,400 who entered during the camp's first year, only 315 could actually be called graduates, and as a result, "the cost-per-graduate for the boys of Fort Custer was \$28,254."<sup>4</sup>

The following is a table of annual cost per enrollee of the Job Corps for fiscal year 1967:<sup>5</sup>

Category	Total	Men's urban center	Women's urban center	Conservation center, Federal
Total.....	\$8,076	\$8,664	\$9,735	\$7,315
Enrollee expense.....	2,761	2,617	2,619	2,931
Pay and allowances.....	1,188	1,220	1,150	1,177
Travel.....	324	267	248	396
Clothing.....	276	226	203	331
Subsistence.....	435	323	394	540
Medical and dental supplies and services.....	256	195	342	296
Educational supplies.....	80	92	156	57
Vocational supplies.....	156	309	95	31
Recreation and welfare.....	105	113	75	103
Less receipts.....	-59	-128	-44	.....
Operation and maintenance.....	1,129	1,350	2,078	782
Center administration, supplies and services.....	346	426	490	252
Center facilities and maintenance.....	178	193	273	149
Utilities and fuel.....	129	129	120	130
Communications.....	77	76	115	71
Motor vehicle operation and maintenance.....	110	46	30	180
Other general purpose equipment.....	12	24	17	.....
Legal and accounting services and insurance.....	14	25	42	.....
Lease costs.....	25	.....	311	.....
Contractor's fees.....	118	221	298	.....
Contractor's expenses.....	120	210	382	.....
Center staff expense.....	2,983	3,494	3,835	2,399
Educational personnel.....	452	408	675	454
Vocational personnel.....	269	487	317	70
Safety and recreational personnel.....	137	211	264	52
Guidance and counseling.....	698	740	843	638
Management and other personnel.....	997	1,420	1,445	554
Medical and dental personnel.....	104	151	200	48
Work project personnel.....	242	.....	.....	494
Staff travel.....	72	55	87	84
Staff training.....	12	22	4	5
Total, overhead.....	603	603	603	603
Total, capital costs.....	600	600	600	600

At the same time Federal funds are being spent at the rate shown by these figures for Job Corps enrollees, the dropout rate continues extremely high. In fiscal 1967, more than 40 percent of

enrollees terminated in less than 3 months and another 24 percent terminated in less than 6 months, for a total of 67 percent of the enrollees.

<sup>3</sup> STROM THURMOND Reports to the people, May 23, 1966.

<sup>4</sup> Reader's Digest, February 1967.

<sup>5</sup> Examination of the War on Poverty, Staff Consultant Report, vol. I, September 1967, p. 10.

<sup>1</sup> House Rept. No. 866, 90th Cong., 1st sess., p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> House Rept. No. 1568, 89th Cong., 2d sess., p. 123.



On August 10, 1967, the Wall Street Journal carried this comment on Job Corps dropouts:

Critics see this high dropout rate as another indication that the corps is a costly flop, and there are those who charge that the dropouts may be worse off than before as a result of their brief stints in corps camps.

Mismanagement, lack of discipline, and gross expenditures are consistently cited in Job Corps center evaluations.

According to a recent General Accounting Office report on the Camp Parks Center, Pleasanton, Calif., the GAO investigation disclosed that after 2 years of operations the estimated cost of the center had increased from \$12.8 million to \$25.5 million, the dropout rate was 55 percent, and many were placed in jobs not related to their training.<sup>6</sup>

The GAO report established that from the start of the Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton on April 26, 1966, through September 1966, a total of 2,258 or 55 percent of enrollees had left the center without completing any courses of training.<sup>7</sup>

In reviewing the disciplinary problems as the Camp Parks Center, the GAO report includes incident reports showing the following incidents for the period October 31, 1966, to January 15, 1967:<sup>8</sup>

Type	No. of incidents
Burglary	62
Robbery	36
Alcoholism	35
Assault	75
Battery	47
Possession of weapon	8
Arson	2
Malicious mischief	19
Absenteeism	77
Disturbing the peace	18
Insubordination	106
Narcotics	22
Sex	6
Other	154
Total	667

The GAO report also reviews the record of one corpsman, and in commenting points out that a corpsman staying at the center more than 90 days, would be paid, in addition to basic pay, a readjustment allowance based on the length of his stay. This readjustment allowance could range from \$75 to \$150 for 90 days up to \$600 to \$1,200 for 2 years, depending on whether he sent an allotment home. The corpsman in question spent 323 days at the center, rarely attended class, except to create disturbances; eventually departed, after completing no training; and accumulated a readjustment allowance of about \$239.<sup>9</sup>

And the General Accounting Office report only relates to one Job Corps center.

Another report on the Job Corps comments:

While the Job Corps spent some public funds on activities which some would consider "frills" most cases were due to inexperience or errors of judgment on the part of some center personnel. Providing enrollees with occasional bus transportation to attend a dance several hundred miles from their center may be classified in this category. There was also room to question some of the continuing practices, such as the payment of corpsmen's transportation costs for home visits during the Christmas season. The Armed Forces are not as generous with their enlisted men.<sup>10</sup>

A major criticism of the Job Corps program has been the gross lack of planning, direction, and coordination. No proper provision was made for program evaluation, placement of graduates in jobs, or followup studies. An evaluation system has finally been placed in operation by the Job Corps. However, as noted in the summary of findings in a report published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, this has come after "more than \$486,000,000 has been spent on 60,000 enrollees who have already left the Job Corps and who, for the purposes of evaluation, are lost."<sup>11</sup>

The charges and reports of near riots, crime, and violence including the use of narcotics, involving Job Corps enrollees have been widely covered in the press, and these conditions resulting from lack of effective discipline and mismanagement in camps have contributed to the dropout rate as former corpsmen have, upon returning home, blamed conditions and fear of violence for their dropout action.

In a summation of the Job Corps value in a staff consultant report, it is stated:

Regrettably, it must be inferred that no conclusive case has yet been established to justify the Job Corps on the basis of past performance. The issue is not whether participants require aid. Their high unemployment rate, low wages and deficient education offer ample evidence that Job Corps enrollees need help. However, alternative, less costly, programs are available. There is a need therefore for more convincing data to prove that the expensive Job Corps program is justified.<sup>12</sup>

While the Job Corps has by far received the most searching attention and investigative review, the record of mismanagement and excessive costs is apparent in other phases of OEO activities.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps was intended to establish an out-of-school program to enable high school dropouts to return to school or to provide them with meaningful vocational training on which to build a career. Following an amendment to the OEO Act last year to permit private employers to participate in NYC, during the 1967 House hearings it was determined that only four projects involving private employers had been approved, which included a mere 164 enrollees out of 25,000 total enrollment.

It was also brought out that only 30 percent of out-of-school enrollees were receiving remedial or vocational education training. Thus, 70 percent of out-of-school NYC enrollees, at \$2,930 apiece, are still in "make-work" jobs and receiving no remedial education or vocational training.

The record of the community action program has also been characterized by community disruption and misdirection, irresponsible handling of funds, and even political activity.

A newspaper also carried the following item:

The General Accounting Office said . . . it has found fairly extensive evidence that Federal anti-poverty funds were used in efforts to unionize farm workers in Florida last year. It suggested that the Office of Economic Opportunity recover the funds from Community Action Fund, Inc., and the American Friends Service Committees, which administer two migrant projects financed by OEO. The GAO report said CAF officials met last June with AFL-CIO officials and discussed CAF's role in efforts to organize farm workers. It also said the wife of CAF president Thomas Hardeman was an AFL-CIO employee under her maiden name. The GAO said it appeared certain that employees of both CAF and AFSC engaged in political and union activities and received Federal funds as reimbursement for travel expenses.<sup>13</sup>

Added to all other expenses of OEO programs, with the unbelievable waste of tax dollars, a budget of \$2.4 million is utilized for public relations which is extensively used to meet criticisms of the program with little regard to facts.

I have made no attempt to cite all the seemingly endless recorded instances of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the many agencies of OEO. They are far too numerous. But it is clear even from these few amazing examples of flagrant disregard for economy and efficiency in OEO administration at all levels that extensive curtailing of expenditures for nonessential and useless items is necessary, and that safeguards must be provided to assure that a program to help the poor and decrease poverty accomplishes just that.

The tragedy in this whole situation is that dollars which were authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States and collected as hard-earned tax dollars from the American taxpayer have been squandered and wasted by an indifferent administration, and have not contributed to the improvement of the poor, the underprivileged, and the disadvantaged which could have been accomplished by intelligent, dedicated, and efficient administration of the programs.

A war on poverty may be important, and the need urgent, but money expended under such a program must accomplish the primary and most vital objective—it must eliminate poverty and constructively aid the poor. It must produce meaningful and effective programs of rehabilitation and training for the underprivileged and disadvantaged which will help them to help themselves—increase their employability, ele-

<sup>6</sup> Review of Selected Program Activities at the Parks Job Corps Center by the Comptroller General of the United States—November 1967.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Review of Selected Program Activities at the Parks Job Corps Center by the Comptroller General of the United States—November 1967.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Examination of the War on Poverty, Staff Consultant Reports, vol. I, September, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> Youth and the War on Poverty—prepared for: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

<sup>12</sup> Examination of the War on Poverty, Staff Consultant Reports, vol. I, September, p. 22.

<sup>13</sup> Washington Post, May 30, 1967.



vate their wage levels, and raise them above poverty.

In my judgment, personal responsibility and greater private and local activity are more important than Federal dollars toward this end, and Federal direction has proved a costly failure. To the extent that the Federal establishment remains involved in a poverty program, however, better administration is not only desirable. It is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, a rising chorus of protest from many individuals and organizations is reaching me from home over proposed reductions in the war against poverty.

Rarely have I received so much mail from so many concerned individuals. The remarkable thing about the mail is that it reflects such a broad cross section of community groups.

Both Buffalo daily papers, the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier-Express, are profoundly concerned over the proposed cuts. The Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Merchants Association as well as Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish organizations, labor unions—the list is a long one—all are protesting reductions in the program.

The people of Buffalo are particularly exercised over amendments which would require local sponsors of antipoverty programs to contribute 10 percent of the program cost in cash and tie community action programs to local political establishments.

Proud of the way the program has worked in Buffalo, the Buffalo Courier-Express in an editorial November 6 said:

The answer to the failure of the program elsewhere is not to kill but to improve it, to make it work by giving it the kind of leadership it has had here.

In a November 9 editorial entitled "A House Impoverished," the Buffalo Evening News charged:

The House of Representatives has allowed shoddy politics to overwhelm decent purpose in its shameless toying with the national anti-poverty legislation.

The News went on to say that while the national program can be improved, "it should not be dismembered or starved to death by a lack of funds."

For the 1964 anti-poverty legislation departed radically from traditional and often ineffective welfare-handout approaches. It involved the poor, stimulated them to help their own personal and collective causes.

At a meeting Sunday, November 5, in Buffalo, a wide range of organizations and individuals expressed their disapproval over cuts and changes in the anti-poverty program. A statement from Democratic Mayor Frank A. Sedita of Buffalo was read. Others opposing the bill during a 2-hour procession to the microphone included Republican Mayor Thaddeus Orzech of Lackawanna, Catholic Charities of Buffalo, Catholic churches, the United Jewish Federation, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Locals 1199, 593, and 537 of the United Steelworkers of America. Telegrams and statements were read from the Retail Merchants Association, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, United Auto

Workers of Western New York, and the Niagara Frontier Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Other organizations were represented or sent messages. The newly reelected Republican county executive earlier expressed his concern. And my mail has reached a veritable crescendo of protest.

We are proud that this program has worked so well in Buffalo and that it has such widespread support—bipartisan support which covers the whole spectrum of the community.

While the poverty areas on the Niagara frontier are located chiefly in the 41st Congressional District represented by our distinguished colleague, Mr. DULSKI, most of the officers of the organizations and groups I cited above reside in the relatively prosperous 39th District which I represent. I think this is an excellent sign and it shows that many, many segments of the Buffalo community support this great effort.

It would be catastrophic for us to cut this program back or enact the two amendments alluded to above.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in the past few days I have received many calls and organized pressure letters as well as a letter from the Office of Economic Opportunity and a letter from the Community Action Corp., of Sedalia, Mo., which serves four central Missouri counties. There are some statements in these last two letters which are a fitting subject for comment as the House considers the poverty bill.

George D. McCarthy, Assistant Director, OEO, for Congressional Relations, says in his letter dated November 3, 1967:

The War on Poverty has helped millions of people across the poverty line since it began. Millions who were tax-burdens are now taxpayers.

I see in this statement a prime example of the false axiom. Who are these millions of people? Where are the concrete figures to back up such a broad claim? Furthermore just what criteria does OEO use to define "help?" When my secretary arrives in the morning and opens the door to the office it most assuredly is a help to the other members of the office staff who do not have to bother to unlock the door. But it is not the kind of help that justifies the billions of dollars that are being spent. When OEO uses figures so haphazardly, it should be careful to draw a line between meaningful assistance, and the kind that contributes little if anything to any real improvement in economic status. Why, if so many persons have been "helped" has the unemployment rate stayed relatively steady, and in fact increased by two-tenths of 1 percent according to the most recent pronouncement? These are the answers that have not been forthcoming in spite of all the platitudes that emanate from the OEO "public relations mill."

Another letter received from the Missouri CAP, Sedalia, Mo., adds insult to the previously listed misinformation. It is a copy of a letter to Mr. Wayne Thomas, regional CAP administrator, signed by Hardy L. Cobb, director of the four-county central Missouri CAP, with copies to other members of the Missouri

congressional delegation. Members of the House will be interested in the following quotation from this letter:

A candid overview of this proposed amendment (referring to the requirement for a 10 to 20 percent in-kind contribution) would indicate that Congress is more concerned with appeasing and serving the middle class. The middle class represents the majority, which is the source of a congressman's votes. The congressman may think it is unnecessary and wasteful to consider the problems of the poor, when, in general, the poor do not vote, and thus do not constitute a threat to the congressman's well paying job."

I submit that is one of the most insolent and insulting remarks I have yet heard from a paid member of the poverty warrior establishment.

In his own job, paid for by the taxpayers, Mr. Cobb has obviously forgotten the basic concept of representative government. Under this concept, the majority rules. The middle class being the largest group and paying the most taxes, why should they not have the largest voice in the deliberation of legislation?

A lot of people in and out of Congress have been concerned with the problems of the poor, long before Mr. Cobb or the antipoverty program ever came into existence. In his obvious effort to stir up class warfare between the so-called middle class and the poor, Mr. Cobb forgets that the people who are asked to pay the bill, have every right to examine and justify what they are getting for their hard-earned tax dollars. Many of them see a threat that their tax load, the highest of any group, and inflation, are moving them faster into the poverty group than it is moving any members of the poverty group into the middle class.

Mr. Cobb suggests that Members of this body are here to fill a high-paying job rather than to serve their country as their conscience and judgment dictates. I am sure there are many of Mr. Cobb's constituents who look upon him as the holder of a high-paying job. We know from the number of supergrades in the poverty establishment that there are some mighty comfortable salaries available to the poverty warriors, who often fail to get our "message of relief" to the poverty stricken. I think if every Member of Congress had a copy of the Cobb letter there would be little doubt as to the outcome of the poverty bill on the House floor, and, under unanimous consent, I insert this record at this point in my remarks:

MID-MISSOURI  
COMMUNITY ACTION CORP.,  
Sedalia, Mo., November 3, 1967.

Mr. WAYNE THOMAS,  
Regional CAP Administrator, Community Action Program, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR Mr. THOMAS: Reference is made to proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act by the House Education and Labor Committee. These two amendments are relative to the (1) Local Share Requirement; (2) CAAs sponsored by public governing bodies.

Briefly and concisely, it is my considered opinion that if either or both of these proposed amendments become a part of the Act, local CAAs will cease to exist. The presumed demise of CAAs would be especially true pertaining to the local share requirement being in cash.

As you realize, more than a few CAAs experience some difficulty in obtaining a ten



to twenty per cent in-kind contribution. With particular reference to this agency which is still under the ten per centum requirement: Our Level of Approved programming is \$91,000. Ten per cent of \$91,000 is \$9,100. Obtaining \$4,500 in cash would be simply impossible. Thus, approximately 24,000 low-income persons in the four counties of Benton, Johnson, Morgan, and Pettis would have lost representation.

I think what Congress is failing to comprehend, either through ignorance or anger, is that communities and counties are poor, just as the individual residents are poor. If this be the case, this agency and many others like it cannot expect poor counties and poor people to be able to help themselves if they initially have to raise several thousand dollars in order to "help themselves." It is idealistic to promise the constituency a car in every garage; but first the person has to have the garage.

You are cognizant of the fact that OEO has faced an overall fifteen per cent decrease in budget. Not only will this affect our operation in trying to provide education and training programs for the poor, it will require the termination of several persons who have been providing these services. If, in order to meet our budget, we find it necessary to terminate several employees, a moral decision needs to be made. The alternatives are these:

(1) We terminate several low-income persons who have not as yet received sufficient training, work experience, job direction, and earnings (such persons are quite plentiful in the labor market).

(2) We terminate professional staff who provide work experience, job direction, supervision, and training to their subordinates (these professional persons are not plentiful in the labor market).

Thus, in order to maintain our present operation, we would need approximately \$104,000 per twelve months year, rather than \$91,000.

With reference to CAAs being controlled by public governing bodies and not private non-profit agencies, it would seem that we would become puppets of partisan politicians. Thus, the poor would again lose any representation they may have had. If city and county agencies have not functioned properly for the poor in the past, I fail to see why they would immediately begin serving the poor upon receipt of Federal monies.

A candid overview of this proposed amendment would indicate that Congress is more concerned with appeasing and serving the middle class. The middle class represents the majority, which is the source of a congressman's votes. The congressman may think it unnecessary and wasteful to consider the problems of the poor when, in general, the poor do not vote, and thus do not constitute a threat to the congressman's well paying job.

The above is respectfully submitted for your information and consideration.

Very truly yours,

HARDY L. COBB, *Director.*

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, there appears today in the New York Times a full-page statement entitled, "Women Support the War on Poverty." I urge my colleagues to read—and heed—its message:

We call upon the Congress to give the Office of Economic Opportunity renewed and strengthened authority to get on with the job. It has earned this vote of confidence. It must be given the tools to make even greater progress.

Mr. Chairman, the women who endorsed this appeal to the Congress are an exceptionally outstanding group. They include representatives of different political parties and a variety of organizations—civic, educational, religious.

Each of them would be part of anyone's list of the truly leading women in America today. And they are united in the belief that we, in this House of Representatives, must act with wisdom and dispatch to renew our commitment in the war on poverty.

We cannot be deaf, Mr. Chairman, to the eloquent and factual assertion by these women that:

American women have responded to the challenge of OEO and the War on Poverty in greater numbers than any other national effort except in time of war. This humane war against poverty has moved us, has changed us, has inspired us.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to respond to the mounting appeal of this sort from around the country? Every major newspaper in the Nation has editorially explored this body to approve a strong antipoverty bill and to continue the OEO as the command post in the war on poverty. We have had similar appeals from mayors and Governors of both parties. We have the record of the House Committee on Education and Labor whose tens of dozens of witnesses made a virtually unanimous record of endorsement for OEO and its work. And we have the example of the Senate, where Members of both parties got together to approve good antipoverty legislation.

I hope we can move rapidly to renew our commitment to the poor, and I salute the women whose New York Times statement has reminded this Congress of the productive partnership which has evolved between war on poverty programs and the women of America.

With unanimous consent, I include at this point the New York Times page to which I have referred:

#### WOMEN SUPPORT THE WAR ON POVERTY

The Congress is now determining the direction—perhaps the very fate—of the War on Poverty. We call upon the Congress to give the Office of Economic Opportunity renewed and strengthened authority to get on with the job. It has earned this vote of confidence. It must be given the tools to make even greater progress.

American women have responded to the challenge of OEO and the War on Poverty in greater numbers than any other national effort except in time of war. This humane war against poverty has moved us, has changed us, has inspired us.

Take WICS, for example. Thousands of women have given their time and their heart to Women In Community Service, formed by four national women's organizations, in order to help seek out disadvantaged girls in the 16 to 21 age group who need the "Human Renewal" Program of the Women's Job Corps. Thousands of these girls have now been recruited, trained, motivated, placed and started on the road of self-sufficiency. Some are working as secretaries or airline hostesses or computer operators. Some are serving in the Armed Forces of their country. And many are now at home, better equipped to raise the families they are starting.

Take Head Start, for another. Hundreds of thousands of women have already had the excitement of participation as volunteers in this program for pre-school children from poor families. This program has already reached about 1½ million children and many of their parents.

And much more, too. Women have given opportunities for service in Consumer Education Programs, Legal Services, Health Centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and others.

OEO has made this service possible. It has been the articulate champion of the poor. And it has given the poor a voice and a role in their escape from poverty. It has encouraged communities and social agencies and private industry to give new opportunities to the disadvantaged. America needs the War on Poverty. The War on Poverty needs OEO.

Carlyn E. Agger, Attorney at Law; Lauren Bacall, Mrs. Herman Badillo, Mrs. Harry Belafonte, Mrs. Bruce Benson, Second Vice President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Mrs. Leonard Bernstein, Dorothy Dulles Bourne (Mrs. James R.).

Sarah Caldwell, Artistic Director, American National Opera Company; Mrs. Scott Carpenter, Carol Channing, Julia Childs, Mrs. Robert Claytor, President, YWCA of the USA; Sister Corita.

Marian Ruth Crown (Mrs. Alfred), Helen Frankenthaler, Eleanor Clark French, Mrs. Fred R. Harris, President, Oklahoma for Indian Opportunity; Dorothy I. Height, President, National Council of Negro Women, Inc.; Lillian Hellman.

Mrs. Sidney Hillman, Mrs. Hal Holbrook, Ruth Grigg Horting, Executive Council of the Lutheran Church; Mrs. Jacob K. Javits, Mrs. Marcus Kilch, Past President, Women in Community Service, Inc.; Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, President-Elect, National Education Association.

Mrs. Burton Lane, Mrs. Mary K. Lasker, Mrs. Robert S. McNamara, Mrs. Robert J. Mangum, Mrs. John A. McCone, Phyllis McGinley, Dina Merrill.

Senator Maurine Neuberger, Chairman, Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women; Mrs. Harold Prince, Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, Director, Pacific Science Center Foundation; Muriel Resnik, Mrs. Louis J. Robbins, President, National Council of Women of the U.S.

Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller, Mrs. A. M. G. Russell, Chairman, California State Commission on the Aging; Mrs. John D. Shields, President, National Council of Catholic Women; Cornelia Otis Skinner, Marie Therese Squerclati, Maureen Stapleton.

Mrs. Stanley Madeline Steingut, Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Geraldine Stutz, President Henri Bendel's; Mrs. Marietta Tree, Mrs. D'Jaris Watson.

Mary Wells, President, Wells, Rich, Greene, Inc.; Mrs. Eric Wentworth, Founder, Plymouth Heritage Trust, Mrs. Joseph E. Wilder, Mrs. Joseph Willen, Past President, National Council of Jewish Women; Joanne Woodward, Mrs. Sherry Lafolette Zabriskie.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, during the 90th Congress we debated some of the most frustrating and difficult problems in the history of the Nation—the Vietnam conflict, riots in our cities, and the huge budget deficit to mention just a few.

Yet despite these problems, we must continue to work to effect those changes so essential to the continued progressive development of our Nation—with its 200 million population. One such change is the war on poverty.

It should not be particularly surprising that poverty exists, or that a country otherwise prosperous, counts the very poor among its citizens. One out of every five Americans is nearly as bad off as if he and his family lived in one of the backward or underdeveloped countries. One out of every five Americans lives in a family unit where the average annual income is less than \$3,000, where—on less than \$250 per month—families must pay for food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and all other family needs.



Thus, there was little doubt in 1964 when the Economic Opportunity Act became law that there was an urgent need for a war on poverty; there is less of a doubt now. That is why passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 is so important. By this legislation, we can demonstrate that we can wage a war on poverty—and succeed.

What is most unusual is that poverty exists in America—the richest nation in the world. It should be alleviated and eventually brought under control.

In many sections of our country, individual projects authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, have made an impact on the community by affording economic opportunities to individuals who previously had no such opportunity or chance to participate in job training or education program. The excellent results of EOC's nonpartisan and bipartisan program to combat poverty and eliminate unemployment, not only deserve widespread attention, but also our united and bipartisan support in the House. At a time when Members of the 90th Congress are concerned about reducing nonessential expenditures, I urge my colleagues to exclude from the category of nonessential expenditures those programs designed to meet human needs in the fields of health, education, and the war on poverty. These programs enacted by the 90th Congress must be re-examined, improved, and the good ones extended.

Some Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee have proposed broad changes in the antipoverty program, including the shift to other existing Government agencies of many programs currently administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I will not support such a move which would have the effect of weakening the war on poverty.

This year I voted to cut the NASA and public works appropriation for development of a supersonic transport. Now I am engaged in efforts to defeat the proposed 10-percent tax surcharge unless and until we place a tax on loophole income and reach those who avoid their contribution to the Nation's obligations through various tax loopholes. Notwithstanding the fact that I have differed with the administration on these issues, I consider the war on poverty an essential domestic program.

I also wish to express my continued concern over the decline in the number of business loans approved by the Small Business Administration last year. While New York State and Nassau County loans dropped to an alarming low, there was also a marked nationwide downward trend.

I have been a consistent supporter of efforts to strengthen the SBA, and I have opposed efforts to transfer SBA as an independent agency to the Commerce Department. In order to pinpoint the reasons for the decline in SBA loans and to assure that this trend will be reversed, I have called for a full-scale inquiry by the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 contain a number of pro-

visions in title IV which would place functions normally handled by the SBA under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce.

Under section 406 of the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to provide technical and management training assistance to private and public organizations to assist individuals or enterprises eligible for small business economic opportunity loans. The Small Business Administration has done a fine job in carrying out its authority in the area of poverty loans to small businesses and the SBA should continue to expand its activity in this area.

The SBA has a major role to play in eliminating slums in our cities across this Nation and that objective can best be served by expanding the existing authority and expertise of SBA, rather than requiring a joint program and overlap of responsibilities with the Commerce Department.

The SBA's strength stems from its independence as an agency which speaks for the 5 million small businessmen of America. The Congress has already made clear its opposition to efforts to transfer the SBA to the Commerce Department. That congressional opposition cannot be diminished by indirect steps to accomplish the same objective.

Since Congress rejected the reorganization proposal concerning the SBA, the agency has found some rough sledding with the Bureau of the Budget and its business loan program has declined sharply. A priority system on business loans has been imposed which discriminates against the small businessman who cannot obtain bank financing and who cannot assure the SBA that he will hire additional employees from the ranks of the unemployed.

For that reason I have proposed the elimination of the SBA priority system. For the same reason it is important to separate the regular business loan program of SBA from its responsibilities in the area of economic opportunity loans.

There is a job to be done—we must help the disadvantaged lift themselves out of the ghettos of America. This is a job of human renewal. There is a job to be done in stimulating small business activity and free enterprise in our low-income areas and pockets of poverty. But there is also a mandate from Congress to the SBA to help the average small businessman who cannot get bank financing—whether he falls within the poverty definitions of the law or is a middle-class businessman in need of assistance.

The provisions of section 406 of the economic opportunity amendments would merely cloud the issue by placing the Commerce Department in charge of certain responsibilities which should be handled by SBA.

I urge my colleagues to support an amendment which would substitute SBA for the Commerce Department in section 406.

In addition, I urge my colleagues to review the activities of the SBA in their congressional districts and in their regions to determine whether additional steps can be taken to strengthen this

agency. I will introduce legislation early in the second session of the 90th Congress to eliminate the priority loan system and to require a more equitable distribution of SBA loans among the 50 States.

These changes in the present loan regulations and allocation procedures of SBA would strengthen the SBA as an independent voice for the small businessman. Other steps should also be considered and I hope that a dialog on this subject in the next session of Congress will produce the desired results.

One of OEO's antipoverty programs is Project Headstart. This program has already supplied more than 1.5 million preschool children from poor families with a stimulating educational and cultural experience and, in addition, provided them with medical, dental, and nutritional care. One might hear occasionally that Headstart represents an unnecessary giveaway, a frill for the children of the poor; to that I say, recall the saying that "as the twig is bent, so grows the tree"—and reflect on the fact that in every group of Headstart children 90 percent will never have had a medical examination, some will be found to have active tuberculosis, 4 percent will be discovered to be partially blind, 15 percent will reveal some sort of eye difficulties, 10 percent will turn out to be partially deaf, and 50 percent will have no record of tetanus or diphtheria immunizations.

OEO programs have stimulated local initiative in the war on poverty—Job Corps, VISTA volunteers, Project Upward Bound, and others.

The House Education and Labor Committee has recommended \$2,060,000,000 for the antipoverty program. I urge my colleagues to resist efforts to reduce this minimum support for an essential program.

Mr. Chairman, last week I was privileged to transmit to my colleagues a message from representatives of agencies and organizations with millions of members in all sections of the country. I want to read the message at this point in the debate on this important legislation:

#### A MESSAGE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

As representatives of agencies and organizations with millions of members in all sections of the country, we call upon the House of Representatives to reject any efforts to cripple the anti-poverty program by cutting the authorization below \$2.06 billion annually or by accepting disabling amendments or substitutions.

The debate now going on in the House of Representatives must not result in abandonment or emasculation of the anti-poverty program.

By enacting the Economic Opportunity Act, our government and the American people gave its citizen poor a solid basis for hope and opportunity. Today we stand at the crossroads of our moral commitment to eliminate poverty from our society. Our nation has the resources. We call upon Congress to keep faith with its past commitments.

Failure to move forward vigorously will bring disenchantment and despair to the poor and will lead to further agitation and social unrest.

With this appeal we pledge our continuing support to an aggressive national effort to achieve full opportunity and social justice for all our people.



The above statement was adopted by the following national agencies and organizations November 9, 1967 at a meeting in the Hotel America, Washington, D.C.

Interreligious Committee Against Poverty; League of Women Voters; United Church Women; National Council of Catholic Women; National Association for Community Development; American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations; Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty; Industrial Union Division-AFL-CIO.

The message I have just read is the combined voice of the representatives of the three great religious faiths in America—the League of Women Voters—and the AFL-CIO. It is a united cry for justice on behalf of the poor and appeal for full opportunity and social justice for all people.

The Members of Congress should not be found wanting in answering this appeal to conscience. The cry for justice in behalf of the poor, the underprivileged, the undereducated, the socially deprived must not go unanswered.

Mr. Chairman, the only way to end the war on poverty is to end poverty itself. If the future of the antipoverty effort is to be assured; if the war on poverty is to continue to be waged until the ultimate victory pledged by the Congress in 1964, then Congress must reaffirm its original commitment this year by rejecting a variety of proposals aimed at calling for a retreat from the battlefield.

#### AN APPEAL FROM A HEADSTART MOTHER

Mr. Chairman, the attempts to cut-back on the war on poverty funds has sounded an alarm and struck fear in the hearts of those who are deeply committed and directly involved in the effort to strike at the causes of poverty at the grassroots level.

In Nassau County, N.Y., more than 34,000 persons have participated in some aspect of the war on poverty. There are thousands who have volunteered their services and are committed to every attempt to help the disadvantaged help themselves and to reduce our welfare rolls by devoting our resources to making taxpayers out of tax-eaters.

I recently received a letter from the mother of twin boys—4 years old—who participate in the full-day Headstart center program at Long Beach, N.Y. I know that the views and the cry for justice expressed in this letter from Mrs. Joan Grohosky will shed some light on the debate in the House of Representatives this week on the proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967.

So that my colleagues in the House may also hear the cry for justice—to help eliminate poverty in our midst—I am placing the text of Mrs. Grohosky's letter in the RECORD at this point:

LONG BEACH, N.Y.,

November 11, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: I'm writing this letter on behalf of the parents of the more than three hundred children enrolled

in the ten full day Headstart Centers program in Nassau County, New York. We want to beg you to do your best to see that our Centers aren't closed. Congress is trying to cut back 25% of the money we need to keep going. If Congress does this they will be cutting children—not just a program. They will be killing the hope that has grown in the hearts of countless thousands of families that have been helped by Nassau's Anti-Poverty programs.

I have twin boy's 4 yrs old in the full day. Headstart Center program in the City of Long Beach in Nassau County. Since my boys have been in the program, I've seen them grow, and get a real Headstart on life and I've been able to get a job and build a better life for them. Please don't let Congress kill our hopes. Don't put us back where we were.

At a rally yesterday 600 Nassau parents and children lit vigil candles. These candles will burn in our Anti-Poverty and Head Start Centers until Congress grants us the money needed to keep our hope alive; please help us keep this light of hope burning. It is better to light one candle than curse the darkness.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOAN GROHOSKY.

Mr. Chairman, the Nassau County Economic Opportunity Commission has published a progress report covering its operations during the period October 1, 1966, to May 31, 1967. The significant theme of the progress report is the growing participation in the local war on poverty programs by people committed to the goal of helping the disadvantaged help themselves.

I place in the RECORD at this point, the text of the progress report so that my colleagues may review the scope and seriousness of purpose of our local efforts to win the war on poverty:

#### PROGRESS REPORT

(Economic Opportunity Commission, Nassau County, October 1, 1966, to May 31, 1967)

In Nassau County, over thirty-four thousand persons have participated in one or more activities under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the period October 1966 to May 1967. This number includes an approximation of the number of persons involved in the more indirect activities such as serving on: the Economic Opportunity Commission, Community Councils, Executive Boards or special committees or sub-committees. It also includes an estimation of persons who have participated in special lectures, seminars or workshops run or sponsored by "anti-poverty" organizations or their staff members. While it is difficult to quantify the exact number of persons involved in the areas just mentioned, cognizance of their contributions must be taken into consideration.

The thirty-four thousand plus includes two types of direct service. The first consisting of Countywide services such as the Small Business Development Center (SBDC), Students Together and the Law Services Committee. The second general type of direct service includes the programs operated by the Neighborhood Service Centers.

Countywide services rendered include 704 persons who availed themselves of services provided by the SBDC. These services included aid in obtaining loans and the dissemination of other pertinent business information. Students Together has provided

tutorial services for 259 students. In addition, the Law Services Committee has provided legal service in civil cases for 1331 clients. This case count includes consumer, administrative, housing, family and miscellaneous cases.

During the period October 1966 to May 1967, the number of operative Neighborhood Centers increased from five to ten. All of these agencies provided varying types and degrees of services to the target area population in their respective communities. In spite of the fact that these services varied, they can be broadly divided into Enrollment, Full Year Head Start and Direct Services.

Enrollment services include tutorial programs and CAA operated skills programs. These services had 668 participants during the period. Volunteers from the communities have provided another type of service to the communities. To the end of May, 308 volunteers have been involved in enrollment programs.

Full year Head Start has enrolled one hundred and eight-nine children in operative centers. Again, a large number of neighborhood residents have been used as volunteers in the implementation of these programs. The ongoing Full Year Head Start programs have involved 226 volunteers in their operation.

Direct services to the participant population include such things as employment, housing, family work services, etc. In the area of employment, 2847 people have participated, 2673 have been counselled and 1187 job placements have been accomplished. Consistent with their function of cooperating with other agencies, the employment programs have made 1508 referrals to other agencies for training and employment purposes. The housing programs exhibit the same general type breakdown: 1252 participants, 1093 participants counselled, 311 referrals to other agencies and 287 placements. Family service constitutes another large area of direct service. The nature of family service does not necessarily lend itself to placements. However, these programs have provided service for 4611 participants of which 2085 have been counselled and 2043 have been referred for service outside of the CAA's.

In order to present a more comprehensive picture of the overall function of the CAA, one additional category of service must be included. This is the area of Neighborhood Organization. While it is difficult to enumerate the total number of participants involved, it should be noted that the CAA's have initiated or revitalized 52 neighborhood organizations. The goals of these programs vary widely but they bear the common trait of either the sponsorship or the support of a CAA. Based on a statistical approximation of the number of participants involved, the number is slightly in excess of 7600 people.

Mr. Chairman, in Nassau County—one of the richest counties in the United States—there are pockets of poverty where the disadvantaged need assistance and encouragement. There are more than 1,450,000 persons residing in the county of Nassau, and the war on poverty has provided less than \$1 per person to attack this problem.

The following chart indicates the comparative budgets of neighborhood service centers for the program year, August 1, 1967, to July 31, 1968, under the community action program:



NASSAU COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM—COMPARATIVE BUDGETS OF NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE CENTERS FOR PROGRAM YEAR AUG. 1, 1967, THROUGH JULY 31, 1968

	Personnel	Consultant contract service	Travel	Space costs and rentals	Consumable supplies	Rental, lease- purchase of equipment	Other costs	Total cost	Non-Federal share	Federal request
Nassau County.....	\$216,933	\$2,000	\$4,310	\$6,000	\$5,120	\$1,140	\$7,730	\$243,233	-----	\$243,233
Five Towns.....	172,999	4,450	3,400	10,500	3,200	( <sup>1</sup> )	8,450	202,999	\$27,500	167,474
Freeport.....	81,407	( <sup>1</sup> )	2,160	3,447	1,635	219	5,404	94,272	16,498	77,774
Glen Cove.....	98,414	17,280	1,561	13,950	2,869	578	4,332	138,984	31,808	107,176
	232,928	1,500	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	34,428	5,546	28,882
Hempstead.....	91,077	1,500	1,080	2,400	920	( <sup>1</sup> )	2,700	99,677	13,120	86,557
Long Beach.....	162,678	15,320	3,240	14,000	4,440	1,440	10,095	211,213	36,930	174,283
Manhasset-Great Neck.....	81,871	640	1,632	19,168	2,245	5,789	4,890	116,235	23,677	92,558
	247,513	3,920	450	( <sup>1</sup> )	500	( <sup>1</sup> )	1,400	53,783	3,520	50,293
Port Washington.....	46,251	11,430	606	7,600	1,255	300	2,190	69,632	10,630	57,447
Roosevelt.....	73,218	850	1,080	4,200	1,395	( <sup>1</sup> )	3,720	84,463	3,000	81,453
Rockville Centre.....	125,684	600	4,460	8,477	2,395	260	4,720	146,596	38,447	108,195
Westbury.....	103,226	9,046	1,200	11,024	2,229	90	3,660	130,475	25,416	105,059
Total.....	1,334,199	68,536	25,179	100,766	28,203	9,816	59,291	1,625,990	236,092	1,380,364

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

<sup>2</sup> Figures for family assistance or referral units.

Mr. Chairman, the efforts of some to cut the poverty program under the guise of economy must be defeated if we are to continue to wage and win the war on poverty. Many of these same individuals support without blinking an eye, such programs as spending \$5 billion on space, some parts of which can be deferred; a supersonic transport program, which will cost our Government \$4 billion plus and which should be postponed at least until we know the answers to the sonic boom problem; a public works appropriation bill of \$4.5 billion or more, a great deal of which could wait until the war in Vietnam is over and the manpower shortage in skilled labor is at an end. Once again I say that we need a reassessment of our priorities, and upon such a review we should place the war on poverty high on the list.

I urge my colleagues to resist those efforts and to support the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago, I spoke in opposition to the Goodell amendment which would critically cut back the antipoverty program which is so essential to my community.

Yesterday, Mayor-elect Carl B. Stokes, of the city of Cleveland, stated that cuts in the Federal antipoverty program would be "a major menace to the future of Cleveland and the Nation." He stated that the cutback would be a "body blow to our efforts to help human beings rise above the poverty level in Cleveland and throughout the Nation."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, in an editorial on Sunday, November 12, 1967, urged that the "United States should not surrender in the war against poverty."

Following is a copy of the news story which appeared in the masthead in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 12. Also following is a Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial of that same date:

#### STOKES FIGHTS FOR POVERTY AID

Carl B. Stokes does not become Cleveland mayor until tomorrow but already he has gone to bat for the poor as he promised to do in the recent election.

He joined the battle yesterday to save the federal antipoverty bill, which is in trouble in the House.

He called a contemplated cut in the program a major menace to the future of Cleveland and the nation and pointed out that Cleveland would lose \$5 million a year in

poverty aid. This would be a severe blow to the poor.

Stokes urged congressmen to retain a vigorous war on poverty. Thousands of Cleveland voters, including many who preferred his opponent in the mayor's race, would join him in this plea.

Some congressmen are playing political ping-pong with the poor.

The effort to dig down to the roots of poverty and to wipe it out is a national effort. The White House, the Congress and the people committed themselves to that effort just two years ago.

This Office of Economic Opportunity experiment is barely lifting off the pad. This is no time to abort the test flight.

And yet Republican congressmen like William H. Ayres of Akron want to slash it down to half size by cutting its funds to \$1.2 billion a year.

And Democrats like Edith Green of Oregon want to harness its community action programs and put the reins in the hands of local elected officials. They want to forbid antipoverty workers to put on voter registration drives (though they are supposed to inspire the nonparticipating poor to become active citizens).

One reason why there is a federal war on poverty is because local elected governments have not solved poverty.

"Welfarism," the standard brand of dole punctuated by spasmodic checkups to "scrape chiselers off the relief rolls," obviously has not rehabilitated the hard core poor.

That is exactly why community action programs should not be put under the thumb of local politicians, who might well stifle or even squash them.

Some congressmen also want to require that local governments put up 20% of the cost of any community action program, half in cash. Any mayor or commissioner who wants to kill an action program in a poor neighborhood can twist the handle on the money spigot and dry it up.

Then the poor would be forced—as they were in the past—to wait out that elected official's term and find some candidate to run against him, in order to revive their dead program.

All this is folly. If congressmen want to kill the OEO, they should move to kill it straightforwardly. They should not cripple it by inches.

But not even the critics dare to say the U.S. should surrender in the war against poverty and go crawling away defeated.

If they have a better battle plan, let them go out and prove it is better. If not, the statesmanlike thing to do is to improve the present experiment and to keep it rolling forward.

#### STOKES RIPS CUT IN AID TO POOR

Mayor-elect Carl B. Stokes yesterday warned that cuts in the federal antipoverty

program would be "a major menace to the future of Cleveland and the nation."

Stokes was referring to a threatened \$1.2 billion cut in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) appropriation which will be taken up by the House tomorrow. A House amendment would slash the \$2.06-billion appropriation already approved by the Senate.

Stokes, who issued his statement in Miami Beach, Fla., said he had been informed by Sargent Shriver, director of OEO, that such a reduction might cost Cleveland as much as \$5 million in antipoverty funds next year.

Stokes, who is on a brief vacation before taking office tomorrow, said he was speaking out "because of the seriousness of the emergency and nature of the situation."

Stokes pointed out that OEO allocations to Cleveland for fiscal year 1967 totaled more than \$10.5 million; over the last three years they have totaled nearly \$26 million.

If Congress slashes the appropriation, antipoverty funds for Ohio probably would be reduced from \$63.5 million to \$32.6 million, Stokes said.

"This would be a body blow to our efforts to help human beings rise above poverty level in Cleveland and throughout the nation," Stokes said.

"I appeal to all members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to place people above politics and vote for the full appropriation requested by President Johnson."

"It is far cheaper and wiser in the long run to help people on the poverty level to become self-sufficient members of the community than to ignore them and permit misery and hopelessness to fester into critical proportions that might menace our entire social and economic structure," he said.

Stokes said that many commentators had hailed his election as an indication that "new hope" had been kindled among the poor in American cities.

"However," he continued, "Sen. Edward Brooke, Massachusetts Republican, has said that the hungry, the unemployed, and those living in deplorable conditions will take little hope from election victories such as mine if the antipoverty program is scuttled."

The Mayor-elect claimed bipartisan support for his viewpoint.

"In Ohio, for example, the Republican mayors of Akron, Canton, Dayton and Toledo have joined the Democratic mayors of our state in demanding that Congress continue and expand all the present antipoverty programs," he said.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B of such title and amended to read as follows:



"PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH  
AND ADULTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the section be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to protect my right to offer an amendment. I have a substitute to offer to part B, and as I understand this part B will be considered as having been read.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is correct. Let me ask the gentleman if there are any more amendments to the Job Corps from the minority?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky that we have already passed the Job Corps. We are now on section 102 of the bill which ends on page 168.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

A MILITARY OFFICER SPEAKS OUT  
ON VIETNAM

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I issued a call for veterans of the Vietnam conflict to advise me of their availability to attend a meeting where all might express their views on America's involvement in the war and all its implications.

After attending briefings by the President, State Department, and by high-ranking officers and civilians of the Defense Department, I am convinced that there will remain a vital information gap until we hear from local officers and men who served in the Vietnam campaign

and are now free to discuss their experiences and their ideas.

I have received a letter from a serviceman who is not privileged to make public his own feelings about the hostilities that are taking such a heavy toll of our fighting forces, but who felt an obligation to report to his Representative in Congress on changes of policy that could, in his view, lead to a savings in both American lives and American money. Since the missive contains no security violation, I include the full text to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—except that his name and billet are omitted for obvious reasons.

My correspondent is convinced that the U.S. military effort should be continued in Vietnam, but objects to the restraint imposed upon our fighting forces to the advantage of the enemy. It will be important to obtain the opinions of those who preceded this young hero on the battlefield and have had an opportunity to follow the conduct of the war from a stateside vantage point after completing their military service.

All Members of Congress will appreciate the recommendations for reducing waste that are contained in the letter from the dedicated soldier who has taken time to write in the interest of his country. I trust that immediate action to remedy the situation will be forthcoming.

No doubt, others who have served in Vietnam have ideas on how the cost of the campaign can be reduced, and Congress should welcome all such suggestions. Perhaps the meeting of Vietnam veterans who reside in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District will also be helpful in this respect.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 18, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: I would like to give you some idea of the feeling at the "grassroot level" or, I should say, "rice-root level." I am now serving with \_\_\_\_\_, U.S. Army, Republic of Viet Nam. The feeling in my unit and among the vast majority of officers and enlisted personnel that I have spoken to, outside of my unit, is that we should be in Viet Nam; we should help these people; and we should win this war! But we should not fight with one hand tied behind our back.

It is felt we should bomb anything and everything of military importance in North Viet Nam. Second, that whatever tactics that are necessary to win should be employed. This includes going into the DMZ and using non-lethal gas.

There is one area which disgusts many Americans and is worth Congressional investigation. That is the waste going on in the use of material and the misuse of funds. To give you one example, there is \$10 million of mess equipment sitting in the depot which cannot be used because it is the wrong cycle. Plus there is more on the way (about 17 million). It seems to me that these contracts could be canceled by giving the producer his profit for the contract and stopping production (this would only work for cost plus fixed fee and cost plus percentage contracts).

Another example of waste is the disposal of unusable items such as: lumber, broken equipment and other raw materials. These things are buried in the ground and amount to 10 to 20 thousand dollars a day. The salvage rights could be contracted which would be advantageous for three reasons. First, its sale would save the taxpayers money. Second, it would put badly needed items into

the Viet Nam economy (such as lumber). And last, when the Vietnamese purchase from the U.S. it takes money out of their economy, cuts down their inflation and in a small way helps our gold flow.

If you decide to look into either of these matters I would appreciate my name not being used until my service obligation is completed.

So in conclusion, I feel, as many others here do, that we should finish what we started, but it should be done efficiently and effectively.

Sincerely,

SPACE COSTS ARE WORTH IT

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from a paper in defense of large investments in the American space program. It was presented last week by Princeton economics professor, Oskar Morganstern, at a meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics in Anaheim, Calif.:

Whether the goals are good, whether it is more important to explore space or the ocean or to clear slums is not an economic question. Perhaps the country can even afford all? So it is important to realize that annual space expenditure is but a fraction of one percent of G.N.P., only about four per cent of the Federal budget, only a quarter of the annual sales of General Motors, and that it costs less than two months of the war in Vietnam. Clearly, the country can afford a high degree of space exploration, even if the hopes of results are uncertain, as they must be. . . .

ECONOMIC IMPACT

First there is a conventional and needed manner of analyzing the economic impact of the space program. It consists in determining the expenditure streams of large amount of money, of analyzing their regional impact, the good and bad effects of concentration of high activity in a few highly specialized industries, of estimating the multiplier effects of money added to some regions or income groups, etc. Such analysis gives valuable information, but does not touch on many crucial matters. It could illuminate the fact, of course, that spending \$5-billion on space has a very different and technologically a far more stimulating influence on the economy than spending the same amount on slum clearance.

In the first case, entirely new skills have to be created, new materials must be found, new devices are to be invented and developed, which radiate through many other industries, while in the second case these effects are minimal. The same \$5-billion left in the pockets of the taxpayer—i.e., scattered among millions of people—would also be spread through private consumption and savings, but in our country they would only slowly and indirectly lead to innovations as decisive as those which are due, and will be further due, to highly integrated programs. It would at first mean mostly the making of more of the same things we already have in plenty; the space program on the other hand, working under the pressure of the constraints of a highly hostile environment, is forced to produce entirely new things, many of which, we hope, will be beneficial to mankind.

At this point I want to mention . . . important economic features of the space program. The investment already made is



such that it cannot easily be turned off. A space program without continuity would be an absurdity. The time span, e.g., the duration of preparatory work, even the time needed to evaluate the observations, is so great that a commitment for decades was made when the program was first started, where we like it or not. . . .

When we ask what the economic effects of space exploration are, we must first look at the output so far obtained. Thus far, no basic discoveries as great in importance as atomic fission have been made. Nothing, comparable to the transistor or the laser could be attributed to space exploration. . . .

#### NEW PRODUCTS

It is a well-known phenomenon of the last 25 years that most of our important companies find that the majority of their currently offered products did not exist 25 or even 10 years ago. Their profits stem mostly from the new products. So they push research and development as far as their means will allow. The Government, constantly prodded by the scientific community, also begins to believe that research is needed for the purpose of the general well-being of the community. It is then difficult to see why these expectations should not also apply to space exploration, especially when one remembers that some of the most vital discoveries ever made by man derive precisely from watching the stars and planets. Now that we are able to break through the obscuring shield of the earth's atmosphere how could we but expect that discoveries will not be made of a magnitude that will astonish even this generation which has seen so much and is prepared to expect that our knowledge will increase without limit.

#### PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 780

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 780.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 916)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies, expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles, provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions, authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Air Quality Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857-1857i), is hereby amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE I—AIR POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL

##### "FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

"SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary

lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this title are—

"(1) to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

##### "COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress. It is the intent of Congress that no agreement or compact entered into between States after the date of enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, which relates to the control and abatement of air pollution in an air quality control region, shall provide for participation by a State which is not included (in whole or in part) in such air quality control region.

##### "RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investiga-

tions, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution;

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities;

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution in cooperation with any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located;

"(4) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of air pollution to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and proposals and to avoid duplication of research.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in subsection (a) (1) of this section;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological effects of varying air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof; and

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to construct such facilities and staff and equip them as he determines to be necessary to carry out his functions under this Act.

"(e) If, in the judgment of the Secretary, an air pollution problem of substantial significance may result from discharge or discharges into the atmosphere, he may call a conference concerning this potential air pollution problem to be held in or near one or



employment records; schools have IQ scores and reports of emotional difficulties; employment files have personality inventories and hospital records; and business and marketing communities are constantly taking surveys.

Apparently in an effort to consolidate all government statistics, the Federal Government has been considering for several years the creation of a National Data Center combining information from all government sources. While our subcommittee has been told that this is not presently recommended by the Census Bureau, the fear of the creation of the center has led to headlines such as, "Computer Feared as Monster Snooper," or "Don't Tell It to the Computer," "The Naked Society," and "The Punchcard Snooper." The Harvard Business Review says that it is precisely this "getting together" of knowledge, not computerization per se that is the danger to our basic beliefs in an individual's right to privacy.

As the tentmaker, Omar Khayyam, stated 900 years ago:

The moving finger writes; and having writ,  
moves on:

Nor all thy piety nor wit shall lure it back  
to cancel half a line,

Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it.

Last month I advised my constituents that I was contemplating introducing this bill and requested their views. The response has been unanimous in endorsing the idea of limiting the broad prospectus of the Census Bureau. One constituent writes:

Entirely too much information of value  
only to market research organizations is being  
included in the census questionnaire at  
the taxpayers' expense.

Another states:

I do hope our privacy will not be invaded  
any more than it is.

Still another one says:

Infringement on the private life of individuals  
could go on and on like the proverbial  
Topsy.

And another recommends, that "this  
type of foolishness be stopped in its  
tracks."

Our citizens are also concerned about  
the rising cost of Government. In this  
connection, Dr. Ross Echler, Director of  
the Census, stated that—

As the number of questions is reduced,  
the cost will be reduced.

The cost of the 1960 census was \$182 million. As further stated in the report of our subcommittee, the Census Bureau says that it has "called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee that we might believe it is justifiable to submit a request for another \$20 to \$25 million for work on or above what would be included in this \$182 million."

Another consideration in evaluating the merits of a longer census form, is the possible inaccuracy of the survey due to a lengthy questionnaire. We are told that over 5 million people were uncouneted in the 1960 census because they avoided the enumerator. The monstrosity of over 20 pages proposed for the 1970 census will certainly overwhelm and antagonize many of our citizens just as the 1960 census did, thereby voiding the original

purpose of obtaining a very accurate and simple count.

The Congress has an obligation to ward off this threat of diminishing freedom. The Constitution, while establishing a census in article I, section 2, clause 3, goes on to protect the individual against undue invasion particularly in amendment 4. Mr. Justice Brandeis has written:

Every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment.

Charles A. Reich, professor of constitutional law at Yale University, says:

I believe that the real protection in this world comes not from people's good intentions but from laws.

The only answer to this problem of safeguarding our right to privacy is to be found in law. Optional answering of questions, in my opinion, will not suffice, for if some citizens participated in the census and others did not, it would be a statistical nightmare and might cost more than the original proposal with useless results.

Passage of this bill, however, will limit the number of questions and give us a true census at a lower cost without any undue invasion of privacy. It will be in accord with our Constitution and tradition, upholding the rights of the people. It is for these reasons that I urge early consideration by the committee and the ultimate adoption of this bill by the Congress.

#### ARBITRARY ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE FCC

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have again been receiving correspondence from individuals who are disturbed and rightly so, with the arbitrary attitudes and actions of the FCC.

There has been a long history of the independent agencies of our Government acting as judge and jury in actions which fail to allow those judged against any real recourse. This usurpation of power by regulatory groups seems to me to often deny many individuals the basic freedoms provided for under our Constitution. Only recently, a radio station in my district was denied an appeal to increase its power output by the FCC which summarily dismissed the appeal with a terse, highhanded statement. Examples of attempts to deny commentators on the radio a freedom of speech which is allowed others are being pointed out at an alarmingly increasing rate.

The FCC would be well advised to remember that they are an appointed regulatory body, and they do not enjoy any divine right which permits them to pick and choose at the whim of men not responsive to the will of the people. It appears that the FCC feels that the power to license gives the power to destroy, and the power to regulate gives the power to capriciously and arbitrarily rule. Such

should never be the case, and I would hope that our colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who have the so-called fairness doctrine under review would take whatever action is necessary to place the activities of the FCC in its proper perspective. I see no reason to grant arbitrary authority to an extragovernmental agency without the retention of safeguards for the individual.

#### WOMEN SUPPORT THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, some very well-known and outstanding women in America, including many from my district, have addressed a message to each of us today. They have made a simple and sensible request. They have asked us to keep our promise to the poor of this country by enacting legislation which will keep the Office of Economic Opportunity as the vigorous leader in the war on poverty.

These women, a bipartisan group of concerned citizens, including the wife of my Senator, JACOB K. JAVITS, have stressed that the war on poverty has given American women an opportunity to be of service to the poor. They make this point, as follows:

OEO has made this service possible. It has been the articulate champion of the poor. And it has given the poor a voice and a role in their escape from poverty. It has encouraged communities and social agencies and private industry to give new opportunities to the disadvantaged. America needs the war on poverty. The war on poverty needs OEO.

Mr. Speaker, all that stands between hope and disappointment for the poor is legislative action by this body. And I might add that all that stands between public confidence and public dismay over this body is how we deal with the pending antipoverty legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the statement as it appeared in the New York Times today, and I thank the women who made it possible for the timeliness and appropriateness of their message.

The statement, and the list of signers, follow:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 13, 1967]

#### WOMEN SUPPORT THE WAR ON POVERTY

The Congress is now determining the direction—perhaps the very fate—of the War on Poverty. We call upon the Congress to give the Office of Economic Opportunity renewed and strengthened authority to get on with the job. It has earned this vote of confidence. It must be given the tools to make even greater progress.

American women have responded to the challenge of OEO and the War on Poverty in greater numbers than any other national effort except in time of war. This humane war against poverty has moved us, has changed us, has inspired us.

Take WICS, for example. Thousands of women have given their time and their heart to Women In Community Service, formed by four national women's organizations, in order



to help seek out disadvantaged girls in the 16 to 21 age group who need the "Human Renewal" Program of the Women's Job Corps. Thousands of these girls have now been recruited, trained, motivated, placed and started on the road of self-sufficiency. Some are working as secretaries or airline hostesses or computer operators. Some are serving in the Armed Forces of their country. And many are now at home, better equipped to raise the families they are starting.

Take Head Start, for another. Hundreds of thousands of women have already had the excitement of participation as volunteers in this program for pre-school children from poor families. This program has already reached about 1½ million children and many of their parents.

And much more, too. Women have been given opportunities for service in Consumer Education Programs, Legal Services, Health Centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and others.

OEO has made this service possible. It has been the articulate champion of the poor. And it has given the poor a voice and a role in their escape from poverty. It has encouraged communities and social agencies and private industry to give new opportunities to the disadvantaged. America needs the War on Poverty. The War on Poverty needs OEO.

Carlyn E. Agger, Attorney at Law.  
Lauren Bacall.  
Mrs. Herman Badillo.  
Mrs. Harry Belafonte.  
Mrs. Bruce Benson, Second Vice President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.  
Mrs. Leonard Bernstein.  
Dorothy Dulles Bourne (Mrs. James R.)  
Sarah Caldwell, Artistic Director, American National Opera Company.  
Mrs. Scott Carpenter.  
Carol Channing.  
Julia Childs.  
Mrs. Robert Claytor, President, YWCA of the USA.  
Sister Corita.  
Marian Ruth Crown (Mr. Alfred).  
Helen Frankenthaler.  
Eleanor Clark French.  
Mrs. Fred R. Harris, President, Oklahoma for Indian Opportunity.  
Dorothy I. Height, President, National Council of Negro Women, Inc.  
Lillian Hellman.  
Mr. Sidney Hillman.  
Mrs. Hal Holbrook.  
Ruth Grigg Horting, Executive Council of the Lutheran Church.  
Mrs. Jacob K. Javits.  
Mrs. Marcus Kilch, Past President, Women in Community Service, Inc.  
Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.  
Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, President-Elect, National Education Association.  
Mrs. Burton Lane.  
Mrs. Mary K. Lasker.  
Mrs. Robert S. McNamara.  
Mrs. Robert J. Mangum.  
Mrs. John A. McCone.  
Phyllis McGinley.  
Dina Merrill.  
Senator Maurine Neuberger, Chairman, Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women.  
Mrs. Harold Prince.  
Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, Director, Pacific Science Center Foundation.  
Muriel Resnik.  
Mrs. Louis J. Robbins, President, National Council of Women of the U.S.  
Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller.  
Mrs. A. M. G. Russell, Chairman, California State Commission on the Aging.  
Mrs. John D. Shields, President, National Council of Catholic Women.  
Cornelia Otis Skinner.  
Marie Therese Squerciati.  
Maureen Stapleton.

Mrs. Stanley Madeline Steingut.  
Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.  
Gerald Stutz, President, Henri Bendel's.  
Mrs. Marietta Tree.  
Mrs. D'Jaris Watson.  
Mary Wells, President, Wells, Rich, Greene, Inc.  
Mrs. Eric Wentworth, Founder, Plymouth Heritage Trust.  
Mrs. Joseph R. Wilder.  
Mrs. Joseph Willen, Past President, National Council of Jewish Women.  
Joanne Woodward.  
Mrs. Sherry Lafolette Zabriskie.

### THE SOVIET QUEST FOR PEACE

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor today carried the first of a series of 14 articles entitled "What Is the Soviet Up To?" The sub-heading stated:

The Soviet Union's ploy in the Mediterranean is aimed not only at the Arab world. It involves oil logistics, naval strategy, the future of CENTO and NATO, the phasing out of British and French bases, a Soviet desire for its own bases, and a desire to push the Americans out.

For those who are still interested in building bridges to the Soviet Union and the other Communist-bloc nations, I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT IS THE SOVIET UP TO?—SOVIET LEAP-FROGGING IN MEDITERRANEAN

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

(NOTE.—The Soviet Union's ploy in the Mediterranean is aimed not only at the Arab world. It involves oil logistics, naval strategy, the future of CENTO and NATO, the phasing out of British and French bases, a Soviet desire for its own bases, and a desire to push the Americans out.)

(First of a series of 14 articles by Monitor correspondents John K. Cooley and Bertram B. Johansson appearing twice weekly.)

JERUSALEM.—"One thing as becoming clearer and clearer to us," the Israeli intelligence officer was saying.

"We are convinced that the Soviet Union is out to gain the ascendancy and establish its influence over the entire Middle East.

"We have had plenty of evidence of this in the past six months, both during the six-day war in June and before and after the war."

The statement was reminiscent of another that had been made to me by a high "NATO person" in London. He said:

"The Middle East is the most serious long-range problem the West faces today, and for two reasons.

"Not only is the Soviet Union making rapid advancements in space [witness the Soviet space-bomb tests just announced by United States Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara]. But, more immediately, and while we divert our gaze into space, the U.S.S.R. is advancing swiftly in the area of seapower, as exemplified by the fleet it is maintaining now in the Mediterranean.

"The Soviet Union is already the second largest sea power in the world. It has some 400 submarines, some of them with missile capability. Six to 10 of these are in the Mediterranean today. The U.S.S.R. is aiming to become the first and largest seapower in the world."

(The United States has 105 submarines—excluding Polaris vessels—of which 32 are nuclear-powered attack submarines, according to the Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

(The United States Navy has in addition, according to ISS figures, commissioned 41 nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarines, each of which carries 16 Polaris missiles. Of the 41, 13 are equipped with the A-2 missile, 1,500 mile range, and the remainder with the A-3, 2,500 mile range. It has been decided to start production of the Poseidon missile, which will have nearly twice the payload of the A-3 missile and will eventually replace all the Polaris missiles.)

The Israeli intelligence officer swung around toward me in his swivel chair, and paused a moment. Outside the window, in the warm sunlit Jerusalem air, a turtledove cooed wistfully, almost urgently, it seemed.

### DECEPTIVE ATMOSPHERE

In the distance, over in Old Jerusalem, where Arabs and Israelis mingled with at least superficial friendliness, loudspeakers chanted melodious electronic prayers from a Moslem mosque. Bells rang from a Roman Catholic enclave. And at the Wailing Wall, the last remaining wall of the destroyed temple of the Jews, Israelis and Jews from all over the world were intoning their sad and glad prayers.

In this casual, quite peaceful, but easily deceptive, atmosphere, where at any moment a terrorist bomb might pop off, the Israeli intelligence officer had been telling us how in June the Israelis had found timber saws in the Soviet tanks abandoned in the Sinai.

What were the saws for?

For cutting nonexistent forests in the barren Sinai desert.

The Israelis found, too, that captured Egyptian officers had been equipped with Geiger and radiation counters.

What for?

For nuclear warfare that was supposed to be waged by the Israelis, no doubt.

But, how deep had the fantasy extended, I asked. Had the Soviets convinced the Egyptians that the Israelis would use atomic bombs? (I reminded myself as I asked the question that Israeli soldiers fighting the Jordanians in the Jerusalem area had been equipped with antigas pills and injection capsules. They were quite aware that the Egyptians had used gas in the Yemen, as the Red Cross has confirmed.)

The intelligence officer answered:

"We don't know how far the Soviet-U.A.R. fantasy or the confidence in their massive-scale weapons had gone. We do know that none of the Soviet tanks had been adapted for desert warfare. Egyptians literally baked in their tanks because of lack of ventilation in the hot desert sun. The tanks were built for north European terrain, not for the Sinai."

(In Istanbul, a Turkish source told me that in the last days of May, just before the June 5-10 war began, so many Soviet tanks were being shipped through the Bosphorus from the Black Sea one could see them clearly on the decks of the Soviet ships. Battleships were even being disguised as supply ships to go through the straits. There seemed to be undue haste in the Soviet shipments, he commented.)

The Israeli officer continued:

Apparently the Soviet Union had had no time to make adjustments on their tanks for desert warfare. Sometimes the tanks stopped dead on their tracks for no apparent reason. He explained that the reason was Sinai desert dust which is extremely adhesive. Thin films of the sticky desert dust had accumulated on some of the tank electronic equipment. Egyptian personnel, the Israelis say, unable to find the trouble, would bail out, and hightail for cover.



Israelis would then come along, find the abandoned tank, still half full of petrol. Israeli mechanics and electrical experts would case the tank. In minutes, sometimes, they would find that the only trouble was that some of the sticky desert dust had coated the small electronic part and shorted electrical circuits. All the Israelis had to do was to wipe off the electronic connection, and the tanks would start up.

As a result of this and thousands of examples of undertraining of Egyptian soldiers, according to the Israeli intelligence officer, the Soviet Union today is insisting on inserting Soviet officers and technicians more deeply into the Egyptian Army. It is insisting on more effective Soviet teaching presence in the reorganization of the Egyptian Army. This is confirmed by both Cairo and Israeli sources. The Egyptians are objecting, but they appear to have little choice. Their dependence, militarily, on the Soviet Union, is quite complete, ironically reinforced by defeat.

The Cairo correspondent of the respected French newspaper *Le Figaro* writes that there are now well over 1,000 Soviet officers in Egypt, headed by four Soviet generals, virtually directing the rebuilding of the Army.

During June and July more than 250 flights of giant Antonov transport planes brought into Egypt some 150 aircraft and between 200 to 250 tanks. In August, the Russians resumed supply by sea, and sent an additional 100 tanks, more aircraft and large quantities of artillery and ammunition, according to David Kimche of the Jerusalem Post, who is close to Israeli intelligence sources.

#### CONFERENCE RECALLED

"You ask me what the Soviet Union is up to in the Middle East?" the Israeli intelligence officer queried.

He suggested that one might think back 12 years to 1955. It was the year of the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian neutral and "third force" countries. The Soviet Union, not considered either African or Asian, had not even been invited to Bandung. Communist China and the Asian neutrals were in the ascendancy.

"At that time," the officer continued, "Russia wasn't even a power in the Middle East. Russia was nothing. Not even its Communist parties had much force here."

Then Soviet arms were offered to Egypt, and accepted on Sept. 27, 1955. A Czech trade deal was consummated with Egypt.

That was the outward beginning of the Soviet push in the Middle East. This was two years before the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I into space on Oct. 9, 1957, well ahead of the United States. It preceded the Soviet Union's outward explorations in foreign policy. These forays in foreign policy proliferated in the Middle East and Asia after the euphoria of the Sputnik space triumph encouraged the Soviet Union to become less isolationist.

"If one checks out what Russia has achieved in 12 short years," an Israeli Foreign Ministry spokesman said, "I think we can say it has achieved a great deal in the extension of its power in the Middle East."

"Twelve years ago Russia was nonexistent in the Mideast. Today, the Soviet Union is accepted as a Middle East power. In fact, the United States finds it must discuss Middle East questions with the Soviet Union at the United Nations. This was not the case 12 years ago."

"This is a tremendous achievement in 12 years."

#### THE CONSENSUS

Here, then, is a consensus of what military analysts, economists, political observers, and intelligence sources in the Middle East and on the Soviet periphery believe the Soviet Union is up to in the Middle East:

With the British presence largely nullified in the Middle East, and its incipient withdrawal from Aden, the Soviet Union is in-

terested in greatly diminishing American influence. At the moment, there is considerably more anti-Americanism prevalent in the Arab world than before the June war.

It is out to gain ascendancy, influence, authority, and control in deep penetration of the Middle East from Morocco to Saudi Arabia.

The Soviet Union is interested in "softening up" Turkey and Iran, border countries on the Soviet underbelly. They have had a long history of antipathy with Russia. Soviet industrial projects and oil explorations already are under way in both countries. A \$110 million Soviet-Iran military aid agreement is already being implemented.

It is out to destroy CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) in which Great Britain, Pakistan, Iran, and Turkey have membership. The United States, though not a full member, contributes finances and a large share of military and economic assistance. Soviet propaganda belays CENTO mercilessly. The West currently is deemphasizing the military nature of CENTO and is increasing its economic function.

The Soviet Union is able to use the Middle East as a constant area of harassment of the United States as pressure on the Vietnam problem.

The Soviet Union is constantly harassing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There are frequent predictions of NATO's demise. But, surprisingly, with the departure of France from NATO's integrated military system, something happened that no one had predicted.

According to Harlan Cleveland, United States Ambassador to NATO, "with France standing aside, the 14 remaining countries set up a NATO strategy council of their own; and the renewed political interest in NATO unity had a sudden and galvanizing effect on the quality of the NATO defense system."

#### NATO WEAPONS

Mr. Cleveland adds that the Soviets "are bound to be in a quandary as to what we would do with the 7,000 nuclear weapons we have placed in Europe for NATO use in case of trouble. These weapons are indeed an important reason why the Soviets in recent years have acted as if they believed military militancy would not pay off in Europe—though they are not yet quite convinced of that principle elsewhere in the world."

What makes the Soviet role in the Mideast crisis especially "intriguing" in NATO, Mr. Cleveland says, "is the patent effort of the Soviets to use the regional turbulence to build up their military presence in the Mediterranean area."

He notes also that the Soviet Union is already the world's second greatest sea power, with the largest submarine fleet the world has ever known. Yet, up to 1963, Soviet subs and other warships were infrequently sighted in the Mediterranean. Then, four years ago, Mr. Cleveland says, the Soviets decided to build their Mediterranean presence, which NATO naval officers have taken to calling the "Soviet Sixth Fleet." Between 1963 and 1966 the Soviet Mediterranean forces increased tenfold.

#### COVER PROVIDED

Then, this year's crisis provided the cover for a further buildup, Mr. Cleveland notes. By July a total of 46 Soviet ships (figures now go as high as 50 to 55 ships) were operating in the Mediterranean, including some of the latest guided-missile cruisers and about 10 submarines together with numerous support ships.

The United States Navy estimates that Soviet operating days in the Mediterranean during the first six months of 1967 were 400 percent greater than the comparable figure of 1963.

And Soviet submarine operating days in the Mediterranean have increased by nearly 2,000 percent since 1963.

The Soviet ploy in the Mediterranean is seen by most naval authorities in the larger international context. Not only is the two-century-old Russian desire for warm water outlets an operative motivation. But the Soviet Union's flexing of its naval muscles in the Mediterranean is seen in terms of challenges to the cold-war balance of power, and in relation to the United States' consuming preoccupation with Vietnam.

#### IN A DIFFERENT WAY

The closing of the Suez Canal hurts the Soviet Union nearly as much as Britain, but in a different way. Britain suffers because of a cutoff of oil deliveries; the Soviet Union because its deliveries of war materiel to North Vietnam must go over longer sea and land routes. Thus, paradoxically, the Soviet Union could have almost as great an interest in opening the Suez Canal as the British might have, and Egypt.

On the question of oil in the Mideast, from which the West obtains some 40 percent of its petroleum supplies, the Soviet Union weaves an intricate and contradictory web of objectives.

While the Soviet Union is rich enough in oil itself, it appears to be interested in diverting or hampering supplies for the West. Since the closing of the Suez, the Soviet Union has begun to sell oil to Europe, to Spain of all countries, much as Cuba has sold sugar to Spain, though hardly being in ideological sympathy with Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

Admiral John S. McCain Jr., commander-in-chief of United States Naval Forces, Europe, otherwise known as the Sixth Fleet, sees the Soviet moves in the Mediterranean on an even higher strategic level.

He says, "Ivan has gone to sea in the interest of Soviet goals because the Soviets recognize fully the importance of the oceans to the achievement of Communist ambitions."

#### MERCHANT FLEET GROWS

"Soviet sea power is modern and it is growing. The Soviets have the second largest navy in the world. They have more than 20 cruisers, 160 destroyers, and 400 submarines." (In recent days, the Soviet Union has announced it is constructing an aircraft carrier, reversing its previous views of carrier vulnerability.)

He points out that the Soviet Union, unlike the United States, is almost self-sufficient in raw materials. Yet, "they have one of the most modern merchant fleets in the world, and it is rapidly growing. They have over 1,200 merchant ships today, and the signs are that they intend to more than double this fleet by 1970. In five years' time, they could have the world's largest and most modern merchant marine."

This is important, Admiral McCain points out, when one considers that in Korean War, 99 percent of all materiel and personnel going into Korea was delivered by ship. Ninety-eight percent of everything going into Vietnam is being delivered by ship. Soviet missiles went into Cuba by ship, and they were carried out again by ship, it is stressed.

One Soviet ship of particular interest, says Admiral McCain, is the Komar class guided-missile PT boat. This is the type which sank the Israeli destroyer *Elath*. Its Styx type missiles have such a low trajectory, well below 10,000 feet, that there is practically speaking no defense against them.

#### GRASP OF SEA POWER

This is why the Israelis were impressed with the deadly homing accuracy of the Styx missile. It introduced a new strategic element—that of short-, medium-, and long-range missiles with which the Israelis might someday have to contend.

Admiral McCain feels the West is being challenged by the Soviets not only in the naval aspects of the oceans, but across the entire spectrum of maritime activity—the



merchant marine, oceanography, commercial fishing, and shipbuilding.

Admiral McGain, who commands some 25,000 men in a naval area extending from the British Isles down through the Atlantic, through the Mediterranean, and into the Indian Ocean, feels the strategic importance of the sea is not properly understood in the West.

"It is my firm conviction," he says, "that the Soviet Union has grasped the principle of sea power rapidly, and that the Western world has been slow to learn many of its lessons."

Thus the Soviet flexing of its sea power muscles in the Mediterranean must be seen in the regional context as well as in the international range of strategy.

#### INFLUENCE EXTENDED

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is extending its influence in the Mideast on a country-by-country basis:

With 1,000 Soviet technicians training a 100,000-man army in Algier, and training petroleum field personnel for eventual or possible nationalization of Algerian oil fields.

With a mild flirtation with Jordan's King Hussein over possible military and economic aid.

With a restoration of all weaponry the Syrians lost in the June war.

With a restoration of most of the weapons (the estimates vary from 60 to 80 percent) lost by the Egyptians to Israel.

With negotiations in the Sudan for supplying Soviet MIGs and tanks.

The Israelis are watching the latter negotiations closely. Having learned that Algeria had begun to ferry MIGs to Egypt during the June war, it sees the Sudan as another potential ferrying point for Soviet equipment that might be used against Israel.

At the same time, the Soviet Union warily watches its big Asian neighbor and Communist rival, China. Both the Soviet Union and China, with large Moslem populations at home, try to appear as champions of more than 300 million Moslems in the outside world.

#### AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, we were again reminded of the importance of education for all Americans. American Education Week has been set aside for all of us to recall the great strides that have been made in our educational system, but it also serves to illuminate the critical needs that yet remain.

In school systems throughout the country, such as my own in Westchester, we have witnessed steady progress toward meeting the total educational needs of our children. We have seen curriculums broadened and enriched, facilities greatly expanded and the quality of teachers improved.

These strides have been made in an atmosphere supported by fair and equitable opportunity for academic achievement.

Yet, we should recognize that this progress must not overshadow the reality that many children have not benefited from these improvements. Some 366,850 children go to school on double shifts; only 84.6 percent of our youth between the ages of 5 and 17 are in school; 90,500

teachers are in our classrooms with sub-standard teacher certificates; 15 of our largest cities have pupil-teacher ratios averaging between 28 and 29.7 to 1; 84 percent of all elementary schools have no school librarians; and 70 percent of our elementary schools have no school libraries at all.

The children who have recently entered primary school must be afforded the opportunity to develop their talents and skills and, if qualified, to go on to a higher education, regardless of their financial means. Only if Congress and the American people catch the spirit of this week and concentrate the great store of energies and ideas at their disposal—including passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 and the higher education amendments—will all our sons and daughters meet the challenges of our changing society.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as I have said on this floor several times during debate on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, the sights of the American people are considerably higher than those of this House with regard to the level of funding and the nature of the programs that must be included in this legislation.

I think that this is clear from the articles, editorials, and columns that have appeared in the newspapers of this Nation during this last week alone. They give evidence of a high degree of commitment, of a deep concern, and of recognition of the unmet needs that we face. In reflecting the aspirations of those 30 million Americans still living in poverty, they are in the tradition of a public service that has long characterized the press of this country.

I believe that an article from the New York Post on VISTA and seven editorials and columns from newspapers throughout the country commenting on the urgent needs of the antipoverty program in general will be of interest to the Members of the House, and I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 7, 1967]

#### VISTA FIGHTS FOR ITS LIFE

(By Jack Robbins)

When the federal anti-poverty funds for VISTA run out . . .

A woman, 77, unable to care for herself, may lose her one friend.

One hundred teenagers who need jobs are going to lose their employment agency.

And the residents of single-room-occupancy hotels on the Upper West Side may lose what they prize most—companionship.

The elderly woman, the teenagers and the tenants have one friend in common—Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA). And this is one of Congress' economy targets.

The volunteers are paid \$210 a month for living expenses, \$50 per month is deposited for them for each month of service, payable at the end of their one year term.

Yesterday each of New York's 200 workers, and 3,800 more across the country received a letter beginning "VISTA has another difficult task to ask of you."

The task is to continue working among the nation's poor in spite of the fact that VISTA's appropriated funds ran out Oct. 24, that Congress seems unlikely to vote further funds, that, as of now, no money is available to continue paying their subsistence salaries.

How long can the volunteers carry on without getting another paycheck?

"Until tomorrow," one said. Others, with help from their families, think they can hold out for about a month.

"But the real problem is the people," one of the volunteers says. "We spent months gaining their trust, building programs, now it will all be yanked from under them."

Charlene Todd, a Vista worker on the Upper West Side, has already placed about 200 teenagers in part time jobs, given a few more months she could find something for most of the remaining 100. Another volunteer is making some progress in getting Frances into a nursing home.

Coffee hours are being operated for the aged and infirm residents of the SRO hotels, people who might otherwise pass weeks without seeing another human being.

None of these programs have enough momentum to continue without the prodding of the volunteers, Vista workers say.

Congress is expected to vote on measures which will mean life or death to Vista and several other anti-poverty programs tomorrow.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 4, 1967]

#### A PROMISE TO THE POOR

When Congress established the antipoverty program three years ago, it assumed an obligation to the nation's poor that it cannot abandon. By launching a war on poverty, the world's richest nation made explicit its debt of honor to those of its citizens who are trapped by age, circumstance, ignorance, skin color, or historical misfortune.

Yet the House of Representatives is approaching the antipoverty authorization bill, which comes to the floor next week, in a casual and cavalier spirit. Almost every faction seems to feel that it can play politics at the expense of the poor.

The authorization bill only now reaching the floor should have been acted upon months ago. The current fiscal year is already more than four months old. When the program was started, it was widely recognized that to gain genuine effectiveness, the war on poverty would have to move at an accelerating pace. But many in Congress actually want to cut this year's antipoverty budget request in half.

The heart of the program is community action. The poor have formed their own agencies in more than a thousand cities and towns across the nation. Knowing the needs of their own neighborhoods, they have used Federal funds to provide neighborhood centers, day care centers, pre-kindergarten classes, family planning, health clinics, and numerous other programs.

Inevitably, some community action agencies have made serious mistakes. As in Syracuse, they have not always followed proper accounting practices or administrative procedures. But, looked at as a whole, community action has been a success.

The House Education and Labor Committee unwisely imposed a requirement that these privately-organized community action agencies be brought directly under the control of local public officials. The mayors have not been clamoring for this responsibility. Most of them would prefer that private agencies take the political onus for pioneering in various social innovations. The House Committee was also unwise in requiring that the agencies put up at least half of their share



of the funds in cash rather than services. In practice, this means that local tax funds will be necessary. How many Southern towns are going to appropriate tax funds for community action agencies that may do the bulk of their work for Negroes?

Despite these two unfortunate features, the bill as reported from committee deserves approval. What is essential is that the full amount be appropriated and the small progress made thus far not be frittered away by delays and cutbacks. The war on poverty has barely begun. A retreat now would be a fresh insult to those who have been victims and losers too often.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 6, 1967]

#### FATE OF WAR ON POVERTY UP TO HOUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The fate of the administration's war on poverty—to continue its vital job or to be shrunk to such puny size as to be meaningless—will soon be decided.

It will be decided by the House of Representatives. The Senate has voted strong and constructive anti-poverty legislation, but the outlook in the House is ominous.

The war on poverty is getting plenty of praise even from its critics in Congress, but praise won't finance it. Those who publicly praise the anti-poverty programs are proposing to impoverish them by inadequate funds and crippling amendments.

By the test of public support and expert judgment, Congress will be doing the nation a reckless and ill-timed disservice by suffocating the war on poverty. I believe that most congressmen who may be tempted to vote that way will be making a political mistake through misreading voter opinion.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders, comprising some wise and knowledgeable people, has concluded that city government most needs strengthening in order to deal effectively with civil disorder.

No federal enterprise is doing so much to help city government control and prevent violence as the anti-poverty programs.

This is the nearly unanimous testimony of mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges and civic leaders of cities which had riots and those which didn't. In many of the cities the police departments and community action agencies and joint programs to prevent riots and in eight cities the juvenile arrest rate went down with the help of the anti-poverty programs.

The mayors of the cities know most about how much the nation needs the war on poverty to help improve the lot of the very poor, both Negro and white, and thereby to remove them from the reach of those who seek to turn them to violence. The U.S. Conference of Mayors unanimously asks for expanded anti-poverty programs.

The Republican mayors of 22 cities with over 100,000 population urged the GOP leaders of Congress to "encourage members of Congress to support the Office of Economic Opportunity budget so that these dynamic and imaginative programs may be carried on in a successful manner." Most of the governors, Republican and Democratic, agree.

But the House is rife with suggestions to slash the OEO budget by as much as \$400,000,000 to \$800,000,000—a cruel mistake.

[From the New York Post, Nov. 7, 1967]

#### THE IMPOVERISHED POVERTY BUDGET

As more and more local projects expire from lack of continuation funds, the House is opening debate on a cut-rate budget of \$1,200,000,000 for the national poverty program. If it is not appreciably increased, the whole program will suffer financial and spiritual starvation.

In New York alone, this budget—proposed by the Education and Labor Com-

mittee—would require an overall program cutback of 40 percent. Both locally and nationally, there would be ruinous reductions in Head Start, Jom Corps, job training, health, VISTA, legal aid and migrant labor projects.

All of these programs have been functioning effectively, particularly in the riot prone big cities. They represent a large investment in money and hope. If the first is now withdrawn, the second will founder, perhaps permanently; the catastrophic results of that should be evident, even to those publicity-hungry Representatives and Senators who now pretend to be investigating the "causes" of urban rioting.

The poverty program cutbacks are being falsely represented by some legislators as economic necessities. More often than not, these are the same men who have been voting to restock the pork barrel this year.

Economy is not the issue; there is nothing on which the poor of this country can economize. We applaud Sargent Shriver for his blunt declaration that he will not preside over the program if it is finally mutilated by the Congressional irresponsibles. No deception is more vulgar than a plan designed to delude the impoverished into another cycle of false hope.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Twin City Sentinel, Nov. 7, 1967]

There is a controversy going on in Houston about the role of Federal anti-poverty workers in last summer's racial disturbances in that city. The Mayor believes that employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity aggravated the situation as part of its prejudiced investigation; the local OEO administrator maintains that his people did far more to prevent trouble than to cause it.

Senator John McClellan's Judiciary Subcommittee is studying the Houston situation as part of its prejudiced investigation of the nation's riots, and nothing would delight the Senator more than to find a solid cause and effect relationship between anti-poverty workers and race riots.

We do not know what Federal employees did in Houston last summer, but we do know how workers behaved in Winston-Salem last week—with distinction, responsibility and great good sense. Workers for the Experiment in Self-Reliance circulated in Negro neighborhoods Friday, informing, soothing and cautioning angry residents. They said the facts of the James Eller case can only be determined by the Grand Jury, and they warned the people that violence can only hurt the Negro cause and not help it.

These actions, undoubtedly, had a good effect, but Mark Freeman, Director of the Experiment, was right when he said that after dark, control was a "law enforcement problem and not one in which ESR could be of any useful assistance."

The experiment's real work is helping to create the conditions that will prevent riots, not stopping them, and thought it did not prevent this one, it may have kept the explosion from being bigger than it was.

A cranky and regressive Congress is holding off on its approval of anti-poverty funds, and the Experiment in Self-Reliance here is feeling the pinch. No extra projects are planned in the aftermath of the riot, because there is no money for them. This is more than unfortunate, it is tragic. The first patient ever treated with penicillin was a man with a raging infection. After the initial treatment, he made dramatic improvement, but later he had a relapse. There was no more penicillin in the world, and he died. Poverty is a kind of social infection, and it, too, can be treated and cured. But the medicines required are money, effort, and above all, patience and persistence."

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Nov. 7, 1967]

#### POVERTY FIGHT BECOMES WAR BETWEEN PARTIES

Both Republicans and Democrats in Congress have proposed alternatives to the current poverty war—changes designed, each side says, to "rescue" the effort from annihilation.

That is unfortunate, because both "solutions" are laden with partisan overtones that have nothing to do with delivering the poor from their chronic taste of indigency.

In the House, where the issue nearer decision, perhaps this week, there are all manner of proposals for revising the program. Primarily though, there are two principle concepts: the GOP would cut the cost of the program to \$1.4 billion annually (about a 40% slash) and transfer most of the projects for the OEO, which now administers them, to other Federal agencies such as Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor.

The Democrats would appropriate about \$2.06 billion, but would shift major responsibility for community action programs to state and local government agencies.

Both factions maintain that their motives are defensible, and perhaps in a sense they are. The trouble is that in the political clash that has developed, the poverty war may lose its momentum. Programs including Head Start and the Job Corps would undoubtedly be cut back; others for all effective purposes, would be eliminated.

Nobody claims that the poverty fight has been entirely successful; in several areas it has been marked by administrative waste and mismanagement. Clearly reforms are needed. But they ought to be reforms based on careful study and calm appraisal, not on political expediency.

To strangle the Poverty Program now, before all the results are charted, would be to deny American communities the best weapon that is currently available to combat disruptive social disorder and somewhat relieve the plight of impoverished millions. Such a move would be, as Roscoe Drummond maintains "a cruel mistake."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### VICTIMIZING THE POOR

The poor, it has been said, are always with us. There are a good many members of the House of Representatives who apparently think that the poor and their problems can be made to disappear by simply not looking at them.

They are intent on cutting the Federal anti-poverty program to less than \$1.4 billion instead of granting the \$2.06 billion asked by President Johnson, or the \$2.25 billion approved by the Senate.

House members who are keen to cripple the anti-poverty drive have put together dissatisfaction with various elements of the program, resentment caused by destructive rioting in a number of cities and desire to reduce Federal expenditures to form a coalition of strong opposition to any increase in the appropriation.

Meanwhile funds available to the Office of Economic Opportunity have been exhausted, projects such as Head Start have been suspended, many community action agencies are without money, Peace Corps volunteers and members of Neighborhood Youth Corps are off the payroll or threatened with loss of jobs and allowances. Sargent Shriver is so disgusted with what he calls a "gross deception" of the American people that he has threatened to quit as head of the OEO if the anti-poverty program is stripped of the funds needed to do the job.



There can be differences of opinion on how a war against poverty should be waged to obtain the best results; there can be more efficient handling of anti-poverty funds to make sure the poor receive the benefit of them; there can be plans set in motion to help the impoverished help themselves by job training and other means. But gutting the anti-poverty program by withholding funds essential to its operation is not helping anybody. It could end up being a waste of money. It certainly would not obliterate the poor, and their ever-present problems, no matter how fervently some Congressmen might wish it so.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### POOR STAND TO SUFFER IN HOUSE POVERTY FIGHT

(By Carl T. Rowan)

There is an old African proverb, "When two elephants fight it is the grass that suffers."

We now have an elephant and a donkey fighting in the House of Representatives, and the suffering grass turns out to be the poor people of America.

The Republicans have rightly seized upon a Democratic effort to put a billion dollars worth of Community Action Programs (CAP) under the control of local politicians.

"Where city hall is unsympathetic to the needs of the poor or to this program, the CAP is dead without the decency of a burial," the Republicans argue.

"Where city hall seizes upon CAP as an instrument for political power, it will become just that and nothing more," the Republicans add.

The country's 30 million poor people can take small comfort from these Republican words, however, because the GOP persists in trying to reduce the federal funds for a poverty program from the two billion plus that President Johnson requested to something less than \$1.4 billion.

The Republicans keep talking about generating "public and private funds well in excess of \$3 billion" and winding up with a bigger and better "crusade" against poverty.

The Republicans are just as wrong in trying to reduce the federal role in fighting poverty as they are right in trying to keep CAP out of the clutches of city hall.

I've been in reservation territory in the Dakotas where the local people wouldn't give the time of day to the impoverished Indians. And I've seen not the slightest reason to believe that "public and private" funds of any consequence will be made available for city ghetto programs in 1968.

If the Republicans are sure that public and private funds are available, why not let Congress still allocate \$2 billion? If other sources do come up with \$3 billion, then we'll have a poverty program approaching what these tragic times seem to require.

But what if the House, in its angry and irresponsible fiscal orgy, retains the worst proposals of both parties and the Senate (which has been remarkably responsible on the poverty issue) is forced to go along?

It would mean a 40 percent reduction in funds for Community Action Programs, with severe impact on Head Start, health centers, family planning centers and similar programs.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) says that at least 30,000 poor people who have recently received opportunities as teacher aides, recreation aides and the sort will be thrown out of jobs.

OEO also says that the Head Start follow-through programs scheduled to benefit 190,000 children at a cost of \$120 million, will be "completely eliminated."

OEO claim further that there will be no special programs in 295 communities next summer and that a million poor children who might otherwise have meaningful jobs or

recreational activities will wind up idle and on the streets. The cost of the consequences of all this may be greater than the worth of reelecting the whole House.

No one can examine the record without concluding that there has been some waste, some mismanagement, some nepotism in aspects of the poverty program. Maybe a bit more than exists in the House of Representatives, though that is debatable.

Yet, the current poverty program does represent an attempt to help the poor in a time when the effort is urgently needed. There may be reasons to revise some programs, but there is no sane justification for reducing the amount of money spent on these programs.

The near future may show, happily or unhappily, that \$2 billion a year to fight poverty is money this country cannot afford not to spend.

#### MARYLAND CIVIC LEADERS SUPPORT VISTA

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recuperating from a back ailment and is unable to be present today. However, Mr. MATHIAS is closely following the course of debate here on the floor and shares the deep concern of a number of us about the need to continue a fully funded war on poverty.

Mr. MATHIAS has received a telegram from a group of Maryland civic leaders with regard to their support of VISTA in this critical hour for that program. At his request, I am including in the RECORD at this point the remarks Mr. MATHIAS would have made concerning this action and the text of the telegram:

##### REMARKS OF MR. MATHIAS OF MARYLAND

I would like to call to your attention new, substantial evidence of the tremendous support for OEO programs among the business leaders of Maryland.

I have just received the following telegram:  
BALTIMORE, Md.,  
November 10, 1967.

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to advise that an informal committee of Baltimore business men have today guaranteed funds for the payment of approximately 96 VISTA workers in Baltimore. This assistance will be in the form of loans to the workers to be repaid by them when the OEO appropriations bill is approved by Congress. This step considered necessary to insure the continuance of an effective program being carried on in this city by dedicated VISTA workers. Urgently request you support congressional action to insure the adequate funding of and the continuation of this program at earliest possible date.

Mr. L. Mercer Smith, president of Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore and vice president of C. & P. Telephone Co. of Maryland; Mr. Robert H. Levy, chairman of the greater Baltimore committee and chairman of the board of the Hecht Co.; Mr. Austin E. Penn, chairman of the board of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.; Mr. Walter Sondheim, senior vice president and treasurer of Hochschild Kohn & Co.; Mr. Jerold C. Hoffberger, president, the National Brewing Co.; Mr. Irving Blum, president, Blums' Inc.

I would like to congratulate all of the members of this ad hoc committee for their

initiative in taking this constructive step to guarantee the survival of a program which has had great impact in the city of Baltimore. I urge the entire House to give full weight to this impressive testimony on behalf of VISTA and OEO by some of the most prominent business leaders in Baltimore.

(Mr. RUPPE was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RUPPE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### POVERTY

(Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the poor in America today is a problem that must be met realistically. The subject, poverty, has been very much in issue of the present era. Intellectuals from the social sciences, religious denominations, and most every political and social institution have in some way become involved with the crisis of the economically underprivileged. Though interest has been obvious, the institution of workable programs has been woefully lacking. Idealistic schemes and slogans have too often offered hopes to human suffering, but later show little in the realm of performance.

Magic formulas have no place in a problem as complex and as varied as the number of individual people caught up in it. Poverty eradication by massive Federal, social-action plans has been offered and tried as a universal solution. The record achieved using this method has been far from satisfactory. The only significant realization that has arisen from the Federal experimentation is that frustration led to promises, but unfulfilled promises led to further and greater frustration.

The attack on poverty has produced unrewarding results partially because the guidelines used to define the problem tend to be ineffective. Perhaps the fundamental mistake is the attempt to build the case for the hopeless poor around family-income statistics. Back in 1964 the determination was made that a household with less than \$3,000 annual income was in poverty. Under no reasonable assumption does income alone indicate poverty status. For example, a young married couple attending college may well be a household with an income substantially less than \$3,000 annually, but who can say that they are suffering in in abject poverty. And yet, that couple would be a part of the 30 to 80 million poor that the poverty statisticians have told us exist within our population. This type of guideline is a fallacy, and the interpretations based upon it are necessarily erroneous.

One might well ask what the poverty crisis is all about. Are we really faced with people deprived of the benefits of affluency? The answer here is a certain yes. There are poor in America that deserve all of the help we can provide to assimilate them into the mainstream of



relative prosperity. However, they will not be aided by ill-conceived and ineffective programs which attempt to eradicate poverty with funds alone. Mere handouts are cruel for they tend to destroy human dignity—the dignity every individual is entitled to have. Each individual should be permitted to live with the knowledge that he, too, is contributing his share—that he counts for something in doing the world's work.

Experimentation with human misery must be brought to an abrupt halt. There must be recognition that assistance to the poor is not a simple matter of finance, but is a problem of reversing the disturbing social trends which have accompanied the spread of affluency. The rise of illegitimacy is a case in point. The increased number of Americans born and raised outside normal family-life patterns has produced already a group of youth who are suffering from acute social and intellectual deprivation. This army of unwanted and unmotivated lend substantially to further problems of delinquency and unemployment. If Government is unwilling to go to such root causes of human suffering, then all of the spending programs with their administrative networks will certainly be for naught.

#### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

(Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members of the Congress, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a partial and excellent report of the Advancement of Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalism fraternity.

Members of the committee are a group of noted newsmen, including Clark Mollenhoff, Pulitzer prize winning reporter for the Des Moines Register and Tribune; Murray Seeger, vice chairman and representative of Newsweek in Washington; Larry L. Sisk, of the San Diego Evening Tribune; William J. Small, of the Columbia Broadcasting Co., Washington, and Alvin E. Austin, of the University of North Dakota.

The report of the Freedom of Information—FOI—Committee, dealing directly with the Federal Government, is as follows:

#### REPORT OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMITTEE

The Johnson administration issued thousands of laudable words about the importance of freedom of information in government, but high officials consistently employed inaccurate and misleading statements that contradicted most of the fine words.

It was difficult to equate the misleading and inaccurate statements by the Defense Department on a wide range of issues with President Johnson's comment that "A Democracy works best when the people have all the information the security of the nation permits."

The President's comment that "no one should be able to pull curtains of security around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest" is difficult to reconcile with the arbitrary State Department action to conduct a secret hear-

ing to try to fire Otto F. Otepka, the former chief security evaluator.

After five years, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara finally abolished the rule that required all Pentagon officials, military and civilian, to report all contacts with the press to the press office before the end of the working day. But, even as this took place, the Defense Department continued to pour out inaccurate information on everything from the controversial TFX matter to the question of whether there was Joint Chiefs disagreement over the conduct of the Vietnam war.

President Johnson's continued refusal to conduct regular press conferences with some reasonable advance notice continues to be a major problem. His style of press conferences makes it impossible for any but the White House regulars to be present, and it makes it unlikely that he will face any pattern of consistent hard questioning on any subject. He has it well organized for "a White House snow job," even though it is doubtful if he is as successful in accomplishing his purpose as he was a year or more ago.

What was true of the Johnson Administration was also true of the American Bar Association committee on fair trial and free press and the committee chairman, Justice Paul C. Reardon of Massachusetts. Justice Reardon and his committee amended their original report under pressure of press protests, but the final product was still an open invitation for arbitrary actions by courts that are corrupt or blind to the necessity of avoiding undue restraints upon the information available on crime, criminals, law enforcement and the courts.

Justice Reardon speaks periodically with what seems a genuine concern over undue restraint upon the press, then he proceeds ahead on a course that has already encouraged arbitrary court action. No action was needed by the American Bar Association, for the courts already have all the authority they need to bar unreasonable press activities in connection with a trial. The broad rules Judge Reardon approves can be used to justify oppression as much as for assurance of a fair trial.

The Chicago Tribune led the way in fighting unreasonably restrictive rulings of Circuit Judge Herbert C. Paschen in the murder trial of Richard Speck. This was one of a number of significant actions by newspapers in opposing arbitrary and unjustified restraints on the coverage of crime news and court actions. More of the same will be needed.

In the midst of dozens of smaller and related problems, these are the major Freedom of Information issues that demand attention:

1. Aggressive press action is needed to force a proper administration of the federal open records laws that became effective in July 1967. The general spirit of the Justice Department rule book on administration of the law is admirable, but there has been bad interpretation of the law by individual departments and it is inevitable that there will be more cases. It should be remembered that there is a press stake in suits brought under this law by various business groups, and that the press stake is with the broadest policy on open records unless there is some overriding contrary consideration.

2. Editors and reporters must have a firm understanding of the dangers inherent in the American Bar Association's efforts to restrict information on arrests, trials and the whole criminal law enforcement area. Where there are challenges to be made to the courts they should be in a responsible manner and with careful documentation. There are Supreme Court Justices who have expressed views that are in line with the best free press arguments, and it is wise to know them and to know the various problems discussed in this report. Report all cases, with full docu-

mentation, to the SDX Freedom of Information Committee.

3. There is a continuing need for exposing specific inaccuracies, untruths and misleading statements that are the "credibility gap." The fact is that some of our highest officials have been deliberately misleading the public, the press, and the Congress through flat lies, through half-truths and through clever use of statistics that distort. A general charge of a "credibility gap" is not helpful to public understanding of the issue. It is necessary to spell out the deceptions with sufficient detail to give the public a clear understanding. It is essential that we name the liars and the deceivers and show the backing they receive from superiors who keep them in positions of responsibility. It is only in this manner that the press can be helpful in control of the problem. When it is dealt with loosely, the "credibility gap" can be as confusing as it is helpful. When the liars get away with it, they usually go on to bigger and better lies.

It is well to remember that Congress, with all of its faults, represents the best lever the press has in forcing the Executive Branch to produce information or to state under oath why that information is held secret. Until the Freedom of Information Act became effective, the Congress was our only direct lever for forcing production of records or other information. There has always been the indirect method of appealing to public opinion and create the political reaction that would force action. However, public opinion is fickle and the loud strong voice of propaganda from the government can often make black seem to be white until such time as public officials are put under oath to be grilled by members of Congress. There is too much tendency for the press to forget that those things that hamper Congress are in fact shutting off the facts available to newspapers, radio and television.

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

The duel between the working press and Washington officialdom sometimes resembles those dances American teenagers indulge themselves in these days. There is an unpatterned shuffling about which presents a picture of progress in one direction almost immediately wiped out by a shift and movement in a new, negative direction. There rarely is any true sense of direction but more of a picture of shifting for position with the long-range result being a stalemate.

Occasionally, however, there is a breakthrough, a clear change that leaves the parties in redefined positions. When the next long-range history of the battle for greater access to public information is written, the year 1967 will undoubtedly be marked down as a historic turning point. The reason is that the long-sought Freedom of Information Act went into effect on July 4. The huge federal government establishment was given a year to adjust to the new law from the time it was signed by the President in 1966. Suitably, on Independence Day, a new rule book became the guide for Washington's information policy makers.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark played an instrumental role in getting the new law into effect with more emphasis than many Washington reporters expected. Late in the spring, his assistant and chief of the Office of Legal Counsel, Frank Wozencraft, prepared a 47-page memorandum for all government agencies to guide them in following the Act. Copies of the early draft of this memo were shown to representatives of the press, including Sigma Delta Chi, for comment. In general, the statement was a strong endorsement for free disclosure. The surprising element in the memo was that between the first draft and the final published version, this endorsement was strengthened.

Every working newsman could subscribe to the opening statement in the memo by



Clark: "If government is to be truly of, by and for the people, the people must know in detail the activities of government. Nothing so diminishes democracy as secrecy. Self-government, the maximum participation of the citizenry in affairs of state, is meaningful only with an informed public. How can we govern ourselves if we know not how we govern? Never was it more important than in our times of mass society, when government affects each individual in so many ways, that the right of the people to know the actions of their government be secure. . . ."

Clark went on to enumerate what he called the "key concerns" of Congress and President Johnson in seeing the Act through the legislative process. In Clark's words, these are:

"that disclosure be the general rule, not the exception;

"that all individuals have equal rights of access;

"that the burden be on the government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it;

"that individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts;

"that there be a change in government policy and attitude."

In conclusion, the Attorney General made this observation:

"This law can demonstrate anew the ability of our branches of government, working together, to vitalize the basic principles of our democracy. It is a balanced approach to one of those principles." And for those who may not have recalled the statement of President Johnson when he signed the Act in 1966, this cogent LBJ quotation was included: ". . . A Democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the nation permits. No one should be able to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest. . . . I signed this measure with a deep sense of pride that the United States is an open society in which the people's right to know is cherished and guarded."

The Attorney General's memorandum has now been dubbed "the blue book" because of the color of its cover and is handy to just about every government public information officer. It should be nearby for every reporter who wants to dig out some specific bit of information from the government's vast storehouses of data. The blue book and the FOI law together add up to a crucial weapon for the news media and the general public. They do not answer all the problems of disclosure in Washington by any means. But reporters are an insatiable lot—they must admit from the beginning that no policy can ever satisfy their professional needs. And since reporters are highly individualistic, it is almost impossible to draw up a general policy or law that will meet the demands of even a majority of them.

So far, use of the FOI law has been limited. The only tests that have gotten into court dockets involve private companies or individuals dealing with the government. But there are many cases that prove the law is working to the benefit of the American people because working reporters in Washington are finding out how to use it. Just how many little victories can be chalked up for the Act is impossible to determine but here is a case history of one of the first:

A New York writer for *Newsweek* magazine heard of a special study on Mississippi public welfare policies made by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The study was made in May 1966 and the writer, Peter Goldman, queried the magazine's HEW reporter, Steve Saler, to see if a copy of the document could be obtained since it had never been published. Saler called a public information officer at HEW

and got that answer that, "yes," there was such a report but it was considered an "internal working document" and would not be released for public consumption. Saler then studied the "blue book" and consulted with his superiors on the *Newsweek* staff. It was agreed the report was worth going after.

The magazine's Washington Bureau Chief, Mel Elfin, consulted with the lawyer who represents the publication in the federal city, William Rogers, and a formal, written request for the material was drawn up. As the law requires, the letter asked for the specific report in question. The test went no further; within a few days HEW acceded and made the report available. With the ironies of journalism, *Newsweek* did not publish a story on the report, but its sister publication, the *Washington Post*, did on Page One in a Sunday edition.

There are undoubtedly many other case histories available. There are also dozens of examples of new material being made available routinely under pressure of the law. At the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for instance, the law changed a traditional policy in one of the most sensitive areas without any discernible problems. Historically, the Fed released the minutes of its Open Market Committee, the group that meets every three weeks to set monetary policy, at the end of each year. Reporters could then read back and find at what point decisions were made to change the Fed's position in the money markets, decisions that could only be speculated about when they were made. Now, the Fed is releasing the OMC minutes every three months. So far, the market has not been disrupted and the public has been better served since the record of important decisions can be seen within a reasonable time after they were made. The Fed also will allow the inspection of other unpublished records which previously could be released only by a specific action by the Board and the committee. As Edwin L. Dale Jr., economic correspondent for the *New York Times* wrote at mid-year: "Officials agreed that only experience and testing of the new rules would disclose the extent to which more information would become available and what kinds. The change involving the Open Market Committee decisions—which are crucial for monetary policy—is already a major one."

One of the more unusual requests made since the law went into effect came from the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*. A reporter from that morning paper asked the Justice Department for the record of all federal pardons. The Department produced the records with only one stipulation—that the newspaper pay for the extra costs of making copies from the master records contained in a 900-page volume. The bill came to \$245 and the newspaper paid it.

All has not been that simple, of course. The law has done little to improve the access to information at the two most difficult stations—the Pentagon and the White House. And since its provisions do not apply to Congress, there have been only small changes in that area where the private "executive session" continues to gain in popularity as the place where Congress does its work. (Special analyses follow.)

The Federal Aviation Agency was involved in a controversy over a report written on the supersonic transport airplane by Robert Charles, who was formerly attached to the office of the Secretary of the Air Force. Columnists Robert Novak and Rowland Evans attempted to use the FOI law to break loose a copy of the report which suggested that the SST could be developed entirely with private funds under a public corporation arrangement. The answer from the Federal Aviation Agency is that the report "never had any official sanction from any government official." The reply is based on the understanding that Charles wrote his report

as a private citizen on his own time. The issue falls into the gray area of the law, an area that may have to be cleared by a legal test.

In 1966, the FAA was involved in a similar flap over the various reports on the SST submitted by outside consultants and government experts. The agency withheld the reports on the basis they were "working papers" under study. Today, those same reports are available for anyone who asks.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, another of the tough nuts for Washington reporters to crack, has changed little under pressure from the FOI Act. NASA is infamous for holding back a report made by Sam Phillips which warned of shoddy work by private contractors building the Apollo space capsule, the one that killed three astronauts in a launching pad fire. Similar "discrepancy reports" are gathered regularly for NASA by General Electric. *Aviation Week and Space Technology* asked for two such reports on the Apollo command module and the moon landing device now that the FOI law is in force. The requests were turned down. "We decided that they were internal working documents and that we were not required under the law to give them out," a NASA spokesman stated. Again, a gray area case.

The State Department has another such controversy on its hands. In the first two months after the FOI Act went into effect, State received about a dozen formal requests for specific documents and granted them all except three. All three refusals covered transcripts of hearings concerning Otto Otepka, a department official accused of improperly leaking information to congressional committees. State classifies the transcripts as relating to internal personnel matters, a specific exemption under the law.

The State Department secrecy in this instance was an obvious effort to hide a record that is embarrassing to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other high officials. The only real justification for secrecy on personnel records is for the protection of the government employee. This could not be used in the Otepka case, for Otepka had asked that the hearings be public so he could get the full story of the "get Otepka" conspiracy before the public.

When the fallacy of the original justification for secrecy was pointed out, the State Department then claimed that it was justified in conducting secret hearings because national security was involved. In this instance it was pointed out that two documents used in the hearings as evidence carried a national security classification.

Under questioning, the State Department lawyer admitted that the two documents with a national security classification had already been published in full in the reports of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Although this publication had taken place with State Department knowledge more than a year prior to Otepka hearing, the State Department refused to change its position.

A study of this entire case makes it obvious that the State Department was misusing a claim of national security for purposes of hiding or obscuring the record. The record of this case discloses a disgraceful pattern of inaccurate and misleading testimony by high State Department officials. These officials gave inaccurate misleading testimony in connection with security cases. When Otepka gave testimony and produced records proving that superiors had lied under oath, the superiors used unauthorized eavesdropping and wiretapping as well as other police state methods to try to obtain grounds for firing Otepka.

High State Department officials denied they had engaged in eavesdropping and wiretapping when questioned under oath by a congressional committee, and they made the same denials to the press. Later, these officials were forced to admit that there had been the



1 week prior to consideration by the House on the war on poverty bill, it was announced that the Office of Economic Opportunity has chosen to venture into that most controversial and questionable of all social welfare schemes: the guaranteed annual income.

The President himself said last January in his economic message that such a program is "almost surely beyond our means at this time." Someone at OEO did not get the word; OEO has approved a grant of \$620,000 and expects to earmark \$3.4 million more to finance a guaranteed income project through the end of 1971.

What is the refrain in that song? "When will they ever learn?"

Not in the very near future, that is perfectly obvious. We still labor under the delusion that every social ill can be corrected with money, in spite of all evidence to the contrary. An objection to a new Government program that is duplication and overlapping of what is already being done at both State and Federal levels means being damned as one who would condemn the poor to more misery.

The rat control legislation of the past year is a wonderful case in point. Forty million dollars was sought for rat control when four other U.S. Government agencies are already running control and elimination programs, and when the chief Federal investigator of rats and wild rodents said, "Rat control should be part of a real long-term community health program," he observed that cutting or eliminating rats' food supplies, and denying them places to make their nests would be the only solution. He said:

It may be easier to get simple rat control programs funded, but in my opinion such programs will not succeed.

So a vote against rat control legislation—which was a vote against overlapping, duplication, and expenditure of an additional \$40 million which had questionable value for getting results—was denounced from all sides as a vote for poverty, against the poor, and for rats.

#### THE "NEW POLITICS"—PATTERN FOR REVOLUTION?

A country, a people, a nation, grows strong and thrives on challenge. It may be the challenge of a hostile environment, a continent to be tamed, rivers to be harnessed, forests to be cleared, a government to be strengthened and shaped. Such were the challenges that faced a young America; we met these, and others, during the time of our history when most of the major world powers were hostile. We survived, and became strong. Some major historians hold that without challenges, countries, nations and entire civilizations grow weak and decay and eventually disappear from the world scene.

There is a major difference between meeting challenges and cultivating the ground for our own destruction. It is no exaggeration to say that the permissiveness and acquiescence in breaking the laws of our society have given great encouragement and new hope to those who work toward that destruction. We have always had among us those who would tear down all that exists. We are faced

with the situation in a new form today, and although the numbers are relatively small, the gravest dangers are posed.

In August 1965 a "Call for a New Politics"—a hope for a united left in the United States, came out of a meeting at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif. By June 1966 a permanent organization, the National Conference for a New Politics, had been put together in Chicago. In the spring of 1967, NCNP issued a "call to convention" at the Palmer House, in Chicago, over the Labor Day weekend.

Around 350 organizations were invited to send representatives or observers. The American Communist Party moved swiftly. Victor Riesel, the prominent columnist, wrote that:

At the last of its secret sessions (the Communist Party's) general secretary, Gus Hall, point by point, stratagem by stratagem, laid out the tactics for intense infiltration of the National Conference for New Politics.

NCNP convention headquarters in Chicago were located in the same building as the midwest offices of the Worker, the American Communist Party newspaper.

It was like entering the gates of Hell and then finally coming out the other side—

Said one of the organizers after the conference had ended. Around 5,000 delegates—estimates vary—for observers, from about 300 different organizations attended. Some of the groups represented in one way or another were the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress on Racial Equality, Women Strike for Peace, Students for a Democratic Society, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, SANE, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Chicago Peace Council, the Revolutionary Action Movement—a Peking-oriented Marxist group—the American Communist Party, and the Institute for Policy Studies, in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Spock and Martin Luther King called for an end to the war in Vietnam. James Forman, head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, said:

We and we alone have the responsibility to wage our own war of liberation as we see fit.

Later on, Forman saw fit to conduct his own form of parliamentary procedure. In response to a call of "point of order" on passage of a resolution, he informed the protester "there are no points of order." In answer to the retort "Is this a dictatorship?" he answered "Yes, and I'm the dictator." A few minutes later he said he was only joking, and "can't we have a little fun?"

Simon Casady, former head of the California Democratic Council until thrown out by then-Governor Pat Brown, and cochairman of the conference, said:

I've seen several Communists . . . The reason they're not going to take us over is they're the right wing of this movement. They believe in change through orderly means.

The executive director of the NCNP told the delegates that they were part of "the most significant gathering of Americans since the Declaration of Independence," while a bongo group outside chanted "Kill whitey! Kill whitey! Kill whitey."

Impeach Johnson, stop the war, form a third party—a wild variety of suggestions, but the 13 demands of the Black Caucus, a group of Negro militants who took over the convention, stand as what might be called a platform. The demands, adopted by the conference, stated among other things: "there must be revolutionary change"; they asked total support of "people's liberation wars" in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; "condemn the imperialistic Zionist war" and in the next part of the sentence assert this did not imply anti-Semitism; demand restoration of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to Congress and to his committee chairmanship; strongly suggest that white civilizing committees be established immediately in all white communities to civilize and humanize the savage and beast-like character that runs rampant throughout America, as exemplified by George Lincoln Rockwells and Lyndon Baines Johnsons."

There were some prime examples of "savage and beastlike character" for close study. One of Martin Luther King's assistants announced he would speak against the Thirteen Demands; he was stood against a wall and promised a beating, and he did not speak. The parliamentarian of the conference was bound, gagged, and robbed. Other delegates were robbery victims, and one who opposed the Black Caucus takeover had his throat cut.

#### WHAT TO MAKE OF IT ALL?

Walter Goodman, writing in the New York Times magazine, September 24, 1967, called the conference "an exercise that would have been ludicrous had it not stunk so of totalitarianism."

Dwight MacDonald, in the December 1967 Esquire:

I have long had doubts about some of the moral and intellectual aspects of the New Left, but what happened at the Palmer House surpassed my gloomiest suspicions. Black Power has never raised any doubts—or hopes—but still I was unprepared for the crudity with which its racist animus expresses itself.

Arthur I. Waskow, of the Institute for Policy Studies, in Washington, D.C., one of the founders and leaders of NCNP, commented in an essay that it was "a strongly educational event" in which white liberals "learned that a united, tough minority committed not to obeying the rules but to changing them can sometimes win its way. Waskow went on to say that many of the whites "were toughened and radicalized" by the process.

David Broder, writing in the Washington, D.C., Post of October 10, 1967, had sharp and icy words for Waskow's dream-spinning:

"Toughened and radicalized" one might ask, like the Germans who observed Hitler's Munich beer hall "putsch"? Does Waskow think it took the Black Caucus to teach us that a "united, tough minority committed not to obeying the rules but to changing them can sometimes win its way"? Has not every squad of vigilantes, every lynch mob



in American history, taught us the same lesson?

"A Mixture Potentially Poisonous" was the headline of Gerald Griffin's column in the Baltimore, Md., Sun of September 11, 1967:

Mix anti-Semitism with black power extremism, then try to add this combination to intellectual white leftism and what do you get? An indigestible political stew which if swallowed could be poisonous.

The elements of this mixture are so incompatible, as they were spread out at the convention of the so-called New Left last week in Chicago, that it is easy to dismiss the whole thing as a fiasco. . . . Yet this political mess attempted at Chicago is as ugly as it is potentially poisonous, and its implications should be widely understood.

Even though they are unlikely to have a third-party candidate, they may well be a political factor. The disruption, destruction and assorted violence inherent in black racism will almost certainly lead to more outbreak in the cities next year during the political campaign, and produce violent counter-measures. The New Left, to the extent that it tries to temporize with black racism as it did in the Chicago meeting, thus could have a greater impact on our politics than the Left of Henry Wallace two decades ago.

#### PERIL POINT IN OUR HISTORY

To this we have come, to a point in our history where a man with the stature of columnist Roscoe Drummond will comment that "The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

James Reston, writing in the New York Times:

How serious is this? The general view here in Washington is that it is a serious but transitory phenomenon inflamed by the war, and will ease off when the war ends and the costs of that war are gradually redirected into the war on poverty in the cities. This is allied to the notion that attractive women and attractive jobs will soon tame this generation, as before.

There is, however another view. This is that the rise in violence is nothing less than a fundamental challenge against the present foreign policy and social order of the United States and will not be appeased by the end of the bombing, the end of the war, or the defeat of President Johnson.

The most articulate spokesman of this latter view is Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor and present director of the Harvard-M.I.T. Center for Urban Studies. "All the signs declare that the violence is not ended," he said of the Negro revolt. "Worse still, a new set of signs tells us something that is painful, even hateful, to have to hear: We must prepare for the onset of terrorism.

"Indeed, it may already have begun. How widespread and how successful remains to be seen, but the probability is so great that ignoring it would be an act of irresponsibility or of cowardice."

In July 1964, President Johnson said:

It is understandable that those who are aggrieved will take to the streets, whether rightly or wrongly. Their judgments might be wrong as to how justice could be obtained, but they would be less or more than human if they did not seek justice.

Three and one-quarter million crimes were reported in 1966 an increase of 11 percent over 1965. The first 6 months of 1967 show a 17-percent increase over

the 1966 totals for the same period. The volume of crime is up to 62 percent since 1960. The population is up 9 percent.

Crime outstrips population in growth by 7 to 1.

In November 1967, President Johnson said:

The time has come in my judgment when the American people are going to rise up and revolt against the lawbreaker in this country.

#### THE ROAD AHEAD

Somewhere, somehow, we have allowed our national heritage to be subverted and bargained away. We have come close to acquiescence in our own destruction. We have allowed ourselves to be led by those who, in their haste to attain utopia, have ebrayed our past, defiled our present, and endangered our future.

If we refuse to equate what we as individuals owe society with what society has given us; if we avoid the pitfall of change for the sake of change; if we recommit ourselves to that national will and strength that has always been the bulwark of the American people, then we can and will prevail.

I believe we will. I have strong faith in the basic decency, stability, and good judgment of my fellow Americans. We carry a heavy burden, not only for ourselves but for all who look to us as the last citadel of hope for Western civilization.

The burden is heavy, and very likely will grow heavier still before we can lay it down. But bear it we must, for if we should falter, and the burden would slip from our shoulders, it would be replaced by one from which there would never be hope of rescue.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

[Mr. HALPERN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include tables.)

[Mr. MAHON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED CEASE-FIRE IN NIGERIA

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, within the recent months we have heard and read about the terrible outbreak of civil war in Nigeria. A conflict between the Federal region and eastern Nigeria, which now calls itself Biafra. It has been with great concern that we here in the United States have read of the reports of indiscriminate killing of civilians of Ibo origin in that country. It is imperative that something be done immediately to halt the wholesale slaughter of Ibos and other Nigerians, wherever it may be

happening throughout that country. To this end, eight of my colleagues and myself, Messrs. GEORGE E. BROWN of California, JOHN CONYERS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, KENNETH J. GRAY, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, and CHESTER L. MIZE have signed a resolution urging that the United States take immediate action to seek a halt to the present internal conflict in Nigeria. We are not urging that the United States interfere in the internal affairs of Nigeria, but we are urging prompt action in order to stop what threatens to become a genocidal pattern of extermination.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this resolution in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

#### H. RES. —

Whereas there has occurred and is occurring the reported indiscriminate killing of civilians of Ibo origin in both Nigeria and Biafra; and

Whereas it is imperative to emphasize the need for prompt action to prevent what threatens to become a genocidal pattern of extermination; and

Whereas the extension of friendship and assistance to all men of good will in all regions of Nigeria is necessary to the resolution of their differences at the peace table: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States be requested to take such action as may be necessary to transmit to the belligerent parties, to the Organization for African Unity, to the United Nations, and to the International Red Cross the earnest plea of the United States that all appropriate bodies join in seeking a halt to hostilities and take measures, including the dispatch of impartial observers, to protect the lives of the civilian population of the area.

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RESNICK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### BALTIMORE RALLY IN SUPPORT OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I attended a rally in behalf of the war on poverty in the Charles Center in Baltimore and was, once again, enormously impressed by the importance which this program has come to have for the residents of poverty neighborhoods. I was accompanied on that occasion by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CLARENCE LONG, and by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland, Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS, as well as by Mayor McKeldin and several city officials. All of us were deeply moved by the commitment which hundreds of poverty area residents and their families obviously feel toward the self-help programs of the war on poverty.



As Mayor McKeldin put it, the prospect that Congress might end the national effort against poverty seemed "horrifying."

An article by Stephen J. Lynton appeared in the Baltimore Sun on November 7 which presented an effective report on this rally, as well as a discussion based upon conversations with anti-poverty officials from the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland as to the consequences which irresponsible action on the part of Congress would have for the poor of our State. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

**POOR, SUPPORTERS RALLY FOR FUNDS—TYDINGS, MCKELDIN JOIN ANTIPOVERTY OFFICIALS IN DECRYING LOSS OF FEDERAL MONEY**  
(By Stephen J. Lynton)

With scores of placards bobbing up and down, with drums and bugles resounding and cheers rising in the cold night air, a throng of Maryland's impoverished and their advocates gathered in Hopkins place last night to shout its demands that Congress rejuvenate the nation's financially ailing war on poverty.

The rally, which had been organized by city anti-poverty officials, looked like an outdoor version of an election-eve convention. But political candidates in today's election were not permitted to speak.

#### LET LIVELY SPEAK

As the hour-and-fifteen-minute gathering before the new Federal building drew near an end at 8:15 P.M., cries of "Let Lively speak. Let Lively speak" broke from the crowd. But Walter H. Lively, the Republican City Council candidate from the Second district, did not speak.

Crowd estimates varied widely. Anti-poverty officials claimed 3,000 to 4,500. A police estimate was 1,500 to 1,800. Some newsmen guessed even fewer.

Senator Tydings (D., Md.) drew a roar from the crowd just by naming President John F. Kennedy. "I can't believe that Congress is going to turn its back on a program which our beloved President [Kennedy] began," he said.

Mayor McKeldin termed "horrifying" the prospect that Congress might end the national anti-poverty program.

Parren J. Mitchell, the city anti-poverty director, put the crowd—including delegations from Montgomery, Calvert, Harford and other counties—on notice that they might be called upon to demonstrate anew next weekend, apparently in Washington.

Representatives Friedel (D., 7th) and Long (D., 2d) also produced roars in the crowd by voicing support for anti-poverty programs.

The crowd displayed signs saying "Indian Givers," "No More Broken Promises" and "To C.A.A. [Community Action Agency] With Love." One placard bore a skull and crossbones and the words, "Don't Mess with Poor People."

City anti-poverty officials had organized the demonstration against what they considered to be a grim background of increasing fiscal emergencies. Money difficulties have already disrupted anti-poverty programs in Baltimore City and at least six Maryland counties.

#### PROGRAMS HURT

One Eastern Shore community action program was halted last week. A Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Baltimore ran out of money last Friday and has received emergency city funds to last out the current week. Members of the Volunteers in Service to America program face a payless payday. And programs in Montgomery, Prince Georges and Harford counties confront the possibility of imminent doom.

The difficulties are among the results of Congress's failure so far to approve new funds for the national war on poverty or to enact a continuing resolution which would permit Federal agencies to keep spending money. Federal agencies have been told not to pay for new non-defense programs unless they had already been authorized by midnight October 23.

Peter B. Davis, deputy regional director of VISTA, says that 108 VISTA workers in Maryland—94 of them assigned to health, housing, education, recreation, poverty and social work projects in Baltimore—will not receive their two-week's salaries, an average of \$95 for rent, food and personal expenses, when payday comes November 14, unless Congress takes action.

#### VOLUNTEERS UNPAID

Michael A. Toth, director of the VISTA training center in Baltimore, says that 48 new volunteers have not received their normal \$1-a-day expense allowances since they began their studies October 26.

Richard W. Bateman, an associate city anti-poverty director, said that a city Neighborhood Youth Corps program, which employs 40 staff members and provides job training for 500 high school drop-outs, discovered that its newly approved six-month grant of about \$800,000 "suddenly terminated" last week.

William F. Moran, deputy director of the metropolitan Washington area's Neighborhood Youth Corps, says that a job program for 60 high school students in Montgomery county, and two program for 110 students and dropouts in Prince Georges county will end Saturday, unless Congress authorizes new spending.

#### SPECIAL TRANSFER

S. Edward Smith, director of the Maryland Office of Economic Opportunity, says that a community action program assisting 1,200 poor families in Kent, Queen Annes and Talbot counties halted most of its normal operations last Wednesday, Thursday and Friday when a five-month grant expired.

Mr. Smith adds, however, that a special transfer of \$3,700 to \$4,000 in regional anti-poverty funds had been tentatively approved. That amount would be enough for a month's operations, he said.

The Eastern Shore program had returned to regular activities yesterday. But Mr. Smith notes that its nine paid employees "will miss a payday and maybe two."

A Harford county community action program, intended to assist 12,368 poor people, will also run aground between now and November 25, Mr. Smith says, unless Congress appropriates new money.

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRIEDEL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRIEDEL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### THE DEFIANT ATTITUDE OF JOHN DOAR

(Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission

to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, one of America's most honored and respected newspapers, has editorialized on the defiant attitude of Mr. John Doar, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, for his failure to respect the law which he is supposed to honor.

The law in question is the Public Information Act. I have brought this to the attention of the House before when I addressed myself to an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Doar and me.

It is interesting to note that the Times-Picayune describes Mr. Doar as "a scrambling legal quarterback who can 'twist,' improvise, hurdle the law, and give you a big run-around."

This is a most accurate description, and under the circumstances I continue the comparison by saying I have seen many scrambling quarterbacks who have been forced to "eat the ball and were thrown for a loss."

Before this discussion is ended, Mr. Doar will be compelled to "eat the ball" and will be exposed as an individual who flouts the law, thumbs his nose at Congress, and treats individual Members of Congress as something to be swept under the rug and forgotten.

This matter has become more important than Mr. Doar's refusal to abide by the law and furnish names which are on the public payroll. The names are now a mute question. I have already published a partial list, and I am in possession of the names of out-of-State people sent into Louisiana on the November 4, 1967, election day to act as "volunteer observers," action which carried overtones of intimidation by the Federal Government in a State election.

While the individual names become less important, the principle involved becomes all the more important.

The attitude of the Department of Justice, which can more properly be described as the "Department of Injustice," touches every Member of Congress in both the House and Senate.

Under the law, the information I had requested cannot be denied the Congress except by such arbitrary action or contrary to law, which Mr. Doar is doing.

I assure you I shall pursue this matter to the hilt and will keep the House informed of any action taken.

This is so vital to every Member of Congress that each should take a personal interest in the matter without regard to the immediate situation, but most definitely with regard to future requests by Members of Congress.

In the meantime, I direct your attention to the editorial from the November 4, 1967 issue of the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

#### FIRED-UP AT SECRECY

Judging from his current mood, we wouldn't be surprised to find that Rep. F. Edward Hebert is writing a piece for the Congressional Record about the Department of Justice election snooping. The title might be "Tactics and Antics of John Doar." Mr. Doar is the assistant attorney general, civil rights division. The piece would not be complimentary. From what the congressman has



already written or said, we might suppose that his "image" of Mr. Doar would be that of a scrambling legal quarterback who can "twist," improvise, hurdle the law—and give you a big run-around.

Mr. Hebert wanted in advance the names of those "volunteer civil service workers" assigned to watch Louisiana primary election commissioners at the state primary last week. Mr. Doar said, no—no names, not how many, what parishes, no information. It was not in the "public interest," he averred, to tell Rep. Hebert or the public. His watchers or observers could be "harassed."

The congressman boiled up. He didn't like the idea of the Doar observers sauntering around the polling places looking over the shoulders of state election officials—style of commissars sent to watch other commissars. And he wanted to know from Mr. Doar a lot of things—how the Justice Department could reconcile use of civil service workers for political jobs with the Hatch Act; where was there a law that the names of public pay-rollees could be withheld from a congressman; under what section of the Public Information Act, passed last June, could he withhold the information, etc.?

Mr. Doar made a very selective reply, ignoring the Hatch Act question, the rights of congressmen to know, whether the President had authorized information withholding, and so on. Seemingly Rep. Hebert's temper went from boiling to burning, as Mr. Doar cited from the Public Information Act (a very stern law with respect to information withholding) Sec. 552, sub-sec. (b), paragraph 7: (May be exempted from disclosure) "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes . . ."

We agree with Rep. Hebert that it is pretty hard to conceive how a one-day amateur watcher or observer (like a bird watcher, or maybe, a forest ranger looking from a fire tower for a wisp of woodland smoke) can suddenly become an "investigator," or that he can be engaged in "persevering in a systematic probe or examination" as the dictionary seems to expect "investigators" to do. And it takes a lot of imagination to say that a list of volunteer watchers belong in a Justice Department secret "investigatory file compiled for law enforcement purposes."

We guess, with Mr. Hebert, that Mr. Doar was violently contorting the Public Information Act. And we also guess he was going to hang on to the names of all the Toms, Dicks and Harrys, law or no law. Whatever Rep. Hebert puts in the *Record*, if anything, about this "unconscionable refusal" ought to make warm reading for a cold day.

#### AID FIGHTS HUNGER

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the *Record* and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we wonder if our foreign aid program is appreciated or even understood by the countries we seek to assist. Do the recipient nations share our enthusiasm for their own development and economic growth?

I have a translation of an article by Romulo Escobar Bethancourt in the Panamanian newspaper *La Prensa*, which should dispel some doubts. The news item reports a visit to Panama by Herbert Waters, AID's assistant administrator for the war on hunger, and expresses the great respect in that country for Mr. Waters and the work he represents. I was particularly impressed by Mr. Bethancourt's statement that:

Five thousand men like Herbert J. Waters working around the world would be a more effective army than five thousand soldiers.

This is a good indication of the healthy attitude which is growing in the developing countries.

I would like to share this article with my colleagues and therefore I am inserting the translation from *La Prensa* of September 14, 1967:

[Translated from *La Prensa*, "Trinchera de la Palabra" by Romulo Escobar Bethancourt Sept. 14, 1967]

#### WAR ON HUNGER

The Press informs that during the coming week, Mr. Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator, War on Hunger, will visit Panama. His stay will be brief since Mr. Waters is on his way to Lima, where he will attend the "Operacion Niños" Conference.

It is a pleasure to be visited by a representative of the great northern nation who is not coming as a "military advisor", "anti-guerrilla advisor", "hemispheric safety advisor", or an "expert on continental unity."

People like Mr. Waters instills in us great satisfaction since he dedicates his time to analyze the real scourge of the under-developed countries, where the primary cause of social disturbances is "hunger." Children are the future of America and to a large extent they are abandoned to their own fate. In some countries of Latin America—not to be mentioned here—it causes great pain to see how children are so unprotected from hunger, diseases and illiteracy.

If the United States would spend on the war on hunger a tenth of what they spend on wars, such as the war in Vietnam; they would not have to send their sons to die in far away countries. Five thousand men like Herbert J. Waters working around the world would be a more effective army than five thousand soldiers.

Initiating a war on hunger on a large scale would immediately stimulate Russia and China—not to be left behind—as it is presently evidenced by the display of their military power. Humanity would, with pleasure, approve of such a war on hunger between these powerful nations.

The bombardment of food and tools would successfully replace atomic and hydrogen bombs.

This is a daydream, of course, because human beings of all latitudes who have been successful scientifically have not improved their souls at the same rate and remain an easy prey to the ambitions of political and economic powers.

While the arrival of distinguished military officials is welcomed with excessive honors, it is possible that the arrival of Mr. Waters will amount only to a mere protocol call.

When countries learn to react in a different manner, that is by welcoming the fighters on hunger with due receptiveness and turning their backs to emissaries of gunpowder and thunder; then they will show the true road to the leading nations which still remain blind.

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the *Record* and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FASCELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### PRESIDENT STRIKES ANOTHER BLOW FOR WOMEN'S RIGHTS

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to

extend her remarks at this point in the *Record* and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and the U.S. Congress have struck another blow for women's rights with the President's signature of a bill to provide equal opportunity in military service for women.

Before passage of this legislation, the 35,000 women in the Armed Forces by law received fewer promotions than their male counterparts and were not permitted to obtain rank above colonel.

But with the stroke of his pen, President Johnson ended as he put it "the last vestige of discrimination in our Armed Forces." The promotion of women will not be governed by standards generally applicable to men, with no arbitrary ceiling on their rank.

Since the days of the Revolutionary War women have written a long and proud history of military service to their country. They have served—and died—for their Nation's defense—and their Nation is finally giving them, as the President remarked, "the equal treatment and equal opportunity they should have had from the beginning."

This is a proud day in American military annals for America has once again renewed its historic promise of equality for all.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the *Record* the President's remarks upon signing the women's officers bill:

#### TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 5894, THE WOMEN'S OFFICERS LEGISLATION

We are here this morning to strike another blow for women's rights. At long last, we are going to give the dedicated women of our Armed Forces the equal treatment and equal opportunity they should have had from the beginning.

We took the precaution of asking the ladies to supply the Honor Guard this morning. That is in case there are still some die-hard traditionalists who do not approve our action.

As our good friends Margaret Smith, Frances Bolton, Oveta Culp Hobby, and many others, can testify, women in uniform have had to fight on more than the battlefield of war. I still recall what one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives had to say on the subject back in 1942. We were debating the bill to create the WAAC, and he said:

"I think it is a reflection upon the courageous manhood of the country to pass a law inviting women to join the Armed Forces in order to win a battle.

"Take the women into the armed service, who then will do the cooking, the washing, the mending, the humble homey tasks to which every woman has devoted herself?

"Think of the humiliation! What has become of the manhood of America?"

But the ladies won their battle—and American manhood has survived. Colonel Hobby got her Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and school opened in Fort Des Moines, Iowa. All of you who were there will remember what she said on that day:

"You have a debt to democracy, a date with destiny." History has recorded how magnificently our American women kept that date. And they are keeping it still.

Over 1,000 are in Vietnam today. And here to witness this ceremony are many who have already served in Vietnam.

Our Armed Forces literally could not operate effectively or efficiently without our women. Yet, we nearly lost them at the end



of the Second World War. In 1948, the House Armed Services Committee voted to retire the WACs and the WAVES to the Reserves. There was to be no place for them in the Regular services.

We succeeded in reversing that action.

I say "we," but I should say you ladies of Congress and your female allies in the press gallery. I was proud to serve as a buck private in your ranks.

Our gallant ladies were assured permanent status in the military services. But they were not assured equal opportunity. From that day to this, a woman choosing a military career could expect to do her job with fewer promotions and therefore, with less pay than a man would have received for the same service. Furthermore, she had only about 10 percent as much chance of being promoted above the grade of Major—and no chance at all of being promoted above the grade of Colonel.

With the signing of this bill today, we are going to end that inequity.

This bill gives the career women of our armed services no special privileges. But it does relieve them from the handicaps.

The bill does not create any female Generals or Admirals—but it does open the door. There is no reason why we should not some day have a female Chief of Staff—or even a Commander-in-Chief.

I realize that a few of our gentlemen officers may not be too enthusiastic about this possibility. And I know why: As Dr. Samuel Johnson once observed, "Nature has given women so much power that the law has very wisely given them little."

But from now on, the officers and men of our Armed Forces will just have to take their chances in open competition, along with the rest of us.

This is a free country, a democratic country, and the time has passed when opportunity can be denied to anyone.

We gave women the vote, and the country survived.

In this Administration, we have passed laws providing that women in industry must receive equal pay for equal work—and the the economy has continued to prosper.

We have brought women to ever-higher and more influential positions in Civil Service—and the Government has improved.

Women are leaders and doers in our Congress and throughout our government.

Now we end the last vestige of discrimination in our Armed Forces. So, both as President and Commander-in-Chief, I am pleased and proud to sign this bill.

And I can think of no better company in which to sign it. For, in a very real sense, this law belongs to every one of you here in this room.

It is also a great pleasure for me to take this opportunity to honor two very brave ladies in our Armed Forces for outstanding service in connection with the conflict in Vietnam.

To Air Force Nurse Colonel Ethel A. Hoefly we are going to award the Legion of Merit. And to Army Nurse Major Marie L. Rodgers, we are going to award the Bronze Star.

Colonel Kobach and Colonel Hayes will read the Citations.

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished commentators on national issues is Roscoe Drummond, the nationally respected syndicated columnist.

On November 6 in the Chicago Sun Times, Mr. Drummond contributed a very persuasive and thoughtful column concerning the consideration by this body of the pending antipoverty bill.

With permission, I insert Mr. Drummond's column at this point in the RECORD:

#### FATE OF WAR ON POVERTY UP TO HOUSE

WASHINGTON.—The fate of the administration's war on poverty—to continue its vital job or to be shrunk to such puny size as to be meaningless—will soon be decided.

It will be decided by the House of Representatives. The Senate has voted strong and constructive anti-poverty legislation, but the outlook in the House is ominous.

The war on poverty is getting plenty of praise even from its critics in Congress, but praise won't finance it. Those who publicly praise the anti-poverty programs are proposing to impoverish them by inadequate funds and crippling amendments.

By the test of public support and expert judgment, Congress will be doing the nation a reckless and ill-timed disservice by suffocating the war on poverty. I believe that most congressmen who may be tempted to vote that way will be making a political mistake through misreading voter opinion.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders, comprising some wise and knowledgeable people, has concluded that city government most needs strengthening in order to deal effectively with civil disorder.

No federal enterprise is doing so much to help city government control and prevent violence as the anti-poverty programs.

This is the nearly unanimous testimony of mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges and civic leaders of cities which had riots and those which didn't. In many of the cities the police departments and community action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots and in eight cities the juvenile arrest rate went down with the help of the anti-poverty programs.

The mayors of the cities know most about how much the nation needs the war on poverty to help improve the lot of the very poor, both Negro and white, and thereby to remove them from the reach of those who seek to turn them to violence. The U.S. Conference of Mayors unanimously asks for expanded anti-poverty programs.

The Republican mayors of 22 cities with 100,000 population urged the GOP leaders of Congress to "encourage members of Congress to support the Office of Economic Opportunity budget so that these dynamic and imaginative programs may be carried on in a successful manner." Most of the governors, Republican and Democratic, agree.

But the House is rife with suggestions to slash the OEO budget by as much as \$400,000,000 to \$800,000,000—a cruel mistake.

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real pleasure for me to congratulate Donald A. Williams on his receipt of the Rockefeller Public Service Award for Administration.

Dr. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, is a man with an unusual combination of talents and skills—scientific, technological, and administrative, with an extra measure of vision, dedication, and perceptiveness that makes him stand out among other men.

We are indeed fortunate to have him as head of the Nation's major soil and water conservation agency. He has not only given outstanding leadership to the soil and water conservation programs, but he has made major contributions in guiding the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture in forming sound, new programs.

As Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, his job has not been an easy one. The 14 years that he has headed the agency have been a period of change—changes in technology, in land use, needs, and conservation concepts. His agency itself has undergone a complete reorganization. Through this period, Dr. Williams' skilled hand has strengthened the national soil and water conservation program and guided its growth from an erosion control activity to a massive movement that recognizes resource conservation as everybody's business.

While broad benefits are being realized today, future generations undoubtedly will be the major benefactors—perhaps without realizing it—for it is the sound planning of today that will be the foundation for tomorrow's growth.

No State is more aware of the benefits from sound conservation than Texas. The recent destructive Hurricane Beulah caused untold damage and heartache. Still greater damage was averted by the excellent work that has been done under the small watershed program so ably administered in Texas by "Red" Smith. During the heavy rains accompanying the hurricane, small dams and other measures in watershed projects prevented hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage along creeks that had been protected.

I have been close to this program. In 1952 I introduced the first bill to establish an upstream flood prevention program. Dr. Williams played a strong role in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act that was passed in 1954. The act embodies much of his philosophy—that projects should be carried out by local people, with Federal help, rather than as Federal projects—and that land treatment on both public and private lands shares equally with flood prevention dams to make a project a success. Such a philosophy has made this one of the soundest and most important conservation programs we have.

Dr. Williams' ideas concerning local action with Federal help has proved just as successful in the resource conservation and development projects launched only a few years ago under his direction.

#### ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD TO DONALD A. WILLIAMS

(Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to



His initiative in drawing public attention to the need for sound land use planning in the rural fringe areas is in keeping with his belief that land and water need careful planning and management no matter where they are.

In administering the Federal part of conservation programs, Don Williams has insisted on extremely high technical standards for SCS personnel. Technicians and specialists keep up to date through the agency's training programs and are encouraged to be active in professional organizations. This has resulted in a group of probably the most dedicated of Federal employees—as is demonstrated by the fact that the SCS has the smallest turnover of personnel in Government.

Dr. Williams' leadership in influencing attitudes, motivating people, and enlisting support for the conservation programs he directs has provided the force behind them. Through his influence, the important relationship between resource conservation and development and national, social, and economic welfare has become more widely recognized than ever before.

From my vantage point as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture I have been able to observe the progress of resource development. I have been able to observe closely the workings of the agency we established to handle the job—also Dr. Williams, the man who heads that agency. I am gratified that he is being recognized for the tremendous job that he is doing.

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in

the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### COLLEGE COSTS RISING

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Office of Education figures show that the costs of 1 year's training at an average private college have risen 42 percent in the last 10 years—from \$1,760 in 1955 to \$2,500 in 1966. It is estimated that by 1972 these costs will have risen even further—to \$2,940.

A recent study by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges shows that the situation in public colleges is proportionately the same. Costs are rising so rapidly that today's senior pays 15 percent more in his fourth year of study than he did in his freshman year.

The implications of these rising costs could well be, as an official of the association said, "that public education in America as it was once known is disappearing."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should all be aware of the seriousness of the situation. Yet, I do not feel that rising costs necessitate the closing of college doors to a large number of our young people. We, in the Congress, have the responsibility to keep these doors open. We can do it by making sure that adequate financial aid is available to any student who needs it.

I should like to take this opportunity to encourage all of my colleagues in this House to support the higher education amendments when they come before us for consideration.

To emphasize my point, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article on rising college costs which appeared in the New York Times on November 5:

**COSTS UP SHARPLY IN STATE COLLEGES—FRESHMAN IN 1964 PAYS 15 PERCENT MORE IN CLASS OF 1968**

WASHINGTON, November 3.—Costs in public colleges are rising so fast that today's senior pays almost 15 per cent more for his fourth year than he did for his freshman year, a survey disclosed today.

The survey, by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, shows that four-fifths of the nation's public colleges and universities increased tuition, room and board rates this year.

Most of those public institutions that did not raise charges this year did so last year, the report says.

The survey reports that men in their senior year at public colleges and state universities are now paying an average of \$1,112 for total costs—including tuition, room and board. They paid an average of \$968 for the same items as freshmen in 1964.

#### WOMEN PAYING MORE

Women at the same institutions will pay an average of \$1,141 for total senior year charges. They paid an average of \$989 as freshmen.

Rates for women students are higher because most state universities charge women more for rooms.

The survey shows also that total charges for students at 99 land-grant institutions and major state universities that make up the national association average \$850 this year, up from \$830 for last year.

In all, the report says, tuition and required fees have risen 6.5 per cent for in-state students at the same institutions.

A large number of institutions taking part in the survey reported that they were forced to raise charges because state governments had not appropriated enough funds for state educational institutions this year.

#### OTHER COSTS A FACTOR

Rising costs of food, labor and construction were also cited by many state colleges and universities as reasons behind the rising charges to students.

The over-all climb in charges to students by state universities appears to cloud the future of public education in the United States.

The land-grant colleges and state universities were founded as publicly supported institutions where in-state students would be able to obtain a college education for minimum rates.

"The implication to be drawn from the rising charges by public colleges and universities is that public education in America as it was once known is disappearing," an official at the association commended.

United States Office of Education figures show that the cost of one year's training at an average private college has risen 42 per cent in 10 years—from \$1,760 in 1955 to \$2,500 in 1966.

#### A BANKER VIEWS THE MONEY PROBLEM

(Mr. RARICK (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a challenging paper on "The Real Causes of Today's Troubles," by Mr. H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., chairman of the board and president of the State Street Bank & Trust Co., of Boston, Mass., asserts the author's belief in individual liberty under God and private, free competitive enterprise.

I insert Mr. Hagemann's viewpoint in the RECORD and recommend its reading to all Members:

#### THE REAL CAUSES OF TODAY'S TROUBLES

(By H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., chairman of the board and president, State Street Bank & Trust Co.)

The people of this country are deeply concerned with crime in the streets, juvenile delinquency, high taxes, the rising cost of living, riots in the cities and the war in Vietnam. In particular, the continuing outbreaks of violence in American cities have left the country alarmed, perplexed and questioning.

At the same time, the international impact of the riots has shaken admirers of the United States all over the world and, of course, has delighted our enemies.

America finds itself in a dilemma, the solution to which calls for maximum resourcefulness, forthrightness and a high degree of national maturity.

There are many solutions advocated daily. Most of them are concerned with federal funds to be channeled directly to cities, or through the states. Others call for the creation of new or the expansion of present spending programs. But all of them have one common thread—they are, in the main, panaceas to relieve the situation. They are not remedies to cure the condition. And there is a dangerous temptation to react quickly to



rent economic expansion is indeed gratifying and impressive. We are told that our gross national product has increased nearly \$300 billion over 6½ years, and that it now exceeds three-fourths of a trillion dollars a year. But to me, and I am sure to most other Americans, the astronomic numbers tossed about by the economists are really too vast to comprehend. What we really want to know is what this has meant to John Q. Public, the average American citizen.

How far have we all shared this prosperity? Has any of us been short-changed, as has so often happened before?

Looking at the picture in these terms, I find numbers which I can understand much more readily. Let me cite a few:

Nine million more workers are employed today than in early 1961, and the number of unemployed has fallen by 1.6 million.

There has been real progress in cutting unemployment among minority groups and teenagers.

The aggregate income of wage and salary earners has risen by \$178 billion since the first quarter of 1961, or by 68 percent.

Private employee compensation per man-hour worked is up over 30 percent, and the number of man-hours worked has greatly increased, as a result of the fuller employment of a rapidly expanding labor force.

Corporate profits before taxes have risen by \$34 billion over the same period, or by 75 percent, allowing dividends to be raised by more than 70 percent. Earnings of unincorporated businesses and professions also rose dramatically.

Total farm income increased 35 percent between 1960 and 1966, and the value of farm assets by 28 percent. Income per farm rose 64 percent.

No section of our Nation, no industry, no group of our citizens has failed to benefit, and benefit richly, from this great recession-free advance.

At the same time, our growing resources have permitted us to make much more adequate provision for the needs of our elder citizens, in the form of both medical care and other benefits. And, with steadily rising tax revenues—despite tax rate reductions averaging 20 percent—we have been able to broaden greatly our provisions for education, for social services, and aids to the disadvantaged. And, at the same time, we have spent about \$30 to \$35 billion on the war in Vietnam.

In short, this unprecedented boom has had no stepchildren and no favorites. By every measure I can find, it has been truly pervasive, extending its benefits to virtually all of our citizens today and bearing promise of still more in the future.

#### OEO: COMMITMENT TO THE NATION'S POOR

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is up to this body to solidly reaffirm our commitment to the poor of this Nation, our commitment that America's future is also theirs, and that their hope is ours.

A very fine editorial, entitled "Commitment to the Poor," appearing in the Boston Globe of November 7, sums up the importance of the questions before us regarding the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, and rejects the alternatives to continued progress against poverty which some of our colleagues seem eager to have us adopt.

Referring to these alternatives, the editorial states that:

America cannot afford this kind of betrayal of its hard-up citizens. We have a commitment not only to attack the poverty problem but to carry through with the attack until it is successful. Failure to live up to this commitment would create a "credibility gap" within our own country which would take generations to heal.

Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with this timely statement of editorial opinion from a distinguished Boston newspaper and place the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### COMMITMENT TO THE POOR

The conservative coalition in Congress is insistent that the United States keep its commitments to the South Vietnamese and other far-off peoples, but it is far less scrupulous when it comes to honoring pledges to impoverished Americans.

The antipoverty program, which was launched with such fanfare only three years ago, is already in serious trouble. Set up with the clear understanding that it would be continued and expanded, it is now being hampered and cut back and threatened with imminent extinction. The expectations aroused in thousands of worthy citizens have been rudely disappointed.

Although we are now more than four months into fiscal year 1968, Congress is still bickering over an authorization bill for the poverty agency (Office of Economic Opportunity). Meanwhile no temporary funds have been made available with the result that many O.E.O. programs have literally run out of money and closed down.

The House this week takes up a \$2.1 billion O.E.O. authorization bill reported out by its Education and Labor Committee. This bill is far from ideal. It virtually destroys the community action program, for example, by requiring that it be run by local officials instead of private community leaders. It also creates needless problems by requiring that half of the 20 percent local contribution be in cash rather than "kind." But it does provide very nearly the whole amount of money asked by the administration and only a few million dollars less than the Senate has approved.

The big danger is that Republicans and Southern Democrats will gang up on the bill and amend it to death on the floor. One proposal is to take the poverty programs out of O.E.O. and reassign them to the older line agencies. Another is to apply a ceiling of \$1.2 billion on anti-poverty spending. If either of these moves succeeds, the poverty program will be as good as destroyed.

America cannot afford this kind of betrayal of its hard-up citizens. We have a commitment not only to attack the poverty problem but to carry through with the attack until it is successful. Failure to live up to this commitment would create a "credibility gap"

within our own country which would take generations to heal.

#### CONGRESSMAN JACOB H. GILBERT HONORED BY BRONX AMERIGO VESPUCCI LODGE OF SONS OF ITALY

(Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call your attention to the honor bestowed on our distinguished colleague, Congressman JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York, on last Saturday, November 11, when he was presented with the annual award of the Amerigo Vespucci Lodge 2159 of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America. At a dinner in his honor in the Bronx, Congressman GILBERT was presented with a plaque by Venerable Orlando Oliva of Lodge 2159 in appreciation for his compassionate concern for and his vigilant attention to the well-being of the Italo-American community. He was cited for his efforts in securing passage in Congress of the new immigration reform bill and for his support of a bill to make Columbus Day a national holiday. This award testifies to his being a true friend of Americans of Italian descent.

Mr. Speaker, the Sons of Italy is a fraternal society of Italo-Americans that started in New York City in 1905. Its motto is: "Liberty, Equality, and Brotherly Love." The fraternity is nonpolitical and nondenominational in concept and programs, and its membership comprises persons of every profession and occupation. It is the largest Italian organization, with lodges throughout the United States and Canada.

The aims of the Sons of Italy are to promote civic education among its members, to uphold the concept of Americanism; to encourage the dissemination of Italian culture in the United States; and to organize and establish benevolent and social welfare institutions for the protection and assistance of its members, their dependents and the needy in general.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman GILBERT considers it a particular honor to receive the award of the Amerigo Vespucci Lodge of the Sons of Italy. Every man in this body knows, as I know from my personal experience, that Italo-Americans have no better friend in Congress than JACK GILBERT. He is compassionate in his concern for the welfare of Americans of Italian descent. I commend Congressman GILBERT, and I commend the Amerigo Vespucci Lodge of the Bronx on its wise choice for this award.

(Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ADDABBO'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]



# PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WAR ON POVERTY IN THE NINTH DIS- TRICT OF INDIANA

(Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1967, I met with community action program directors in the Ninth District of Indiana to discuss informally and candidly with them the progress and problems of the war on poverty in southeastern Indiana.

This meeting was one of a series of meetings which I have held to review major Federal programs. In August I met with school superintendents in the district to talk about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and with hospital administrators to discuss medicare. In October I met with county welfare directors to discuss welfare programs. And I had a meeting with leaders of veterans groups to discuss veterans legislation.

Each Member of Congress has a responsibility not only to help draft and vote on legislation, but to see that the programs as administered and implemented do, in fact, accomplish the objectives of the legislation.

Before the October meeting with CAP directors, I sent the directors a letter asking them to explain and evaluate their programs and seeking suggestions on how the programs could be improved.

The Ninth District is predominantly rural, and it includes one-third of the counties in Indiana in which more than 30 percent of the families are in low-income brackets. Thus, the poverty program has special significance for the 17-county Ninth District.

A statistical analysis of the program follows:

## PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BUT FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

County	Number of participants (in school and out of school)	Federal funds (since Jan. 1, 1967)
Bartholomew.....	19	\$6,232
Clark.....	89	15,023
Dearborn.....	67	14,171
Decatur.....	17	4,273
Fayette.....	18	24,077
Franklin.....	33	82,050
Jackson.....	37	11,656
Jefferson.....	62	14,748
Jennings.....	21	5,138
Lawrence.....	48	15,641
Ohio.....	21	5,586
Orange.....	29	9,193
Ripley.....	47	13,886
Scott.....	35	10,328
Shelby.....	15	4,491
Switzerland.....	19	7,395
Washington.....	22	7,081
Total.....	599	251,019

In addition, the LOW Economic Development Corp., Inc., has just received approval of a project for the Neighborhood Youth Corps for 125 participants, utilizing \$114,630.

Green Thumb employs approximately 111 men in eight Ninth District counties:

Bartholomew, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Lawrence, Orange, Scott, and Washington.

Operation mainstream: Sponsored by

the Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corp., Inc., and employing 88 people with a Federal grant of \$203,050.

### COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN THE 9TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA SINCE JAN. 1, 1967

Agency and activity	Beneficiaries	Nonprofessional workers	Professionals	Teachers	Federal funds
Community action program of Bartholomew, Brown, and Jackson Counties:					
Rural resource center.....	4,521 families.....	24	2	0	\$39,162
Summer Headstart.....	210 children.....	48	16	14	57,584
Clark County Community Action Committee:					
Program administration.....	16,176 families.....	1	4	0	21,231
Year-round Headstart.....	285 children.....	28	18	15	167,925
Summer Headstart.....	60 children.....	6	5	4	10,994
Fayette, Franklin, and Union Counties Community Action Council, Inc.:					
Rural resource center.....	3,900 families.....	5	2	0	27,793
Summer Headstart.....	45 children.....	5	1	2	7,629
L.O.W. Economic Development Corp., Inc.:					
Program administration.....	5,706 families.....	2	2	0	31,345
Summer Headstart.....	195 children.....	21	21	13	55,896
Senior citizens centers.....	4,328 low-income elderly.....	1	11	0	51,591
Ohio Valley Opportunities, Inc.:					
Program administration.....	3,847 families.....	6	1	0	31,856
Summer Headstart.....	206 children.....	19	3	13	42,556
Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corp.:					
Program administration.....	33,500 people.....	6	3	0	42,987
Year-round Headstart.....	300 children.....	111	5	21	183,772
Summer Headstart.....	do.....	41	5	20	91,948

Note: The total amount of Federal funds allocated to date is \$864,269. In addition, the following funds have been allocated to the 9th District:

Adult basic education (3 participants).....	\$660
29 individual rural loans.....	51,330
2 small business loans.....	16,500
Total.....	912,604

### PRESENT PROGRAMS

The major programs which the six community action agencies in 15 counties have provided during the past year are Headstart, senior citizens centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and beautification projects.

All of the community action agencies have sponsored summer Headstart classes and two have year-round Headstart programs.

Four of the community action agencies have Neighborhood Youth Corps projects and one has a senior citizens program. One agency has an Operation Mainstream project, sponsored by OEO under the Nelson amendment and funded by the Department of Labor. This program provides work experience for the elderly on 10 park projects.

Green Thumb operates in eight Ninth District counties, employing 111 men. The Green Thumb program is authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act and funded by the Department of Labor. It is not part of the beautification program which is authorized under the Highway Beautification Act. It provides work experience for men over 55 years of age on the highways. They plant grass seed, clean roadside parks and plant pine seedlings.

Other projects sponsored by the local agencies in the last year include a hospitality program for the Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center, whereby boys from the center were invited into homes in the area; work-study programs in conjunction with Indiana University; and long-term low-interest rural family loans.

As was the case last year, by far the most successful and popular program is Headstart. The directors said Headstart

provides an opportunity to start with very young children. Good results are noted almost immediately.

The parents of the children, who otherwise might be reluctant to participate in the activities provided by the local agency, become involved through their interest in helping to provide an opportunity for their children.

Headstart has successfully provided a basis for participation in other activities. It is the basis for a beginning of total involvement of the low-income community, a major goal of the war on poverty.

As the local leaders and aides meet the parents, ways are found to also help these parents. They have been encouraged to participate in the Headstart activities, and many have proved to be very helpful as volunteer or salaried aides.

### PROBLEMS AND CRITICISM OF THE PROGRAM

First. Administration: Although obvious progress has been made in the regional office in Chicago, and in the local agencies themselves, there are several problems which, if corrected, would make the program more effective.

Although the directors felt that the application process has been improved, they still felt it takes too long to review the applications. The main complaint was that officials in the regional office wait until the last minute to review applications, no matter when they are submitted. They felt that the staff in the regional office charged with processing the applications is too small, causing a delay in the processing.

Second. Communications: The directors said there is a need for better communications between the regional office and the local agencies. Several times there have been phone calls and letters



which have not been answered, or not answered promptly. Some directors told me that personnel in the regional office often evade questions because they do not know the answers either.

**Third. Funding:** The most serious concern of the directors was the delay and difficulty experienced in funding the programs.

When programs were approved at the last minute, as frequently happened, the local agencies very often did not receive their funds in a reasonable length of time, causing a problem in paying salaries and meeting other financial obligations. This happened with summer Headstart programs.

The directors were particularly concerned with the inadequacy of funds. OEO could not fund "new" programs because funds were very limited this past year. This forced the local agencies to leave out more creative programs. All of the directors felt that some funds should be designated for specific areas. However, they believe the goals of the poverty program cannot be realized until the local agencies are able to initiate programs which will attack specific problems in their areas.

They all agreed that the programs, to be more effective, must be long term, permitting long-range planning. Unless they are allowed to plan and implement new programs, stagnation will result. Effective programs depend on an assurance of adequate funds to allow planning and implementation.

For example, one director presented the plan his agency has for attacking poverty in his area.

Beginning with Headstart, his plan would involve children, and through these children, their parents. This has been done.

Now he would like to develop five neighborhood centers for everyone from the elementary school age through senior citizens. He also wants to establish a family planning program for parents.

However, this agency has not been able to plan completely or begin to implement the plan because funds are not available. Obviously, the war on poverty falters in such an instance, as the initiative of the local agency is frustrated.

Some of the agencies which did not have year-round Headstart programs last year cannot even have them funded this year because they are new programs. One agency in the district has submitted applications for three year-round programs, and serves a county which is an EDA-designated depressed area and is in real need of Headstart. Summer Headstart programs have been tried in this area with much success, but year-round programs cannot be funded.

**Fourth. Rural areas:** The directors complained that officials in OEO do not understand the particular problems of rural areas.

For example, the directors have regularly met resistance from officials in the regional office to transportation costs, necessarily high because of the sprawling rural areas served.

**Fifth. Technical assistance office:** The directors believed the absence of a technical assistance office in Indiana

handicapped the work of the community action agencies.

Several directors said the problems encountered with applications would be minimized if a technical assistance office were available in Indiana. They also felt communications would improve if such an office were in operation.

**Sixth. Training sessions:** Most of the directors were critical of the training sessions held in September 1967 at the University of Wisconsin. The meetings, they said, were poorly planned, too general, and not of specific assistance to directors with experience. The sessions consisted of lectures, and did not deal with specific problems. They would have been more beneficial if they had lasted 5 days, instead of 3, and if small group sessions had been planned, involving directors with similar experience and similar problems. There should have been time allowed for discussion and questions. The directors also complained that there was too much emphasis on reports and regulations.

#### IMPROVEMENTS SINCE LAST YEAR

**First. Regional office:** Substantial improvements have been made in the organization and administration of the regional office in Chicago. All of the directors were concerned at this time last year with the operation of the Chicago office; however, this year they praised Regional Director Alan Beals and the operation of the office since he took over.

The local agencies have also become more competent. One director observed a definite change in the attitude of the officials in the regional office toward his office as his organization improved and gained the confidence of regional officials. He said:

As far as rapport is concerned, this was established at the same time that we grew up to the fact that confidence had to be earned, and rapport is a two-way street.

**Second. Involvement of the poor:** A major objective of the poverty program is to involve the poor in working toward solutions to the problems of poverty. This is a radical departure from the traditional concept of "service to the poor." By helping themselves, the poor take an essential step toward breaking the "cycle of poverty."

The directors noted a marked improvement in the involvement of the poor in all of these activities. Last year they had mentioned that, except for the parents of Headstart children, it was difficult to reach those the program was designed to help. Many of the people to be served did not know about the program, and others were indifferent. This year they have been more receptive.

At first the local agencies' only contact with the low-income community was through the board members who were from the poverty group. The directors soon found success came when they learned to lean on the board members and other neighborhood leaders, sincerely seeking their advice and assistance in tackling a common problem.

Involvement of the poor still remains a difficult, but essential, part of the agency programs. Not every effort to reach and involve them succeeds. Many

of the people to be served do not have access to newspapers and other news media, and do not hear about these programs. Specific efforts must be made to contact them directly.

**Third. Community acceptance:** Local communities in which the agencies operate have become more aware of the goals of the program through the cooperation of local news media, the volunteers in the program, and the public information program conducted by the agencies themselves.

Community acceptance is particularly evident in the case of Headstart, senior citizens, and the Nelson amendment park project. As people in the community realize the program is not just a "give-away" and see constructive projects in progress—disadvantaged children learning, parks made more useful and beautiful, young men and women engaged in keeping county records—their attitude begins to change; and their acceptance of the program increases.

A long road must be traveled, however, before community action programs are firmly established and accepted. Questions reflecting a lack of community acceptance of various programs come up often, and all of the agencies have a formidable public relations task before them.

**Fifth. Coordination with county welfare departments:** In the last year the coordination between the community action agencies and directors and the county welfare departments has improved. Both CAP directors and welfare directors I met with felt that this increased interaction has been helpful to the agencies and beneficial to the communities they serve.

**Sixth. Response of the people:** I have had a number of letters from constituents who are participating in the programs. The letters quoted below show better than anything else the impact of these programs.

Following is part of a letter from a woman who was an aide in a summer Headstart program:

I am now working for the Head Start school and I think it is wonderful.

It just brings out the real love a person has for children, especially these children—which I didn't know even were in town.

I understand these needs because I was having a very hard time a few years ago myself. We just couldn't pay our doctor bills and eat. The good people here helped us and I really appreciated it.

So now I am glad to have a part here in helping these children. Until this Head Start was started I baby sat for people. I never dreamed I could be of any help to anyone or do anything. This program not only helps the children. It has helped me to realize just because a person is growing older [is no reason] he can't be of help to his own community. I just hope this program will continue to grow to greater things.

I have received quite a number of letters from men working on the Green Thumb project:

I hope and pray that the Green Thumb will continue and that I can keep the job I now have.

I'm glad I'm working on the Green Thumb project. I like the project. I think it is a good idea. I'm interested in this work also.



This is the first job I've had in 14 years. . . . I thank you for letting me work on this job, and everyone else who had anything to do with it.

Recently I had a letter from a woman who participates in the activities of the senior citizens. She told me about her activities and then said:

I am a charter member of the Senior Citizens Club. The center was started two years ago by a group of people here. . . . I have found a number of friends. I enjoy the Senior Citizens Club very much.

I am a widow of 27 years and live alone and have no transportation.

So I didn't get out much.

Now the center sends out cars to pick up the ones that don't have any way to go.

The Senior Citizens Club is a wonderful place for the elderly people. . . . There are no words to describe what the government has done for the senior citizens center. We are indeed grateful.

Recently, Social, Educational Research, and Development, Inc., of Silver Spring, Md., evaluated the senior citizens program in the district. One of the comments made was:

There is no question that the LOW Senior Citizen's program is providing a truly worthwhile service.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT

First. Action on applications: The directors could not understand why the regional office had to wait until funds were actually available before reviewing applications. They suggested much time could be saved if preliminary reviews of the applications could be made so that when the money became available, approval could be quickly given and the local programs begun.

Second. Technical assistance office: Better communications and an improved application process would result if Indiana had a technical assistance office. All of the directors strongly favored such an office.

Third. Funding: The many problems related to funding will be resolved if community action agencies have the assurance that adequate funds are available for planning and implementation of programs. Without the assurance and availability of funds, it is safe to say the community action agencies cannot operate as efficiently and effectively as hoped and expected.

Fourth. Better understanding of the problems of rural areas: a greater recognition of the peculiar problems of rural areas by officials at OEO could also increase the effectiveness of the programs, such as the importance of transportation and the difficulties encountered in multi-county organizations.

Fifth. Visits from the regional office: Regular visits by regional office officials to local agencies, bringing new ideas and concepts being tried in other areas would be an excellent way to stimulate the agencies. Regional office teams could travel to the local agencies to talk to the boards of directors and staff members about the particular problems affecting these agencies and possible solutions for their problems. Through such visits procedural matters could be worked out, new ideas exchanged, information related

and the channels of communications opened.

Sixth. Letters of encouragement: One of the directors commented on how much she appreciated receiving a note of thanks for her work in the community from Sargent Shriver, the Director of OEO. She said that this was the first time in 2 years that she had received such a letter, and she felt that it would mean a great deal to the people who work for the program if such letters were more frequent.

Seventh. Premier OEO: The directors felt strongly—that OEO should not be dismembered, and some of its programs transferred to other agencies. This is the only agency which speaks just for the lower income community and should continue to be this voice. The directors pointed out, for example, that Headstart is not merely an educational program, but also a means to involve parents and the entire low-income community in jobs, volunteer activity and a host of other activities.

The directors felt that the goal of total community involvement would be destroyed if OEO were disbanded, or if the successful programs were transferred.

#### CONCLUSION

There have been disappointments in the poverty program. Good results have not been attained as soon as many expected. The people to be served have often shunned and ignored efforts to assist them. Some participated in the activities for a time and left. Administrative tangles have occurred, and community acceptance has been slow in coming.

Nonetheless, a balanced view of the program in the Ninth District acknowledges that several efforts have succeeded, and others are beginning to make headway.

Headstart classes have enabled the children to have a better start in school than they would otherwise have had. Young men and women have been given opportunities to work and earn money through the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps in a great variety of productive tasks. Many have gone back to school to learn more about an activity which has caught their interest. Parents have become more interested in doing more for their children. Senior citizens have become active, contributing members of their communities again, earning money, beautifying public places, creating a center for their friends and enjoying a great variety of activities.

A beginning has been made. It is not impossible to find weaknesses in the program. However, the roots of poverty in any community are deep and stubborn. With the problems it has had, perhaps the amazing aspect of the poverty program is that its impact has been so significant in the lives of so many.

(Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HAMILTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there exists today widespread discussion of and discontent with the present operation of automobile insurance practices throughout the United States.

Recently the House Judiciary Committee published a staff report unequivocally stated:

Materials in the preceding chapters of this report make it abundantly clear that further investigation of the automobile insurance system in the United States is in order. Further investigation is mandatory should Congress find it necessary to enact constructive legislation that would alter the present automobile insurance regulatory system.

Information set forth in this report shows that, by any objective standard, performance of the automobile insurance business in the United States is unsatisfactory. The system is slow, incomplete, and expensive. The companies and organizations involved in furnishing this service to the public in many respects do a poor job.

Legislation that is designed to improve performance in the U.S. automobile insurance business involves decision on two fundamental policy issues. A substantial body of factual information should be collected before these basic policies are decided. The policy decisions are:

(1) Shall the Federal-State relationship that is established in the McCarran-Ferguson Act for regulation of the automobile insurance business be continued?

(2) Does the function of the automobile under modern economic and social conditions require changes in U.S. compensation systems applicable to individuals that suffer economic losses and personal injury as a result of automobile accidents?

Mr. Speaker, among the various alternatives to the present fault-liability system of adjudicating claims is the no-fault system operating in Saskatchewan, Canada.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of November 7, 1967:

INSURANCE INNOVATION: A CANADIAN PROVINCE FINDS A WAY TO SLASH AUTO CRASH LITIGATION—COMPULSORY NO-FAULT POLICIES SOLD BY SASKATCHEWAN PAY ALL VICTIMS AUTOMATICALLY—SIMILAR PLANS URGED IN UNITED STATES

(By John F. Lyons)

REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN.—The accident was a bad one. Two cars going in opposite directions on a narrow road crashed into each other on a dark night. Of the five occupants, four were killed.

Had it happened anywhere but in Saskatchewan, chances are that little if any liability insurance benefits would have been paid, because it was impossible to establish which driver was at fault. Because it did happen here in Saskatchewan, however, damages totaling \$35,000 were paid to families of the cars' occupants—and nobody had to hire a lawyer or file suit to get the payments.

The reason: Saskatchewan's automobile insurance policies provide death and injury











# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 15, 1967  
For actions of November 14, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 185

## CONTENTS

Air quality.....	11	Economics.....	22,30	Migratory birds.....	20
Appropriations.....	10	Employment.....	25	National Grange.....	13
Awards.....	4,12	Farm Bureau.....	9	Payroll allotments.....	29
Butter.....	18	Farm labor.....	21	Poverty.....	1
Civil rights.....	3	Farm program.....	23	Public lands.....	16
Commission.....	30	FES.....	17	Research.....	5,17
Continuing		Fiscal policies.....	6	Rice allotments.....	2
appropriations.....	10	Food.....	6,23	Shipping.....	26
Credit.....	8	Foreign trade.....	24	Social security.....	15
Credit unions.....	28	Grain storage.....	7	Tobacco stems.....	28
Crop insurance.....	14	Grants to States.....	17	Water pollution.....	27
CSRS.....	17	Imports.....	28	Watersheds.....	19

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated poverty bill. Both Houses adopted conference report on air quality bill. Senate rejected Sen. Javits' amendment to include continuing appropriation provision in military construction bill.

## HOUSE

1. **POVERTY.** Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill. pp. H15168-212, H15239-41, H15256-65, H15269, H15278
2. **RICE ALLOTMENTS.** A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action S. 2195, to provide that, if the farm marketing excess of rice determined for any farm is delivered to the Department, such farm would be considered to be in compliance with the farm acreage allotment for such year. p. D1028



3. CIVIL RIGHTS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10805, the civil rights bill. Senate conferees have not been appointed. p. H15168
  4. AWARDS. Several Representatives commended SCS Administrator Williams upon his receipt of the Rockefeller Public Service Award for Administration. pp. H15218-19, H15229-30, H15252-3
  5. RESEARCH. Rep. Fascell commended the completion and "successful operation in Key West of the world's largest and most efficient single-unit water desalting plant," and inserted material on this subject. pp. H15224-5
  6. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Zwach inserted an editorial, "Don't Blame the Merchant," which states "the cost of food...is directly related to the spending and fiscal policies of government." p. H15227
  7. GRAIN STORAGE. Rep. Jones, N. C., commended USDA's action in instructing the "Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State committees to make full use of Government excess storage bins so that grain and soybean producers will have additional storage space for their 1967 crops," affording some measure of protection "against the price-depressing effects of temporary excessive market supplies." p. H15253
  8. CREDIT. Rep. Hanna urged action on the truth-in-lending bill and inserted supporting articles. pp. H15269-71
  9. FARM BUREAU. Rep. Resnick stated that the Kansas Attorney General's report on the Kansas Farm Bureau confirms his conviction that a "full-scale investigation...is urgently needed." pp. H15277-8
- SENATE
10. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 71-3, as reported H. R. 13606, the military construction appropriation bill, after rejecting, 44-33, a motion to suspend the rules so as to make in order an amendment by Sen. Javits to continue appropriations through Nov. 30 for those agencies whose regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. A two-thirds favorable vote would have been necessary to suspend the rules for this purpose. Conferees were appointed. pp. S16390-2, S16398-412
  11. AIR QUALITY. Both Houses adopted the conference report on S. 780, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S16392-6, H15165-6, H15230
  12. AWARDS. Sen. McGovern congratulated Administrator Williams of SCS on his receipt of the Rockefeller Public Service Award for Administration. p. S16382
  13. NATIONAL GRANGE. Sen. Javits commended the National Grange on the celebration of its 100th anniversary. p. S16427
  14. CROP INSURANCE. Sen. Holland commended the increased participation in the crop insurance program by Fla. citrus growers and inserted remarks by FCIC Manager Luft on this subject. pp. S16386-7



it appears the first time in line 1 on page 6 and insert: "or publicize".

Page 6, line 14, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 16 and insert: "or selling".

Page 7, after line 10, insert:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit a State nonmember insured bank from acting as agent of a State operating a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State."

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

Page 7, lines 22 and 23, strike out "publicize, or keep any record of" and insert: "or publicize".

Page 8, line 11, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 13 and insert: "or selling".

Page 9, after line 8, insert:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit an insured institution from acting as agent of a State operating a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if all amendments are germane to the bill as it passed the House. It is difficult to understand what all of these amendments mean. I want to be sure that the amendments that were adopted are germane to the House bill.

Mr. PATMAN. May I proceed for about 2 minutes to explain the bill, and then I will try to answer the questions of the gentleman.

The acceptance of the Senate version of this bill would not destroy the basic thrust of the legislation as passed by the House. We passed the bill in the House in July. It was intended to prevent any national bank or any bank that is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from selling lottery tickets anywhere. That has nothing to do with the lottery law in any State, but it just prohibits Federal agents, in other words, from selling lottery tickets for any State or any political subdivision.

The House passed the bill by quite a substantial vote of about 71 percent. The Senate took up the bill either last week and debated it again yesterday and passed the bill by a much bigger majority than did the House. There was a vote on a motion to recommit which was defeated

by a vote of 56 to 17. Even those who opposed the bill did not ask for a rollcall vote with the statement that the Senate was obviously overwhelmingly in favor of it and a rollcall on its final passage would not be asked for.

The Senate made some amendments to the bill, which are all right as far as I am concerned, because we never intended to cover the areas that the Senate covered in their amendments. Our proposal was just to prohibit the people working for banks that were connected with the Federal Government from selling lottery tickets. That was done for the obvious reason that it is really inconsistent with our traditional practice in the Federal Government to discourage gambling. We encourage thrift and saving instead.

If we were to allow banks to sell lottery tickets, they would have one lottery ticket window and one thrift window. Even people who had pension checks to cash would be placed in the unusual position of getting their checks cashed at the same window where they were asked to buy a lottery ticket. This, of course, just does not make too much sense in the usual banking practice. Now I do not know of any banks that really want this situation. I just do not know of any. I do not think the banks of any State want to do that. However, under the peculiar situation they were in a position where great pressure was brought to bear on them to do it. The Senate amendment provides that the banks can still carry accounts for people as they have in the past.

You know, there is a lot of gambling going on besides just lotteries. Any gambling institution now can carry an account in a bank and receive a report and statement thereon, just like anyone else.

This law was not intended to stop them from doing that at all. It was only intended to stop the bank itself from permitting its employees to sell lottery tickets. In other words, matters connected with gambling. Personally, I agree with this concept.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, if the questions which I shall propound to the chairman of the committee can be answered satisfactorily. However, I am not wholly satisfied with what the Senate amendment does.

In my opinion this language will open the door to banks to enter other business than banking business. The language, I think, would permit the banks, possibly, to computerize the lotteries and, perhaps, even selecting the winning numbers of the lottery.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if that is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is not contemplated. The manner in which the Members of the other body explained it to me, and as the amendments would indicate to me, as I gather it, I share the views of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that banks should not

have an unrelated business. I have been in opposition to that over the past many years as has the distinguished gentleman. I share her views entirely.

But, there is nothing in these amendments that would indicate that we would be setting a precedent for the purpose of a bank in the future to be permitted to engage in that kind of operation should they ask us to allow them to do it. This is not a precedentmaking language situation as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that it is not the intent to allow the banks to get into any other unrelated business.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say for the record that insofar as the handling of the accounts are concerned I can see no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But I think there should be in the legislative history the fact that they will not be able to do anything else except handle the accounts with reference to the lottery money.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree thoroughly with the distinguished gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, RESERVE FORCES BILL OF RIGHTS AND VITALIZATION ACT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of the National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, HÉBERT, HARDY, BATES, and BRAY.

#### MAKING IN ORDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under clause 8, rule XXIV, shall be in order on Monday, November 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader clarify for the Members of the House the intent of this particular request, and this rule?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri, District of Columbia business would be made in order by this rule.

Mr. HALL. And it is intended to take up the District of Columbia business on which day?



Mr. ALBERT. On Monday next. It does not displace the regular order of business.

Mr. HALL. It does not displace the regular order of business?

Mr. ALBERT. No, it does not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### OKINAWA "TALKS"

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Sato of Japan was scheduled to talk with President Johnson last afternoon, and among the topics indicated for discussion, was the future status of Okinawa.

While it is a pleasure to have any sovereign nation's Prime Minister as a guest in Washington, I hope the President will not make the same mistake in regard to Okinawa that he has made in regard to Panama. Under no circumstances should the United States consider at this time any change in the status of Okinawa and our sovereignty thereover. Okinawa is a vital bastion of our Pacific defense perimeter, and is a vital and essential cog in our Vietnam supply line. Americans paid a heavy cost in lives in World War II to secure Okinawa from Japanese control, and there is no reason to believe that the inhabitants of these islands would benefit from a return to Japanese control.

The United States has made a tremendous economic investment in Okinawa as evidenced by the bill recently considered by the House and Senate resulting in a compromise \$17 million expenditure. There are no doubt many great problems deserving of attention when the President meets with Prime Minister Sato. But the question of sovereignty over Okinawa is not among them.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 363]

Anderson, Ill.	de la Garza	Laird
Anderson, Tenn.	Derwinski	McClory
Andrews, Ala.	Dickinson	MacGregor
Annunzio	Dorn	Martin
Ashbrook	Everett	Mathias, Calif.
Aspinall	Fountain	Mathias, Md.
Bell	Fullton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.
Broomfield	Gaimo	Multer
Button	Halpern	Myers
Clawson, Del.	Harsha	Poage
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	Pool
Cowger	Herlong	Purcell
Davis, Ga.	Howard	Rallsback
	Kleppe	Reinecke

Resnick  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
St. Onge  
Scherle  
Stafford

Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stephens  
Thompson, Ga.  
Ullman

Utt  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN BANKS AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FROM FOSTERING OR PARTICIPATING IN GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10595) to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I objected earlier to the unanimous-consent request that we concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It is an antieducation bill and it is an anti-New York State bill, posing under the guise of morality and in opposition to gambling. I intend to do what I can to delay its enactment into law as long as possible.

Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter, this bill is an attempt to tell the sovereign State of New York and its voters who have adopted this lottery by a referendum election—and I did not support that proposal and my congressional district did not support it, but the people did overwhelmingly support it, are we now to tell the people of New York State that they cannot carry on that lottery and cannot use the funds from that lottery, funds which are being directed toward education in our State? Shall we tell the people of New York they cannot raise money in that way? Shall we tell them that the entire burden will fall upon the shoulders of the taxpayers to raise that money instead from their own pockets? If so that is going to represent quite a problem to our State, and to the children in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, just because the other body has passed it, it seems to me no reason at all for us in this House to hasten the enactment of this unwise, unfortunate, and highly discriminatory legislation against the voters and the children of New York State.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10805, TO EXTEND THE LIFE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10805) to extend the life of the Civil Rights Com-

mission, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, RODINO, ROGERS of Colorado, McCulloch, and BIESTER.

There was no objection.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee arose on yesterday, it had agreed that section 102 of the committee substitute amendment would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to section 102?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: On page 154, after line 7, strike out everything through line 13 on page 168 and insert: "Sec. 102. (a) Parts 'C' and 'E' of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are redesignated 'Part F' and 'Part G', respectively; sections 121 through 126 are redesignated respectively as sections 171 through 176, and section 141 is redesignated as section 181, which is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 181. Each of the programs under this title shall be carried out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. From the amounts appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this title in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, there is hereby directed to be allocated the sum of \$38,500,000 for Part B, the sum of \$100,000,000 for Part C (less any amount expended in such year prior to the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 for the in-school programs authorized under Part B of title I of this Act), the sum of \$5,000,000 for Part D, and the sum of \$100,000,000 for Part E (less any amount expended in such year prior to the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 for the out-of-school programs authorized under Part B of title I of this Act),



of which \$70,000,000 is reserved for carrying out the Industry Youth Corps program authorized under section 163.

"(b) Parts B and D of title I of such Act are repealed, and replaced by new Parts B, C, D, and E, to read as follows:

"PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR ADULTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will help unemployed or low-income adults, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

"COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 121. (a) The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

"(b) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to a community action agency or to a public agency or private organization to carry out one or more component programs.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 122. (a) The Secretary may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:

"(1) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks highways, and other lands;

"(2) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

"(3) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having

substantial outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

"(4) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

"(5) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

"(6) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: *Provided*, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Secretary shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

"(7) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this title.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 123. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of

so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

"PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 124. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Secretary, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"ELDERLY

"SEC. 125. The Secretary shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

"PILOT PROJECTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 126. (a) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

"(b) The Secretary shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

"(c) Before the Secretary may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

"(d) The Secretary may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist



in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

#### "ROLE OF THE STATES

"SEC. 127. The Secretary may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

"(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 126(d), with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

"(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

"(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

"(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

#### "EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 128. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Secretary shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 122(a) (3); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 122, the Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 129. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 122 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 223(c).

#### "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

"(b) The Secretary shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development

and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"(c) The Secretary shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 122, 126(d) and 127.

#### "PART C—SECONDARY SCHOOL WORK STUDY PROGRAM

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 131. It is the purpose of this part to enable needy young men and women to continue or resume their education at the secondary school level through work-study programs carried out in the school or by public or private nonprofit organizations.

##### "ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK STUDY

"SEC. 132. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a work-study program for secondary school students to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary').

##### "ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 133. (a) From the sums allocated to carry out this part for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount, not in excess of 2 per centum, as he may determine, and shall allot the amount so reserved among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. The remainder of such sums shall be allotted among the States so that the allotment to each such State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of related children aged fourteen to twenty-one, both inclusive, living in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 in such State bears to the number of related children of such ages living in such families in all such States.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Secretary may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year from funds allocated for this part shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

##### "STATE PLANS

"SEC. 134. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this part shall submit to the Secretary a State plan, in such detail as the Secretary deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State educational agency as the agency which shall, through arrangements with local educational agencies or other public or private, nonprofit agencies, act as the sole agency for the administration of the plan;

"(2) sets forth procedures under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 133 will be expended for work-study programs meeting the requirements set forth in section 139, and by which such

funds will be held apart from general State funds;

"(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies or other local public or private, nonprofit organizations for work-study programs;

"(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other agency or organization) under this title;

"(5) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(6) provides a standard of income of participants and their families that takes due account of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining, subject to the Secretary's approval; and

"(7) provides for participation of non-public-school students comparable to the participation of public school students.

##### "ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 135. (a) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 134(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

##### "JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 136. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 134(a) or with his final action under section 135, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the Court to the Secretary. The Secretary shall thereupon file in the Court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the Court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the Court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The Court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the Court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.



**"PAYMENTS TO STATES"**

"SEC. 137. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 133, the Secretary shall pay to the State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

**"BYPASS OF STATE AGENCY"**

"SEC. 138. In the absence of a satisfactory State plan, or satisfactory implementation thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make grants from such State allocation directly to community action agencies or substitute agencies qualified under title II of this Act, in order that work-study programs may be provided by contract arrangements or otherwise.

**"QUALIFICATIONS OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS"**

"SEC. 139. A work-study program shall not be considered eligible by the State or the Secretary for assistance under this part unless—

"(1) the program will enable students to resume or maintain school attendance;

"(2) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;

"(3) the students will be employed by public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations including recipients of funds themselves either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private, nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious worship, or involving the conduct of any sectarian religious activity;

"(4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers, jeopardize the potential employment of workers not aided under this part, or impair existing contract for services;

"(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical area, and proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(6) the program will be coordinated to the maximum extent feasible, with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of students in such program and sponsored by State or local public or private educational agencies: *Provided, however,* That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or where appropriate, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary;

"(7) the employer during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall contribute at least 10 per centum, and during any fiscal year thereafter at least 25 per centum, of the total cost of employing any such student (such contribution to be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant equipment or services); and

"(8) in States in which participation of all non-public-school students is permitted, students in such non-public schools are admitted to the program on an equitable basis.

**"ENROLLEES IN PROGRAM"**

"SEC. 140. (a) Selection for enrollment in programs assisted under this part shall be made by participating school systems in ac-

cordance with agreements with the Secretary.

"(b) No person may participate as an enrollee in programs under this part unless—

"(1) he is a student in ninth through twelfth grades;

"(2) his and his family's income does not exceed the standards of income established under section 134(a) (6);

"(3) he is in need of remunerative employment to resume or continue his secondary level education.

"(c) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(d) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, the Secretary may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private, nonprofit organizations.

**"OATH OF ALLEGIANCE"**

"SEC. 141. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to enrollees in programs assisted under this part and to all officers and employees any part of whose salaries are paid from sums made available under this part.

**"PART D—COUNSELOR PROGRAM"****"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"**

"SEC. 151. It is the purpose of this part to assist needy youths to find part-time employment with private profitmaking employers, and with public or private nonprofit organizations on a work-study arrangement, which will enable them to continue or resume their education at the secondary level, through the services of a counselor who will counsel such youth and will seek out, obtain job openings for and place such youth in such openings.

**"OPERATION OF PROGRAM"**

"SEC. 152. (a) To carry out the purpose of this part, the Secretary is authorized to contract with local public or private, nonprofit, educational agencies for the hiring of a counselor, to be located in the school, who will

(1) provide counseling and testing to determine students' capabilities and needs, and (2) seek out, obtain job openings for, and place such youth in such openings on a work-study basis for needy students with private profitmaking employers and with public or private nonprofit organizations, with such employers and organizations paying 100 per centum of the students' wages.

"(b) The Secretary shall give preference to applications submitted by local public or private, nonprofit, educational agencies serving large numbers of youths from low-income families.

"(c) The Secretary shall not approve the application of a local public or private, nonprofit, educational agency which is already carrying on a program described in section 152 unless he has received satisfactory assurances that such agency will not reduce its expenditures for such program.

"(d) In no event shall the Federal payment under this part exceed 50 per centum of the salary paid to the counselor.

**"PART E—WORK TRAINING PROGRAM; INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS"****"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"**

"SEC. 161. It is the purpose of this part to provide needy, unskilled, and unemployed young men and women who have terminated their formal education with on-the-job training opportunities which will enable them to become self-sustaining in a vocation.

**"ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK TRAINING PROGRAM"**

"SEC. 162. (a) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary') shall establish in the Department of Labor a work training program which shall be administered locally wherever possible

through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist public and private, nonprofit, employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. Such program shall be administered in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with public and private, nonprofit employers (other than a political party or organization) in the area served by such agency to provide on-the-job training and necessary related services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such public and private, nonprofit employers to carry out the purposes of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and the reimbursement of not more than 75 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such public and private, nonprofit employers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the reimbursement of not more than 50 per centum of the cost of such wages paid during each succeeding fiscal year.

**"ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM"**

"SEC. 163. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Labor an Industry Youth Corps program to be administered locally wherever possible through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist private, profit-making employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services, such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. The Secretary shall encourage farmers and other employers in agriculture and agriculturally related enterprises to participate in such program by hiring eligible youths for training in farm occupations for which there is a potential of long-term employment.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with private, profit-making employers in the area served by such agency to provide such training and services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such private, profitmaking employers to carry out the purpose of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and not more than 25 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such private, profitmaking employer.

**"CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS"**

"SEC. 164. (a) Any contract made with an employer under section 162(b) or 163(b) shall provide that eligible youths will be hired under terms of employment which provide that—

"(1) an integral part of such employment shall consist of on-the-job training in an appropriate vocational skill area (including supplemental classroom instruction where appropriate), with opportunity for reasonable progression and pay raises consistent with individual performances;

"(2) the employer will, whenever possible, offer suitable long-term employment to any individual who successfully completes his on-the-job training, or assist such individual



to find suitable long-term employment elsewhere: *Provided*, That such employer shall not displace previously employed workers or impair existing employment contracts;

"(3) the employer will provide adequate and safe facilities, and adequate personnel records of attendance and progress;

"(4) such youths will be compensated at reasonable rates comparable to, but in no event in excess of, the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(5) the term of employment shall not exceed one year, except that such term may be extended for one additional year if it is ascertained by the employer that (A) such youth would be unable to qualify for suitable employment at the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services without reimbursement of a portion of the employer's wage costs attributable to the employment of such individual, and the reasonable costs of providing on-the-job training and related services to such individual; and (B) the employed youth probably will benefit from an additional year of on-the-job training; and

"(6) the determination of eligibility of any youth shall be made by the employer, in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary.

"(b) Any contract under sections 162(b) and 163(b) shall be negotiated with due consideration for minimizing forms and procedures imposed upon the contracting employers.

"(c) Under no circumstances shall any contract be made under sections 162(b) and 163(b) unless there is assurance that the obligations of the employer under such contract and under any arrangements he may make with an eligible youth will be discharged in good faith.

"(d) The employer of any eligible youth pursuant to the provisions of this part shall have the same authority to supervise, assign, provide working conditions for, and discharge such youth as he has with respect to regular employees.

#### "ELIGIBLE YOUTHS

"Sec. 165. (a) For purposes of the programs authorized by this part, an eligible youth shall be an individual—

"(1) who has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two at the time he contracts for employment with such employer;

"(2) whose income (together with his family's income if he is a dependent thereof) does not exceed a standard of poverty set forth in rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary on the basis of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of such youth to be self-sustaining;

"(3) who is unemployed and unable to obtain employment in an appropriate vocational skill area; and

"(4) who has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and as to whom there are no immediate prospects of returning to school for additional education or vocational training.

"(b) Eligible youths employed pursuant to programs authorized by this title shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

#### "PAYMENTS

"Sec. 166. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemploy-

ment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this title shall be used within any one State.

#### "COORDINATION WITH STATES

"Sec. 167. The Secretary shall consult with any State assisted under title II of this Act to achieve the most effective coordination feasible of programs assisted under this title with programs assisted under that title.

#### "OATH

"Sec. 168. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to eligible youth in programs assisted under this part."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point. It is the same amendment that is in 1(b) in the so-called opportunity crusade.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say merely this: We have made the point on several occasions before, before this body, that it appears to us on this side of the aisle that some of those who have spoken on these matters have not been thoroughly aware of the specifics of our proposals. We are prepared to consider the amendment as having been read so long as it is understood that if there are any questions about it whatsoever that there will be questions raised in the course of the discussion. It is not true that this is entirely the same as the suggestions that have been made in the opportunity crusade. The first section is somewhat different in this regard, and we will explain it in the course of the discussion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman makes a good point. It seems to me that on a complicated amendment like this, the gentleman would have made arrangements for copies to be available for Members on the floor to see and to read. From just the reading of this amendment now, nobody really can have a thorough understanding of what is in this amendment. I hope the gentleman is going to explain it and I would like to see a copy of it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I may answer my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, you will find that in the course of the discussion we will point out to you where you already have in your hands, partly in the committee's proposal and partly in the opportunity crusade, the written specifics of this amendment. I let this go on this long in part to call clearly to the attention of the majority party where it was that this could be found so there could be no question.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I would say to the gentleman from New York that all changes involved in the amendment here come from the opportunity crusade. They are before you in print. There is no question about that. There is a portion that does not strike the entire section of

your committee bill. That part is unchanged and that is before you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I can see that the gentleman is consistent. Obviously, the gentleman from New York does not know what the gentleman from Oregon is proposing so far as the opportunity crusade is concerned. The gentleman from New York says there is no change from the opportunity crusade and the gentleman in the well said there are substantial changes. Why do not you two gentlemen get together and let the Committee know what you are doing.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman misunderstood the words spoken very clearly by the gentleman in the well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is before you breaks down into four parts.

The first part is part B, work and training for adults. This bears very considerable similarity to a program which is set forth in the committee amendment which is part B thereunder, part B, sections 102 and subsequent.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 384]

Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Hansen, Wash.	Pool
Annunzio	Hays	Purcell
Ashbrook	Heckler, Mass.	Railsback
Aspinall	Herlong	Reinecke
Bell	Kelly	Resnick
Broomfield	Kirwan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Button	Laird	St. Onge
Clark	Landrum	Scherle
Clawson, Del	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Conte	MacGregor	Springer
Conyers	Martin	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Mathias, Calif.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	Mathias, Md.	Ullman
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Everett	Moorhead	Vander Jagt
Fountain	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Willis
Glaimo	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2388, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK] is recognized.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we have proposed is about a 34-page amendment. In view of the fact that we consider this of major importance, I ask unanimous consent that I



be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the gentleman make the request at the end of his first 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, we have here in this amendment a proposal to take the various work-training programs which are in part in the present law and in part in the committee proposals as amendments and in part new and put them in this one particular amendment.

Part B of the proposal which is this amendment is the part B of the committee proposal which is the old parts B and D of the present law, with these two changes therein.

First. This is now a work-training program for adults—not for youths and adults.

Second. We have taken a section of the law where the responsibility is in the hands of the Office of Economic Opportunity but delegated to the Department of Labor, and we have provided that the responsibility be given by statute to the Department of Labor.

Part C of the amendment which is before us deals with secondary school work study.

We have here another section of the law where a portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, covering youngsters in school, at the present time in the hands of the Office of Economic Opportunity is delegated to the Department of Labor.

This is essentially an education-oriented program.

We therefore propose in this section to separate the inschool Neighborhood Youth Corps and out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. We take the in-school program and see it for what it is, an education-oriented program, and place the responsibility in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We also in this particular proposal provide for the institution of a State plan. A State plan after being proposed would be checked by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would be subject to judicial review if there be a dispute as to the action taken by the Secretary.

In addition to this, there is a bypass provided and there is here provision for employment. This is a program designed for young people who ought to be in school to help keep them in school. We here provide for contribution toward salaries by both the Federal Government and by private employers or public non-profit employers on a 90-10 basis for the first year and on a 75-percent Federal contribution and 25 percent for public or private nonprofit agencies basis every year thereafter.

This is part C, the secondary school work-study program.

In part D we have a new program which is not in the present law and is not in the committee amendments. It is called a counselor program. Here is where we have, Mr. Chairman, one of the particularly significant advances proposed by the opportunity crusade.

Part D is in the opportunity crusade. To anyone who has not already read the proposal in full which is before each one of us in H.R. 13894, I refer them to this particular section where they can read in detail any part that they may want to read.

The counselor program is part D. This program provides essentially that Federal funds would be used on a matching basis with local school districts to employ work counselors, counselors who will deal with the young people, talk about what their goals are, find out what their job interests are, make sure there is active solicitation in the community as to the availability of jobs, as to the stirring up and seeking for jobs, and then to take the very significant step of seeking to have these people placed in those jobs.

Later speakers will dwell in detail on this particular program. This is one of the particularly significant additions of the opportunity crusade.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLENBACK was given an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, one more word on this counselor program. We are here talking, you see, about Federal funds going into only one phase of the operation, namely, helping to provide counselors who will perform these important functions. When jobs are found for the young people, it is expected that private enterprise will pay the full cost of those salaries paid to the young people.

Here we see one of the significant breaks in the whole concept of the opportunity crusade. It is not a case of using Federal funds to create jobs where the full salary or where even the bulk of the salary is paid by Federal moneys. We are here talking about Federal moneys being seed moneys to help find the jobs, to help stir up jobs, to help place in jobs.

Part E of the proposal which is before us is a combination of Work Training and Industry Youth Corps. The Work Training is a modification of the old out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Part of the essential difference in this regard is, one, that under the old law this is in the hands of the Director of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Economic Opportunity, delegated to the Department of Labor. We would provide that this be placed by statute in the hands of the Department of Labor. We would provide here that there be 75 percent Federal money, 25 percent employer money initially, the first year, and that this progress to a 50-percent Federal money and a 50-percent employer money for all years thereafter, instead of the 90-percent Federal and 10-percent employer money which is implicit and runs through both the present law and the proposals of the administration.

I stress this point as I go by it because, again you see, we are here making the

significant point that it is through procedures like this that Federal moneys ought properly to be used. Federal moneys ought not to be used to pay all or substantially all of the salaries of the jobs we are seeking to find and to place young people in. Federal moneys ought to be seed money to stir up these jobs and place young people in them.

The second half of this part E, the Industry Youth Corps, is here as a new program. We are here talking about a situation where Federal moneys could be used to pay a portion of salaries. Young people would be placed in this instance in private profitmaking jobs. Here again is a second very significant feature involved in the Republican opportunity crusade, because again, you see, we do not have enough Federal moneys to take care of payment in full of salaries or even a substantial portion of all salaries. We are here talking about a situation where we turn to private industry and we say, "We have young people who need jobs. We want you to take them on. You tell us that you cannot take them on at full salary initially because they are not worth that to you and you cannot subsidize them. We say to you that if you take them on at 75 percent of what you need to pay them to get them, the Federal Government will supply the other 25 percent of this money to make the marginal difference." The result is that it is worth a private employer's rising to the subsidy, a subsidy limited in percent and limited in time.

Through this we would stir private enterprise to reach out and pick up a part of the job themselves, to do the training that needs to be done, because private enterprise knows the jobs it wants young people to fill. And it would pay the bulk of the salaries involved.

So far as the dollars are concerned, under part B we would provide \$38.5 million Federal money. Under part C we would provide for \$100 million, less what has been spent on this portion of the program during the year to date. Under part D we would provide only \$5 million, for the counselor program, because the vast influx of money here would come from outside employers. Under part E we would provide for \$100 million of Federal money, less what has been spent to date on this portion of the program.

That would be a total Federal expenditure of approximately \$243 million. The present committee proposals in this regard, if we total them up, are about twice this amount, or about \$461 million, but one cannot stop there. The \$243 million of Federal moneys under our proposal would act as an incentive, would act as seed to bring into the program at least four times that much.

If we look at the Community Youth Corps, where we would be paying 25 percent of the wages, we would expect that 75 percent would come from outside, and as a result we are talking about another \$210 million involved in this.

If we look at the counselor program, with a total Federal injection of money of \$5 million, we would conservatively estimate, on the basis of the best predictions we can put forward, that we should



be dealing with at least another \$500 million. Some of the estimates we have been able to secure in this regard indicate it would be double this amount.

So we have at least between \$700 million and \$1.2 billion of additional moneys going toward the root causes of poverty under our proposal.

What we are here talking about—I repeat this point again, because I do not want any question about anyone missing it—is, this would increase manifold the total funds striking at the causes of poverty.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again we see a move to cripple most useful programs that are contained in part B.

First, discussing the Neighborhood Youth Corps, this has served 1.3 million youngsters in the past 2½ years in school and out of school, and has assisted others to become employed, between the ages of 16 and 22. These, all, have been disadvantaged youngsters.

It is proposed, for all intents and purposes, to destroy a very effective program.

In the amendment it is proposed to transfer this to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the original crusade it was to be transferred to the Office of Education.

Do Members know the next requirement? According to language in the amendment, if Members will read the opportunity crusade, there would be required a State plan for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. Another lengthy step, another bureaucratic layer to be penetrated in bringing needed programs to youth who need the job experience, who need the training, who need the income to continue in school.

Mr. Chairman, this is a workable program, an efficient program.

NYC is preparing poor people to compete for jobs by giving them work experience and training; it is helping to improve community services by putting the unemployed to work in fields, such as health, which suffer from a shortage of personnel; and it is a major factor in moving people off the welfare rolls into permanent, dignified employment.

NYC is primarily a community program. Projects are sponsored by local organizations on the State, county, municipal, and neighborhood level. The Labor Department lays down the guidelines and funds up to 90 percent of the cost. The day-to-day administration is in the hands of the local sponsor, who locates the worksites, recruits the youngsters, and arranges for supportive services. Many enrollees are placed in jobs in hospitals. Others are sent to libraries, cafeterias, museums, police and fire stations, housing projects, schools, parks and nursing homes.

Boys and girls in the in-school and summer projects are paid \$1.25 to \$1.40 an hour, earning that extra bit of money that usually means the difference between completing their high school education or becoming dropouts.

The in-school program allows youngsters to work in their spare time up to 15 hours a week. In the summer and out-of-school projects, they spend up to 40

hours a week working or taking advantage of supportive services such as remedial education or job related training.

When the Neighborhood Youth Corps was organized in 1964, sponsorship was limited to nonprofit groups, and enrollees had to be 16 through 21 years old. The idea was to give poverty-level youngsters work experience that would help them qualify for jobs, to make them self-sufficient, and to expand community services. Three years of trial and experimentation have led the Labor Department to refine that original concept. NYC now enrolls boys and girls as young as 14, when it is easier to persuade them to remain in school. Private industry has been brought into the picture to supply worksites and to aid in training and placing the youngsters, thus giving NYC the benefit of business' know-how and vast resources. Local sponsors in many areas are now training youngsters for specific jobs, thus easing the transition from NYC into permanent employment.

By June 30, the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the Neighborhood Youth Corps had made available 1,327,000 job opportunities for disadvantaged youth in every State and U.S. territory at a cost to the Federal Government of \$753,504,000. In fiscal year 1967, NYC provided 521,000 job opportunities in 1,459 home town projects at a cost to the Federal Government of \$362,425,000.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has proved highly effective in keeping disadvantaged youngsters in school. A study completed in May 1967 by the Pittsburgh Board of Education of all high schools in the city for the previous school year disclosed that the dropout rate for NYC enrollees was only a little over 4 percent compared with an 8½-percent dropout rate for non-NYC students. An NYC summer work program in 1965 and 1966 at three high schools in Washington, D.C., cut the normal dropout rate for these schools from 20 percent to 2 percent by June 1967. Six school districts in Texas and Oklahoma reported a 7-percent dropout rate among their regular student bodies as compared only to 3 percent among NYC enrollees.

Dr. Louis J. Kishkunas, assistant superintendent of Pittsburgh's schools, attributes NYC's remarkable "holding power" to the money it puts into empty pockets and the sense of pride and responsibility that goes with an NYC job. In other words, boys and girls earning a little extra money can buy the books and clothes they need to keep up with their more fortunate schoolmates.

As for the out-of-schoolers, the NYC wage rate of \$1.25 to \$1.40 an hour would have little holding power if enrollees were given deadend, make-work jobs. Supportive services play a vital role in rechanneling these neglected youngsters into the mainstream of American society. The counseling and remedial education made available by local NYC projects to out-of-schoolers build a solid foundation for future work, training or education. A recent study of the out-of-school program by Dunlap and Associates, Inc., revealed that approximately 9 months after termination from NYC, 35 percent of the former enrollees were working at perma-

nent jobs, 6 percent were in military service, 18 percent were in advanced training programs or had returned to school and 11 percent were housewives—a total of 70 percent.

An impressive example of how the out-of-school program salvages dropouts is revealed in an article appearing in the September 1967 issue of *Hospital & Community Psychiatry*, a journal of the American Psychiatric Association. It also reports how NYC channels the Nation's youthful manpower into those sectors of the economy suffering from a severe shortage of personnel. For nearly 2 years now, a statewide NYC program in Pennsylvania has been training youngsters in job assignments at the State's mental hospitals and school for the retarded. The first project was completed in July 1966. Of the 240 NYC enrollees who completed the 24 weeks of training and work experience, 100 obtained jobs and 63 were hired by the institutions where they trained.

A second project, from August 1966 to February 1967, produced an even higher employment rate.

The magazine reported:

Exactly 50% or 132 of the 264 enrollees, were in jobs when the training ended, 93 in the hospitals where they trained. Of the 156 NYC trainees who were hired by the hospitals after the first two projects, 102 were assigned to the nursing services after they passed the state civil service examination for attendant-trainees.

The project sponsors mobilized a variety of public and private agencies to insure the success of this program. Hospital staff members, public assistant caseworkers, employment counselors, and YMCA employees all worked together to establish the work assignments and training procedures—which include 96 hours of training, averaging 4 hours a week.

NYC's success in rehabilitating so many of these youngsters is particularly significant because out-of-school enrollees are recruited from the ranks of high school dropouts and the hard-core unemployed. Historically, more than 26 percent have come directly from families receiving public assistance. More than 48 percent in fiscal 1967 projects had only a ninth-grade education or less. Almost 90 percent had been out of school and unemployed for 3 months or longer. Almost 27 percent had been out of school for 13 to 24 months. More than 60 percent reported that most of their earnings were used for the support of their families.

It should not be surprising that the young corpsmen also get into less trouble with the police after they enroll. As Winston Churchill once said:

Everyone should do a good day's work and be accountable for some definite task and then they do not make trouble for trouble's sake or to cut a figure.

Community after community reports a reduction in juvenile crime, thanks to NYC. In San Antonio, for example, juvenile delinquency declined 12.6 percent in the slum areas last year, where NYC was operative, while it jumped 5.5 percent during the same period in the



higher income areas of the city and county.

A letter early in 1967 from a local judge stated that juvenile delinquency decreased 30 percent in the Dayton, Ky., area and he gave the credit to NYC. Police in other cities report reductions in juvenile crime ranging from the lowest rate of increase in 5 years in Washington, D.C., to an 80-percent decline since the initiation of the NYC program in Kinloch, Mo. The Los Angeles Times reported in May 1967 that only 1 percent of the enrollees in a project in that city had been convicted of a crime since enrolling, though 50 percent had previous criminal records. Four other California cities with NYC projects report a reduction in crime last year: Oakland, a 25-percent decrease; San Francisco, 10 percent; Stockton, 15 percent; and San Jose, 28 percent.

Youngsters active in juvenile crime often find themselves on the right side of the law after joining the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Labor Department figures show that in September 1967 more than 2,500 enrollees were working in public safety jobs. Their job titles varied. Some were called police cadets, others sheriff's aides or correction officer's aides, still others public safety cadets or police aides. Many of them had previous police records. All served a common purpose. They helped relieve a shortage of personnel in a crucial area of public service, while preparing themselves for permanent jobs.

The police cadet programs are worthy of special attention. Jersey City, Paterson, Newark, Detroit, and Kansas City, have all funded police cadets with NYC money. The cadets promote good relations between law enforcement officials and the residents of low-income neighborhoods where the youngsters live by introducing poverty level youth to the work and problems of the local police force. These cadets and other young people enrolled in NYC won high praise from police officials for their work during the riots that hit several cities during the summer of 1967.

The performance of the Newark cadets was called "magnificent" by Police Director Dominick A. Spina. And in Detroit, Hubert G. Locke, administrative assistant to Police Commissioner Ray Girardin, called the help of the cadets "invaluable" during that city's summer calamity. Mr. Spina reported that he had his command post at the fourth precinct and that on the worst night of the riots, four of the cadets showed up to help. He said there were snipers all about, and the building was being pelted with rocks and bottles. The precinct was rushed three times, once with Molotov cocktails. But Mr. Spina said "the kids were right there." The rest of the cadets reported for duty at police headquarters.

The cadets in Newark and Detroit worked 12-hour shifts. They manned police department telephone switchboards and performed other routine but important tasks, freeing regular officers for riot duty. In Detroit, during a brief telephone breakdown that caused a "communication chaos," as Locke described it, the cadets served as messen-

gers to keep information flowing throughout police headquarters.

Mr. Locke said:

It was in critical moments like these that these young men proved their worth.

The cadets were not the only NYC enrollees to risk their necks to help restore order.

Thirty-five enrollees in Newark, many of them girls, reported for duty at city hospital, in the heart of the riot area. Working 12-hour shifts they relieved exhausted nurses, prepared food, and helped wherever needed. Enrollees working for the Newark Housing Authority aided in everything from emergency food distribution to loading and unloading trucks. They went door-to-door in the low-income public housing areas to locate people needing help.

One of the best stories involving the Neighborhood Youth Corps was one that did not make headlines. Mansfield, Ohio, stayed out of the news because the NYC project director and corpsmen managed to cool a riot before it started. As rumors of trouble began to grow in July in Mansfield's ghetto area, the NYC project director, backed by a local CAP official, went into the area. The two men knew many of the youths personally, and at a meeting with some 70 of them, encouraged the young people to air their gripes and promised immediate action on their legitimate grievances.

The youths organized into a group with a dual purpose: to better living and recreation conditions for the community and to prevent the city from exploding.

The two youths who assumed leadership of the group were both NYC "graduates" who became the driving force in getting the group organized. At one time considered troublemakers, the two boys now have full-time jobs and are responsible citizens, thanks to NYC.

Because of the help I.e had received from NYC, one of the leaders said:

I owe something to this community so let's maintain law and order.

In East Harlem in New York City more than 1,860 NYC youths were deployed to use their influence to help overcome grievances and prevent disorder. The corpsmen visited the street corners, poolrooms and other teen hangouts and recruited several hundred frustrated, angry youths into the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Their efforts helped East Harlem keep "cool."

A new avenue for training out-of-school, unemployed youth was provided by the 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. For the first time Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees are now permitted to receive job training in private industry. Known as "Work Training in Industry" these projects extend worksites for NYC'ers and allow the private sector of the economy to play a more prominent role in developing the employment potential of thousands of disadvantaged youth. Private firms in different cities give enrollees job training, wages, and fringe benefits, while NYC continues to provide additional services such as remedial education, medical attention, and counseling.

Traditionally, NYC has worked closely

with private labor and business groups in order to provide the best services for enrollees.

In California, the Alameda County AFL-CIO this year is pioneering a new type of NYC project to teach 410 school dropouts good work habits and basic job skills. Skilled union craftsmen employed by the Alameda labor organization supervise and instruct enrollees in clerical work, landscaping, remodeling and other construction projects. Those youths who perform satisfactorily in the work experience phase are offered additional training in marketable job skills such as welding, auto mechanics, carpentry, office machine operation, and office procedures. Trainees are paid from \$1.35 to \$1.60 an hour for a 32-hour workweek.

A private corporation joined with the NYC project in Paterson, N.J., to create a business skills training center for out-of-school youngsters in that city. One purpose of the project was to encourage the local business community to participate in job training and placement programs for disadvantaged youths. Another was to demonstrate the tremendous source of skilled workers such a program can produce. Enrollees attended classes approximately 8 hours a week where they were trained in typical office practices, typing, key punch operation, bookkeeping, data processing, and proper work habits. The company trained two specialists to develop and administer the program, in addition to providing curriculum materials. After 3 months of training, the first 30 graduates were honored at a ceremony in Paterson in June 1967. The NYC project director in Paterson said that almost all the young people had jobs waiting for them in the community when they graduated. By actual count, Olivetti located 102 openings for these graduates.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps during 1967 has proved itself a flexible instrument for tackling the problems of the disadvantaged. Within its legislative framework, it was able to experiment with a variety of innovative projects that can guide the Nation's manpower programs into fruitful and previously uncharted paths. NYC in 1967 launched an attack on the migrant problem, explored new ways of improving medical services to the poor, and took dramatic steps to secure college scholarships for enrollees with only average or below average grades.

A pilot project to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their children move out of the cycle of poverty into the mainstream of American society was jointly funded in June by the Labor Department—through NYC—the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the U.S. Office of Education. The \$2 million experimental program included basic and remedial education, occupational rehabilitation, health and food services, economic support, and work experience for 1,000 youngsters aged 14 to 21 in Florida, California, and Texas, and their families.

A medical program was a summer project in Chicago and Los Angeles. Medical and health students and 155 NYC youngsters worked side by side in



poverty-stricken neighborhoods to bring better medical services to the poor. Purpose of the experimental program was to acquaint NYC youths with the world of medicine and to interest them in biomedical careers. It was also to acquaint the medical students, most of them from well-to-do families, with the health problems of the poor.

One of the most promising innovations is the success of many NYC project directors in securing college scholarships for their enrollees, despite average or below average grades. By hard work and diligence, they have been taking advantage of the flood of scholarships that have become available in the last year or so from public and private sources, designed to give college education to disadvantaged boys and girls showing great promise.

In Philadelphia, NYC director Louis P. Goldstein secured scholarships for 37 of his charges. In Charleston, S.C., project director James E. Clyburn reaped a harvest of 29 scholarships to Wilberforce University for his enrollees. The Charleston Evening Post said:

Apparently Clyburn's youngsters walked off with all the Wilberforce awards made in the Southeast.

The history of the Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot be recounted by numbers and statistics alone, satisfying and reassuring though these may be. NYC has meant the reshaping and the reordering of the lives of the individual youngsters. It is the story of Trudie Archie in Louisville. It is the story of 18-year-old Haston Pulley of Little Rock, Ark., a Negro youth who no longer draws welfare and gets in trouble with the law but who now uses his leadership abilities to organize recreation programs for other poor children. It is the story of Sue Pederson in Minneapolis, only 18, who finished high school, got off the welfare rolls, found a permanent job at Minneapolis General Hospital and is now helping support her mother and the four other children in the family. It is the story of Annette Dowdell, 18, of Jacksonville, Fla., no longer on welfare, working full time in the laboratory at the State board of health, and supporting herself and her two children.

These are true stories. They are but a few of many. They tell the people who were down and out, and who now have fresh hope and a new chance in life. They no longer draw welfare money and no longer find it necessary to be paid by NYC. They are standing on their own two feet, competing successfully in the job market, earning their own money for themselves and their families. These youngsters illustrate what the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the war on poverty are all about. As Abraham Lincoln said about another war:

It is a struggle . . . to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the path of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life.

This amendment is most damaging. I am hopeful that none of the Members of this House will be gullible enough to support an amendment that will destroy the effectiveness and deny hundreds of

thousands of youngsters the opportunity to participate in a program of this type.

Now, what else do they do? They cut the funds to the bone. In our program during the next fiscal year we propose to spend for the Neighborhood Youth Corps \$321 million. Their total expenditures for title I(b) are \$243.5 million. These projects have gotten off the ground and are doing well.

We have in here in the committee bill something that will serve 106,000 youngsters for the in-school program. We have funds in here that will serve 50,000 youngsters for the out of school Neighborhood Youth Corps and for the summer program 80,000 for the rural areas and the metropolitan areas of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PERKINS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. They talk about all the spending and the program activity that this so-called opportunity crusade is going to generate from the expenditure of \$1.4 billion. There are indications that a significant number of on-the-job-training positions for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees can be developed in the private sector. This effort has the potential of becoming an effective, economical method of easing the transition from training to the work situation. Increased emphasis will also be placed on research, evaluation and demonstration activities, in a concerted effort to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of program operations.

As in the past, enrollee wages and fringe benefits will continue to constitute the largest single element of the Federal contribution: approximately 80 percent of the in-school, 85 percent of summer and 79 percent of regular out-of-school program wages and benefits.

The full-term enrollment opportunity levels for fiscal 1968 reflect a decrease over those funded with fiscal 1967 appropriations. It is anticipated, however, that the actual number of enrollment opportunities in operation in fiscal 1968, will be at or slightly above the fiscal 1967 level, due to the continued operation in fiscal 1966 of projects funded in fiscal 1967, except for the summer program.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Not right at this moment because I do not have enough time to yield to the gentleman. It takes a real slight of hand to attempt to sell an amendment on the basis that it will reach more young people with a 50-percent cut in funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we come down to the adult training programs. Under the proposed amendment, adult training programs would be authorized only \$38 million as contrasted with \$258 million in the committee bill. But the crusade advocates are making some progress. In the original version no funds were provided for adult training.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH].

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that the opposition to this amendment is again trying to gloss over what the real issue is. This, perhaps, is the most constructive amendment that we have presented or will present to this entire bill. It presents one thing, and one thing clearly. It states that right now, in our educational system, if you do not go to college, you are regarded as a "second-class citizen" in our educational system. And, Mr. Chairman, it strikes hard at that question. It proposes that we must place the highest priority upon developing an effective work-study program within the present educational structure. This is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the major thrust is this: It emphasizes the need for counselors: adequately trained, adequately placed, effective, functioning counselors within the school system and within the community. And, it provides Federal funds for these counselors. Now just what will these counselors do? The counselors will recognize the job possibilities that are available within a given community and then fill those openings through the provision of job-related programs in cooperation with secondary schools and community colleges.

Nowhere in the present bill do we have this emphasis. The one need that we have had demonstrated again and again throughout this country by educators and employers alike is the need for adequately trained counselors to find the jobs that are available; then, secondly, to find the people to fill those jobs, training those people adequately in the process.

That is the thrust of this amendment.

I urge those on both sides to forget the idea that this amendment is destructive. This is the most constructive amendment that we can put on any bill of this nature in this Congress this year.

Now what is the second impact of this amendment? The second feature of this bill proposes that we are going to enroll in the war on poverty private industry, and it sets up a vehicle through which we can enroll private industry in the war on poverty.

It has always been my understanding that any time a nation is fighting a war that they utilize to the fullest extent possible all of their resources. This amendment does just that: It utilizes the private sector, encouraging the private sector and private industry in cooperative work-training programs. That is the second major thrust of this amendment.

Now the philosophy behind the amendment presents the concept that those young men and young women who were dropouts can be made productive citizens of our communities. This is in contrast to the make-work programs where we place young people on these make-work programs, just to get them employed, to get them off the streets, but we give them no long-range hope. In contrast, this amendment gives them training and opportunity to be contributing members of our society.



Now, make no mistake. Decide your vote on these questions:

Do you or do you not want to involve the private sector? Do you or do you not want to have counselors involved in effective programs throughout this country? Or do you want to continue the present cycle?

Do you or do you not want to have the cycle of a young man at age 16 waiting to get out of school to get a job, to get a car, to become delinquent, or to get drafted, or do you want to break that cycle with an effective program of one, counselors; and two, effective work and training programs involving the private sector, and the present educational structure?

If you answer these questions correctly you will vote for this amendment, no matter which party you belong to. This is the most pressing need we have in our country today. How long are we going to let the non-college-bound students in our high schools remain second-class citizens? That is the question you have to answer here today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult—and I noticed two of the previous speakers asked for extensions of their time—to discuss a 34-page amendment in 5 minutes or, indeed, in 50 minutes. I will try to discuss several aspects of it in the most logical way that I can in these few minutes. Mr. Chairman, this is an area of activity in which there has not been a great deal of partisanship in the past, and I do not want to inject any partisanship here, but I would respectfully disagree with the conclusions of the proponents of this 34-page amendment.

They indicate they are motivated by a desire to involve private industry. I might say to the gentleman who has spoken in this vein, so am I, and indeed we have made some very notable improvements along this line in the manpower training provisions of title I in the committee bill.

I think perhaps the outstanding new feature of these manpower programs in the committee bill is the involvement of private industry in a much more significant way.

I think too that a very considerable problem arises from the different kind of involvement our Republican friends propose. In effect, they propose that the community action agencies in each community shall have the power to select certain employers and pay 25 percent of the wage cost for disadvantaged youths hired by them. That could continue for one year. Thereafter if the employer decided that he would like to have them for another year and that they are still not the kind of people to whom he would want to pay a full wage, even after the first year, he can have them for another year at a subsidized wage.

Now, I want to involve private industry, but I want to do it in a careful way. I do not know how I would explain to

employers in my community how it happened that a community action agency was paying 25 percent of the wages of the employees of their competitor. I do not know if you want try taking that one on, to explain it to some employer in your district whose competitor is having his wage cost subsidized by the local community action agency. But I would prefer to avoid that explanation if I could.

Finally, as to this business of generating additional money. Of course, the amount authorized is less than half of the amount authorized by the committee bill. But we are told this would generate private money. It is said that if we spent, let us say, \$50 million on counselors, it will produce \$300 million of private wages for those counseled. Well, if the problem was that simple, we shouldn't stop at \$50 million for counselors. We ought to put the whole \$2 billion into counselors and we would really be in business.

I wish the problem were that simple but it is not.

We have in this program a carefully rounded, well thought-out manpower training program. I think it is an excellent manpower training program in terms of flexibility and of the linkage of one element to another so that it does a complete job for the individual who needs it, tailored to his needs. I think we already have the best manpower program that has ever appeared in any piece of legislation. I hope the Committee will agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 2:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman that he withhold his request? It has been our experience, and as we saw yesterday, that when a request is made to limit the time, a great many Members stand up to be recognized under the limitation of time. I think we might finish debate on this amendment before 2:30 o'clock without limiting the time. Certainly, we might go along without a time limitation for 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's observation, I withdraw my request.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Esch], in his exceedingly eloquent support of this amendment, paid some great attention, and wisely so, to the counselor provisions. Let me try and respond briefly to the remarks of the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], because I think, while we may on the surface appear to be going in the same direction in involving private industry,

the bill, in my judgment, is woefully inadequate to truly provide the kind of involvement that will be meaningful to those for whom we are attempting to provide training.

For example, Sar Levitan testified in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor—

A major problem of NYC has been that most enrollees were assigned to "make work" projects. The public and nonprofit agencies that sponsor the vast majority of programs contribute only 10 percent of the cost of a project which can be made in kind. In most cases, NYC labor is free labor. As a result, it is not surprising that NYC enrollees are frequently assigned to perform only marginal work. Requiring public and nonprofit agency sponsors to increase their contributions in hard cash might improve the situation. I am not at all sure, however, that many areas which need NYC the most could or would raise more funds to finance NYC projects.

In the study of the National Analysts, Inc., of the NYC they found—

The attitudes toward the NYC are grossly negative, primarily because the salary is seen as too low and the status of the jobs they perform is very low.

I think that is a critical factor. The question here is whether we will continue, as the committee bill proposes, to operate on the basis that the Federal Government ought to be sponsoring simple, make-work jobs, or whether we can, in fact, move to redirect the program through the kind of amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Interestingly enough, the cost per enrollee in the in-school NYC program is estimated by the Labor Department to be \$650 for fiscal 1968, and 138,000 youths are enrolled in the in-school program. The universal need, according to the Labor Department, of children ages 14 through 21 who are in school and need financial assistance to remain in school amount to 2.1 million and the fiscal 1968 projection for this program will only reach 7 percent of those youths.

Again, are we to continue on the age-old story of paying a large amount of money to service only a very small number of people?

The cost per enrollee in the out-of-school NYC program is estimated by the Labor Department for fiscal 1968 to be \$3,050. The Labor Department has also estimated the universal need for this program or the total youths who are eligible as 660,000. They have also stated the projection for fiscal 1968 will only cover 10 percent of this need for the program.

If the Industry Youth Corps were adopted with private industry paying three-fourths of the wage, as is provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, the number of youths who could be reached would more than triple and for the same amount of money approximately 225,000 or roughly one-third of the estimated need for this program could be filled, as compared to the committee's bill, which covers only 10 percent.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon makes good sense both in terms of more completely and more cooperatively involving private industry to expand the



service that is available and reducing the cost to the Federal Government so that we do not continue on the age-old treadmill of simply having the Federal Government pick up most of the cost, and therefore limiting the number of young men and women who could be served. If we want to open the doors of opportunity, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be adopted.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, as one who has had some training and certainly a great deal of interest in the subject, of this amendment, I am distressed by the manner in which the business of counseling is bypassed with the language that this is simply an attempt to cripple the present legislation. In fact, in the summer employment programs under our present legislation it has always been related that one of the best features is the counseling service, which is very meager.

This I know: If we are to keep students in school, if we are to direct their educational and vocational capabilities and motivations, it is imperative that regular, continuing, and complete guidance and counseling services be provided. It is incongruous that members of the committee now minimize the importance of counseling. They again put politics ahead of pedagogical truths.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ERLENBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. I am surprised, really, at the offhand manner in which this amendment is completely rejected by the administration forces.

We see here another case of administration myopia. They just cannot see anything beyond the bill which has been reported by the committee.

It is also interesting to see the test which is used time after time by the administration forces. They measure every program in terms of Federal dollars. The amount of Federal dollars appropriated is their test of worth of the program.

The fact that one can involve private enterprise through the Industry Youth Corps, in this amendment, just does not impress them at all. This would not appropriate enough in the way of Federal dollars.

As I say, this is a case of complete myopia. They cannot see the worth of any other program.

One of the speakers took the well and said, "Why, if you are so proud of this program for counselors, why do you not put the whole \$2 billion in the program?"

Is that not a fine way to comment on what I believe is a very thoughtful proposal?

The counselor program provided for in this amendment could do a great deal toward developing the youths in school, seeing that they remain in school and do not become dropouts, and seeing that they gain during their school years some worthwhile work experience—and without a vast Federal expenditure.

But, of course, one cannot put a Federal price tag on this. If we could appropriate \$2 billion or \$5 billion, then this would be a fine program, in the opinion of the administration apologists because we would have the Federal dollars which is their test of value.

The administration forces talk so glowingly about the partnership between the Federal Government and private industry in the Job Corps. Then they just completely deprecate any partnership in an Industry Youth Corps or a work-study program.

Let us compare the Federal partnerships in the two instances.

What kind of a partnership do we have in the Job Corps between the Federal Government and private industry? Is this a partnership in which each is contributing of its talents and its resources? Of course it is not. This is totally federally funded. All private industry does is to contract with the Job Corps to furnish certain services. They are not furnishing, as a part of the partnership, any of the financing. They are not producing anything. They are merely competing for contracts that are available through the Job Corps.

That is not a partnership in the sense we are talking about a partnership between Government and industry, the private sector, in the Industry Youth Corps. Here we would have a meaningful participation by industry, not just a competition to get the Federal dollar. Here would be a contribution by industry in the training of youths, paying them from their own finances, partially, and having that part which represents the difference between the value of the services the youth performs and what they have to pay him under the minimum wage standards picked up by the Federal Government.

This would be a meaningful partnership between the Federal Government and industry.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Illinois has talked so much about the substitute generating so much employment. I wonder whether he feels this substitute bill might not even produce one extra cent, for the simple reason that it would allow recipients of assistance to count their existing non-Federal expenditures toward meeting the matching requirements in the bill?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am sorry. I just do not follow the gentleman's question. I am talking about the Industry Youth Corps and its participation.

Mr. PERKINS. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has completely misunderstood the amendment. There is an allegation being made about another section dealing with community action. We did not talk about that matter. That is not involved in this amendment at all.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I did not think it was, and I did not follow the gentleman's question. It did not seem to be related to the amendment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I admire Mr. DELLENBACK who supports this amendment and spoke for it. He has been a thoughtful and creative member of this committee but I do not detect any worthwhile purpose behind this amendment. Our Republican colleagues speak of involving the private sector. It is deeply involved. Last week I read a roster of several dozen firms that were only symbolic of the hundreds participating across the country. The National Association of Manufacturers itself is involved as a consultant and a professional resource. The chamber of commerce is heavily involved in cities across the country. In San Francisco the chamber of commerce is involved in developing over 1,000 jobs. Of the elements in the poverty program, the job training and employment elements in I-B, are the most successful and the least controversial elements we have. They are working quietly, effectively, and solidly across the face of America in every State of the Union, with the total support of the civic, industrial, business, and banking leaders who are designing these programs.

Our Republican colleagues say we can improve a noncontroversial program of this kind designed to give job training and employment by interlarding in its direction and control the community action agencies. It is a strange way to continue a classically noncontroversial program.

They tell us we can involve more kids with better training by cutting the budget more than 50 percent.

We all know neither of these basic approaches is true. We have a program which is working, which is accepted, which is productive, and which is getting kids who have failed in their high school careers, for whatever reason—and we do not have to assign guilt or blame now—to succeed in absorbing education and job training in a job environment. There is not one of the hundreds of the private corporations giving these job training and placement services that has not involved job counseling as the essence of the job they are performing. The counseling proposal would simply duplicate in providing what is a built-in ingredient in all of these training employment programs.

I suggest we get on and defeat this amendment and leave intact without change the most successful single element in the bill, the job training and employment programs which have heavily and meaningfully involved the private sector of our economy and provided per-



haps the outstanding example in this bill of total participation by the business leadership of America.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dellenback amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the reaction from some of our colleagues who oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, prior talks with them at various times seem to indicate to me that they favored, very strongly, involving all of private enterprise in these very programs for such privately productive jobs, as an alternative to money now spent to create public jobs that are not available. It would provide employment money for real jobs instead of making jobs available for which there is no real purpose. Unfortunately, the latter has too often happened in the past in this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have had the hearings which were conducted upon this subject for the period of some 6 weeks filled with testimony to this effect.

We in this proposed amendment do not eliminate the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It remains to employ youngsters in public and nonprofit agencies, but we would like to divert some of that money to the community action agencies so that they may have the flexibility needed to apportion these funds and to employ these youngsters between the age of 16 and 22. I refer to profitmaking organizations, our smaller businesses—if you will, our businesses that are run by members of minority groups. It will be administered at the local level.

Mr. Chairman, community action agencies will have complete flexibility on this. We are not setting up a major overall national program structure so that there will not be the problem which has developed under the Manpower Retraining Act wherein smaller employers have refused to participate to any large degree. There are just too many forms to be filled out and there is too much trouble involved in connection therewith.

Mr. Chairman, they have to deal with Department of Labor representatives, inspectors, national regulations and so forth. Large companies have refused to participate in any large numbers because they have such programs on-going and they would rather not be bothered with the administrative redtape involved in obtaining a small Government subsidy.

So, Mr. Chairman, under the job training program, as it operates at the Department of Labor today, we have the middle-sized companies participating. Where they do participate and where the private employer is providing on-the-job training, we have had the best results. They get some training, they receive some training directed toward the specific job available. They do not have to look for a job when they get through learning the specific skill involved. The employer takes them on for on-the-job training, because he wants to fill some positions or jobs which he feels these people have the potential to fill.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a practical approach.

As has been mentioned here, under the Industry Youth Corps, you do not have to pay 100 percent of the wages with the money of the taxpayers, because these youngsters are working in profitmaking organizations. Obviously, the profitmaking employer should pay most of the wages involved. Those of us who are in favor of minimum wage legislation—some of us at least—recognize that it does in some instances restrict job opportunities. There are certain employers who will not pay the minimum wage for unskilled youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22. So, they bypass them with automated processes or get along without them in some other fashion.

Mr. Chairman, we have a growing problem in this country and have had such a growing problem during the last 10 years with reference to our 16- to 18-year-old group. This has been an area where we have had an employment increase whereas the general unemployment rate has decreased to some extent.

The unemployment rate for young people in the 16- to 22-year age group has been largely unaffected by general economic conditions in the past 10 years.

When we talk about riots, one of the things that all of us agree on is that one of the issues in these riots has apparently been the lack of jobs, the lack of meaningful jobs with a future, productive jobs. They do not want to have summer jobs for 2 months that try to keep them off the streets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, these youngsters do not want to be put on some kind of a make-work job for the summer with the clear intention to take them off the streets, and to keep them from getting into trouble; these youngsters are looking for something with a future. That is what we are trying to do in getting private enterprise involved.

The statement has been made several times in opposition to this amendment that you can already do this under the present program. Well, they are not doing it today. They do not feel in the administration of the program that they can do it. There is no language in the present law that authorizes this. This would authorize community action agencies to pay a portion of the expense of the on-the-job training, this would authorize them to pay one-quarter of the wage of the youngster, and then the employer would pay three-quarters for up to a year. Then if it is justified they could extend it for another year, if the youngster has made progress and there is hope and promise that there will be the opportunity of full-time employment.

Mr. Chairman, that is the thing we should be trying to establish. That is where we can use the Federal tax money as seed money, and thus it goes four times as far because then we are involving outside sources of income to put

money into the pockets of the poor. And they are earning it. They are learning to earn. These are the practical approaches we believe should be brought into this concept of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, without destroying the basic approach of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In many cases such jobs can be and have been provided that are useful and productive, and they can continue to be provided, but we would add the private sector in it. The counselor program in the schools has the same objective. Instead of just concentrating on public jobs that are paid for 100 percent, through the Federal tax dollars, we can get them private jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would be glad to yield ordinarily, but I believe we are about to wind this up. I thought we had an agreement that we were going to vote on this at 2:15. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman had asked for a time limitation until 2:30, and we said there was a very real possibility we could finish before then, and I believe there is. But if the gentleman wishes to impose a time limitation—

Mr. GIBBONS. No, I do not wish to impose a time limitation.

Mr. GOODELL. Additionally, we would probably have the problem we usually do, that if once we ask for a time limitation, then we see a number of people stand up who perhaps may not otherwise have asked for time, and they will receive the 1½ minutes to speak.

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not want to yield any further time.

This is real interesting. This is the first time I have heard a lot of this.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not want to yield any more of my time.

Mr. GOODELL. We have been discussing this steadily for 2 years, and the gentleman has not been listening.

Mr. GIBBONS. No, I decline to yield any further in my very limited time.

I see the fellow is riding shotgun on my time over there.

Mr. Chairman, I really believe we ought to call this "Scotch tape, Xerox, Government Printing Office" amendment. If you were to walk up behind me, as I did a while ago, and look at those papers that have been put together, you could not call it a serious amendment. I think you would laugh at it, because evidently they started out by typing it, and then they got tired so they started to Xerox it, then they got tired of doing that, so they took some pages from another amendment and then stapled them together into a 42-page



document. And I really cannot consider it as a really serious amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. No, I cannot yield any further of my time. I will turn back any time that I do not consume.

As I started to say, Mr. DELLENBACK has gotten through talking about the opportunity crusade that we have been hearing about for 2 years, because the first thing he says is that, "Oh, no, this is not the opportunity crusade, we did a few things to it." That was when my interest became aroused, and that is when I went up to look at the amendment, and it is really ridiculous.

I would invite everyone of you to go up and look at it and see how ridiculous it is.

Let us talk about what they are striking out of this bill. That is the important part. They are striking out on page 154 everything that was put into this bill in an open markup session not only on a bipartisan basis but on the basis of unanimous consent.

I checked this out before I came here. This bill was marked up in open session. We may have had a little trouble getting a quorum, and you may have read or heard about that when we were marking up the bill, but we came to this section of the bill in the general marking up in the Committee on Education and Labor, we put in this provision on page 154 by unanimous consent. Not a soul objected to it. You do not hear all this said here on the floor now when they put this Scotch tape, Xerox, GPO amendment together while they are trying to think up some way of spending enough time to keep us here Wednesday and Thursday and Friday and Lord knows how long—that is how serious they are.

I had hoped at this stage of the game that we could be united on the manpower programs for we have in the bill before us a provision on manpower that went into the bill by unanimous consent. It covers about 7, 8, 9, or 10 pages and it is all printed.

Go up to the clerk's desk and ask to read this ridiculous thing they put out. Now there is a way to legislate and there is a way not to legislate. One of the worst ways to legislate is to bring something in at the last minute that is pinned together and typed out, part of it written out in long hand, and some of it scratched out, and then something written in in ink. If what I say is not true, you can go up there and look at it and then deny it, if it is not true.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I just want to answer in one sentence the allegation just made. Everything in this amendment was in the opportunity crusade and was before our committee. We struck out one section, the military career centers section, and we added one section that was added in committee and we felt it was valid. There were no other changes, scotch tape or otherwise.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, I discussed the use by many employees of the United Planning Organization in Washington of their connection with OEO as a springboard for promoting radicalism.

If you catch a burglar on the scene, and he has a record of burglary, is carrying a burglar's tool kit and a burglar's loot in his pocket, he becomes a suspect. Not necessarily one that will wind up in jail, or, if he does, one who will stay there, but a suspect nonetheless.

If you catch a man with blood on his hands and a dead body nearby, he is likely to be detained even under the current legal versions of arrest and confinement.

If you catch a known firebug at the scene of a conflagration, with a can of kerosene in his hands, the logical, but far too often not legal conclusion is that he is a likely candidate for a grand jury.

As I pointed out last week, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity is loaded with people of questionable background and association who have been placed in positions of responsibility, and who are supposed to be training others to become useful and productive citizens. I stated at that time that I felt we are sowing the seeds of our own destruction when we provide financing for large numbers of radicals who use their working hours and the people they are supposed to train, to plan ways of turning their trainees against our Government and our way of life.

I have been asked for more specific details, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to name here a few of these public servants and tell you something about them.

Beginning at the top, a Mr. Hal Witt was Acting Executive Director of UPO from May until last month, and is now Deputy Director at \$21,000 a year.

Mr. Witt is the son of Nathan Witt, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He is on the executive board of SANE—a regular sponsor of antiwar demonstrations. He is a frequent attendant, if not a member, of the Washington American Forum, successor to the Progressive Party here. He is on the Washington Area Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. His name is on the mailing list of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. His police record reveals that when charged with disorderly conduct in 1960 he chose as his attorney, Joseph Forer, the leading attorney for the Communist Party, described by a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as one of the most important Communists in the District of Columbia. According to information from FBI files, Mr. Witt has close and frequent association with many known Communist Party members as well as financial backers of the Communist Party.

I do not say Mr. Witt is a Communist, Mr. Chairman. I do not know. I do know that a very real question as to his loyalty should prohibit his employment by a public agency.

The Daily Worker, January 10, 1965, advertised a meeting in New York City to honor the 40th anniversary of the Communist publishing firm, Interna-

tional Publishers. Listed as a featured speaker was Marion Barry, now a \$50-a-day consultant at UPO. Barry was head of SNCC's New York office then, and moved to Washington in June 1965 to expand the SNCC office here. He had been arrested and convicted on various charges in Memphis and Knoxville, Tenn., and in Chicago. He became somewhat infamous in the District last year by kicking a door of a paddy wagon while being arrested. He led a march on the Capitol under the label of "Assembly of Unrepresented People," protesting the Vietnam war; led a bus boycott protesting fare increases; mapped the "Free D.C. Movement," boycotting merchants who refused to sign home rule petitions and contribute funds to home rule causes.

One of Barry's close SNCC associates is Rev. Channing Phillips, who heads the Housing Development Corp., recipient of around \$294,000 in 1966 from UPO and \$100,000 from HUD. He joined in the merchants boycott, cochaired the Coalition of Conscience, led a sleep-in at Bolling Air Force Base; chaired the Committee for Community Action in Public Education, which sponsored the school boycott and paid much of the expenses of the Hobson against Hansen case which resulted in the resignation of Dr. Hansen from his position as Superintendent of Schools in the District.

We all know the antics of Hubert Geroid Brown, known as Rap Brown. He was a UPO employee from March 1965 until June 1966, when he resigned to take the SNCC chairmanship from Stokely Carmichael.

Also active in SNCC while at UPO were Alan and Margaret McSurely, who left here to go to Kentucky where they were charged with possessing seditious materials, including Communist literature and films. While Alan McSurely was director of suburban programs for UPO, he, with two other UPO employees, William N. Hobbs and John Robinson, threatened the Arlington chief of police during a march sponsored by a group known as ACCESS in which they participated.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] recently called to the attention of the House the fact that the same John Robinson was involved just last Tuesday in a violation of the Hatch Act, in passing out partisan political literature and working at the polls on election day. Here, Mr. Chairman, is an example of the Government paying a man for partisan political activity. The taxpayers of the United States will not tolerate this use of our funds.

Gaston Thomas Neil, a UPO worker in the Cardozo area, runs the New School of Afro Thought. He has spent time in St. Elizabeth's Hospital after being found not guilty by reason of insanity on a number of narcotics charges. He now has other charges pending against him not yet resolved. Meanwhile, he and a companion bought two Russian-type carbines in Alexandria in August, for what purpose we can only guess.

Ralph Fertig, former executive director of UPO Southeast Neighborhood House, helped with the school boycott.



He came to UPO from Chicago, leaving behind unpaid judgments and a record including protests against the Un-American Activities Committee and advertisements urging clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Dick Jones, a UPO community organizer, Herbert Kelsey, a UPO housing coordinator, and Michael Searles, UPO housing adviser, are all SNCC members. Mrs. Willie Hardy, UPO Neighborhood council director, is in both SNCC and CORE.

This list would not be complete without Ruby Evans, UPO girls' service coordinator, who although not involved with the militants, urged her girls to refuse birth control information, telling them they should not be prevented from having illegitimate children if they want them.

Finally, Rufus Mayfield, the young hoodlum who was there when a TV set went through a window; when the Red-skin band had to leave a ball game under police protection; when a fire broke out in a dime store; when trouble developed at the Coliseum and looting followed; when poverty warriors marched on the White House. In spite of a concerted effort of the Washington press to show his activities in a favorable light, he is constantly skirting the edge of trouble, and hundreds of 13- and 14-year-old boys acknowledge him as their leader.

Mr. Chairman, one radical in these OEO-sponsored programs in a position to employ others can load a payroll with those who think and act as he does. This has happened in Washington, D.C., and may be happening all over the Nation. The decent people of this Nation—and I mean the decent poor as well as those living in better circumstances—deserve better leadership than UPO is giving them.

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we first ascertain how many Members wish to speak on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon has already spoken, so that would leave four or five Members.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could you make it 2:35 so that there would be adequate opportunity for those standing?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:35.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will not utilize 5 minutes, because I have only one question, and this is a question I would like to ask of the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK], if he would give me his attention, please.

I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK], as author of this amendment: Does his amendment transfer administrative authority of NYA from OEO to HEW?

Mr. DELLENBACK. It would take a portion of NYA and transfer it to HEW, and it would take a portion thereof and transfer it to Labor.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. I have noticed in the past, and again at this time, that when a unanimous consent request to limit debate has been made, Members who have already been recognized to debate the issue are again recognized under the unanimous-consent limitation. I wonder if this is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. When the request was made, the Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Louisiana had already been recognized.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. I am not speaking of that, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman just announced that the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, would be recognized again, though he has already debated on this amendment. I wonder if Members can be recognized for a second time to debate the same amendment merely because a unanimous-consent request is made to limit time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must say to the gentleman that when the unanimous-consent request was made and agreed to it abrogated the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should like to ask if the gentleman from Oregon is also on the list? The gentleman was standing at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Oregon standing at the time?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Oregon was standing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman seeking recognition?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman was seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name will be added to the list of Members.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE].

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon, and I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I say a few brief things? There are many things I would like to say, if there were more time.

The remarks the chairman of the committee made earlier about the multiplication of industry money were not correct. One cannot go off on flights of fancy in this regard.

Look at the difference between the formulas under the program put forward in the administration bill, and the Federal dollars involved—those are almost all Federal dollars under the administration bill—and the formulas involved in our proposal. There is a very clear multiplication provided for in our proposal through the involvement of private enterprise money, and this will make a significant difference as to how many dollars will get to the root causes of poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised to see this amendment here. I rise to oppose it.

Of all the programs carried on under the Economic Opportunity Act, which we have had an opportunity to examine during the past 3 years, the program which has had the most universal support from both public and private observers has been the program that would be taken apart by this amendment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has in fact been a success not only in the big cities, but also in the suburbs, and in the rural parts of America. As a matter of fact, it has probably been one of the most effective rural training programs we have been able to develop. It has been the most rapidly developed program.

I am proud that in our State, although not in my district, in the city of Lansing, they had one of the very first programs in the country. It is looked upon as a model. Many people from around the country have journeyed to our State of Michigan to see that program, which does in fact function in connection with three major industries not only of that city but of our State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Oregon for his creative work in trying to make something out of this program and to correct some of its obvious failings.

I want to say I join him in support of this amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK] regarding the proposed transfer of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

In reality, the entire Neighborhood Youth Corps program fits into the existing Governmental department structure



and I refer here to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the main, only the "inschool" portion of this program has met with any real success under OEO and this was largely because it was being managed by school authorities.

I see no rationale or public purpose in scattering programs dealing with education and the manpower labor force outside of the Federal departments that were originally established for these purposes. Young men and women who are out of school and without jobs desperately need training to fit them for useful employment in private enterprise and in Government. They do not need a so-called make-work program described as "work experience"—which it is not.

In my judgment, there are many advantages to be gained from this proposed transfer of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The primary one, of course, is that it will provide meaningful jobs rather than "make believe" jobs. In addition, it will permit greater participation by private enterprise in the current program and it is private industry that is the principal job producer in this country. It will contribute to our economic growth and enhance our economic development by providing more jobs for more people than is now the case. And, it will establish dialog between the employer and the employee that will be mutually beneficial in determining the type and degree of training and experience needed in industry.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I only have two things to say further on the balance of this time which is yielded to me and on my own time. One, there are good programs involved here such as the good portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps which would be continued and enhanced under this program. Secondly, there is a need present which is a very great need. The present attempts through the present law to solve that need have not succeeded. Anyone can produce isolated examples of success, but our concern is not just for those isolated examples but for the many, many, many people whom these programs cannot reach. If we do not make some basic changes in the formula and the programs, those people in need of help will not be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment needs much more opposition. I think it will fall of its own weight. I am beginning to learn as we go through the debate what the meaning of the word "redirection" is when it is used by the minority. Evidently what they mean when they say the program is to be redirected is that they would like to take an express train off the tracks to see if it can go better cross country. Or, to use another example, of Republican redirection if you have an orderly convoy going down the highway, head it toward the nearest cliff and see if it can fly.

I urge the defeat of this redirection amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the primary arguments in the last 35 minutes by the opponents of this measure have gone off the basic issues and have lapsed into humor. This problem is too serious for humor. We cannot succeed in having meaningful programs under the law unless we can make some meaningful improvements in the law.

I urge that we adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to close debate.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I stated that this amendment would destroy title I-B of this bill. I reiterate that statement. Today we have a most effective Neighborhood Youth Corps and an in-school program for the rural areas of America. This amendment will completely destroy for all intents and purposes that program and will completely destroy the work-training program, because there are just not ample funds in this amendment to do any service to the disadvantaged of this country. It will not do any service for them.

I ask the committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DELLENBACK and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 169.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] rise?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman offering an amendment?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No. I just want to make a few observations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate as it has gone on on this poverty bill. I further wish to say that I yield to no one in my concern for people who need help and are truly poverty stricken. I have supported the Vocational Education Act, I have supported the Manpower Training Act, higher education, and I have introduced the Human In-

vestment Act. I have a deep and abiding concern for those who really need help.

But I want to say to the Members that in my opinion this poverty program has not been effective. Now, you cannot spend several billions of dollars without doing some good, but I do not believe we have been getting the return on the money that we have invested in trying to take people out of poverty and to assure them of an opportunity to take their rightful place in society as working citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to redirect this program. We should take the Headstart program and put it over in the Office of Education. If that is not education, I do not know what it is. Insofar as job training is concerned, what organization is better equipped than the Office of Vocational Education? What better place can we find than that to try to train people for meaningful employment?

How can we accept an expenditure request of something over \$400 million in addition to what we spent last year amounting to \$10 for each and every man, woman, and child in this country, when we will have a Federal deficit of some \$28 billion to \$30 billion next year? And the President is asking for a tax increase and also promising a reduction in spending, while he goes to New York and promises all the Great Society programs are going to go ahead and we are going to have guns and butter at the same time.

There is some inconsistency here some place.

Let me say this in addition. We have had new spending programs and Great Society programs and rather than reducing welfare costs they increase.

I believe in, and I will support amendments here, and I will support the crusade—the opportunity crusade—because I think it is the only chance to put this program into effective operation and to help those people who seriously need help.

Let me say it gives me some concern when we see a group marching from Baltimore down the Baltimore Parkway down to Washington to ask for more Federal help when in the Baltimore Sun newspaper of Monday there are four pages of help-wanted ads, with some of them with no experience being necessary. Most men, women, and young people who are asking for jobs can find them.

If any man or woman is able to walk from Baltimore to Washington, then he or she is able to walk to an employment office and walk to respond to some of these ads in the newspaper.

As far as I am concerned, the taxpayers of this country—and let me tell you what taxpayers—they are not the small taxpayers, they are not the rich taxpayers because they can take care of themselves all right—but the man who is trying to raise his family on \$7,000 to \$10,000 a year and he is having a rough time and you are throwing more of a load on him every day.

They are the mass of the taxpayers. That is the group that really puts up most of the money. You are going to have a taxpayers' revolt in this country unless you call a halt and unless you make these



programs so that they effectively take care of the people who need help.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Is the gentleman not aware that most of the people who are trying to get jobs in America do not have the skills required for the jobs in those advertisements? Is the gentleman not aware that there is a critical unemployment problem and that 40 percent, according to the Secretary of Labor, is the true unemployment rate in the slums and ghettos across America?

Does the gentleman not recognize that the people who made that march were marching because of a sense of dignity and their desire to gain employment?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes; I know all of that. I know all of that. These ads are right in this newspaper here and they show that they can go to many of these places, get jobs, and also get training. Right now they are asking for people in many of these places.

Mr. CONYERS. I do not think that should be dragged into this kind of a discussion when we know what the unemployment problem is. I know what it is in my district. I do not know if the gentleman knows what it is in the slums or ghettos in his district, if he has any, but the unemployment problems in this country are enormous. People write to me trying to get jobs and, of course, I cannot provide them, and I will not hand them the want ads and tell them to fit a round peg in a square hole because it cannot be done.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Those people who need help should be given help. But we just voted down an amendment that was designed for that very purpose in support of the approach with reference to free private enterprise, as is being done in the city of Detroit to help these people. How much support did we get? None at all. That is the only way you are going to help these people.

We are not giving them any help by putting them in the poverty program or getting a job on the poverty program. Some can be trained, but we can do a better job if we let industry help to train them.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman know how many jobs were placed by the Ford Motor Co. that started off with 10,000 and the next time I read in the paper it was 5,000. The next time I saw that they were working on placements. Does the gentleman know how many there actually were?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I know the Ford Motor Co. said they would take 5,000 and J. L. Hudson Co. said 500. I do not know how many the Chrysler Corp. said, or General Motors Corp., but it was a sizable amount.

But it seems to me that this is the kind of step that is in the right direction and ought to be encouraged instead of voted down.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. First of all, let me say I do not think that marchers are going to influence this Congress. I think we have a little more dignity than that and I think anybody who starts one misjudges the gentlemen who sit here.

Second, I read those want ads and most of them, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] said, cannot be filled because the people do not have the skills. We are training them by these programs despite the debate here. We have programs that do these things.

Then we have another amendment that I hope the gentleman will join us in because I think it will bring some responsibility here, and that is on title II, C, section 210, and I think if you will join us in that in a bipartisan effort, we can make this program more effective.

I am not questioning whether we should train people who need help to be trained. They ought to be trained. I am saying that for the \$4 billion that has been spent on the poverty program so far we have not trained enough people. We have not done the job right. The program should be redirected so that the people who have the expertise to train them can do so. Then maybe we will make some sense out of it, and the taxpayers will get a break out of it, too.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman have any objection to citizens from Baltimore coming down here to witness what is going on in the House of Representatives?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have no objection to anyone marching here to sit unless they interfere with the traffic along the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Then I think there is some question about that. My argument is that if they spend as much time trying to find jobs, right in the city of Baltimore, where many jobs are being offered, they would be far better off. Some of them just will not work.

I remember the march from Cleveland, Ohio, to Columbus, Ohio, when the people on welfare were going to march to the State capital because they were not getting enough on welfare. If they can walk that far, they can get a job. They probably passed many help-wanted signs on the way.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is one of the easiest things on earth to criticize a program that is designed to help people who stand on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. For the enlightenment of the House, I would like to impose upon the time of the Committee of the Whole just a moment to read an editorial from the Johnston County Capital Democrat, a weekly newspaper in a small county in southern Oklahoma. The editor, John Lakey, lives in the county, knows the county well, and knows how the poverty program is

working in his county. He gives us, I believe, some food for thought in the consideration of this matter and in weighing its merits and its demerits. This, in part, is what the editorial says:

The public image of the Poverty Program seems to be some young girl or boy who dropped out of school doing too little for too much money and riding a Honda while the taxpayers' kids walk.

We've had some of that here in Johnston county.

But the Poverty Program also has done this in Johnston county:

1. Given us our first county-wide health service.

2. Provide jobs for many students who needed the money in order to stay in school.

3. Hired workers that did more than loaf. They cleaned up cemeteries, the courthouse and our parks, sprayed for mosquitoes and worked on hauling trash from our homes, and helped clean up our roads.

4. It's sent help into the homes of the sick and bedfast.

5. Its Head Start program has given tiny tots a kindergarten program that heretofore only those with money could afford. It's paid to give these youngsters dental and medical attention.

6. It's provided rural areas with a planner and paper work do-er in the form of a CAF director to help capture federal aid projects. Heretofore only large city Chamber of Commercences could boast such work staffs—and that's where the projects went.

7. It's helped organize rural water districts, a peanut drying cooperative and investigated other proposals of self-help.

8. It's taken young men and women who thought college was beyond them in both brains and money and got them started "Upward Bound."

The Poverty Program has done all this in Johnston county and if now and then some undeserving lazy loafer has got a bit of the public money because someone thought he or she deserved a chance to do better, it was not unexpected.

The program is supposed to help these at the bottom of the economic barrel. It's not surprising then that the Poverty Program has turned up a few bad apples, but rather that it has turned up so many good ones.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I commend the gentleman for the statement that he has made. I commend the author of the editorial that the gentleman has quoted. May I say that what happened in that county in Oklahoma is not unique.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course it is not.

Mr. BOGGS. I live in a southern State, and I am proud of it. In that city at least 150,000 people have been helped by this program.

This program has made the most significant contribution to my city that I know of since I have been serving in Congress. The idea that we can live in peace and quiet and harmony in the suburbs when there is misery in the center of a big metropolitan area is one which has been rejected by every sensible student of this problem who has made a study of it.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman.



## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 154, line 8, after "SEC. 102," insert "(a)".

On page 168, after line 13, insert the following:

"(b) Part E of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is redesignated as 'Part F', and section 141 is redesignated as 'section 151.' There is hereby added to title I of such Act the following new part E:

## "PART E—INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS

## "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 142. It is the purpose of this part to provide needy, unskilled, and unemployed young men and women who have terminated their formal education with on-the-job training opportunities which will enable them to become self-sustaining in a vocation.

## "ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 143. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Labor an Industry Youth Corps program to be administered locally wherever possible through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist private, profit-making employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services, such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. The Secretary shall encourage farmers and other employers in agriculture and agriculturally related enterprises to participate in such program by hiring eligible youths for training in farm occupations for which there is a potential of long-term employment.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with private, profit-making employers in the area served by such agency to provide such training and services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such private, profitmaking employers to carry out the purpose of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and not more than 25 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such private, profitmaking employer.

## "CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 144. (a) Any contract made with an employer under section 143(b) shall provide that eligible youths will be hired under terms of employment which provide that—

"(1) an integral part of such employment shall consist of on-the-job training in an appropriate vocational skill area (including supplemental classroom instruction where appropriate), with opportunity for reasonable progression and pay raises consistent with individual performances;

"(2) the employer will, whenever possible, offer suitable long-term employment to any individual who successfully completes his on-the-job training, or assist such individual to find suitable long-term employment elsewhere: *Provided*, That such employer shall not displace previously employed workers or impair existing employment contracts;

"(3) the employer will provide adequate and safe facilities, and adequate personnel records of attendance and progress;

"(4) such youths will be compensated at reasonable rates comparable to, but in no event in excess of, the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(5) the term of employment shall not exceed one year, except that such term may be

extended for one additional year if it is ascertained by the employer that (A) such youth would be unable to qualify for suitable employment at the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services without reimbursement of a portion of the employer's wage costs attributable to the employment of such individual, and the reasonable costs of providing on-the-job training and related services to such individual; and (B) the employed youth probably will benefit from an additional year of on-the-job training; and

"(6) the determination of eligibility of any youth shall be made by the employer, in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary.

"(b) Any contract under section 143(b) shall be negotiated with due consideration for minimizing forms and procedures imposed upon the contracting employers.

"(c) Under no circumstances shall any contract be made under section 143(b) unless there is assurance that the obligations of the employer under such contract and under any arrangements he may make with an eligible youth will be discharged in good faith.

"(d) The employer of any eligible youth pursuant to the provisions of this part shall have the same authority to supervise, assign, provide working conditions for, and discharge such youth as he has with respect to regular employees.

## "ELIGIBLE YOUTHS

"SEC. 145. (a) For purposes of the programs authorized by this part, an eligible youth shall be an individual—

"(1) who has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two at the time he contracts for employment with such employer;

"(2) whose income (together with his family's income if he is a dependent thereof) does not exceed a standard of poverty set forth in rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary on the basis of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of such youth to be self-sustaining;

"(3) who is unemployed and unable to obtain employment in an appropriate vocational skill area; and

"(4) who has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and as to whom there are no immediate prospects of returning to school for additional education or vocational training.

"(b) Eligible youths employed pursuant to programs authorized by this title shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

## "PAYMENTS

"SEC. 146. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

## "COORDINATION WITH STATES

"SEC. 147. The Secretary shall consult with any State assisted under title II of this Act to achieve the most effective coordination feasible of programs assisted under this title with programs assisted under that title.

## "OATH

"SEC. 148. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to eligible youth in programs assisted under this title.

## "ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 149. The Secretary shall carry out the programs authorized by part E of this title

during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year. For the purposes of carrying out part E, there is hereby directed to be allocated from the appropriation for this title for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, the sum of \$70,000,000 to administer and conduct the Industry Youth Corps program authorized under section 143."

Mr. QUIE (during the reading): Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I just want to ask, is this not the identical amendment we just voted on, as included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has helped me with part of my speech and informed the Members that this is a part of the amendment already voted on. This is the Industry Youth Corps, but it is to be added to title I of this bill as a part E. I hope those who voted against it in the previous amendment did so because of the other parts of that amendment rather than the Industry Youth Corps part.

What the amendment would do is to provide that \$7 million be allocated for this purpose, for the Secretary of Labor to operate a program whereby the private profitmaking employers might hire these youths and subsidize them up to 25 percent of their wages.

Under the Industry Youth Corps we find that the money would go about three to four times as far.

Presently in the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages. These young people in many cases are hired for make-work types of employment. Make-work type of employment does not have the dignity or the meaning to it which an on-the-job training program in private industry would. In private industry they gain the kind of experience which enables them to hold full-time jobs thereafter. However, a problem exists which prevents private employers from taking part in the manpower development and training programs for young youths of this type. The minimum wage laws or the wages that are required to be paid in these businesses are more than many of the youth are worth when first hired. The wages are greater than the worth of the young employee. There is a period of time in which the youth must learn to handle himself on the job and learn some of the skills of the job. During this period of time this amendment would permit private industry to be engaged in the employment and training of the youth. This will give jobs to three or four times as many youths as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. This will be meaningful jobs from the testimony we received, which indicated



strong support for this. Let me mention a few examples.

An Oklahoma manufacturer said:

With your government regulation indicating a minimum of \$1.40 per hour it is ridiculous for us to consider such a program. On one hand you ask us to hire a youth opportunity worker and on the other hand you tell us we would have to pay \$1.40 per hour for work that would not be worth more than \$.50 per hour. Therefore, to us your program is impractical and ridiculous.

Now I quote Vice President HUMPHREY, who says:

The Federal Government was not omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent enough to meet the challenges of the war against racial discrimination, unemployment, and inadequate training. The challenge cannot be met efficiently or adequately without the initiative, the investment, creative imagination, the flexibility, the capacity to work out details of specific problems that are the hallmark of a free enterprise system.

Mitchell Ginsberg, the head of the New York City poverty program, suggested subsidies for employers who train youngsters.

Mayor J. D. Braman, of Seattle, testified before our committee and said of the Industry Youth Corps:

I think it would work very well in Seattle. It has been my feeling that the best way to achieve training is to put a man on the job where he has the dignity of working and earning a wage but at the same time is learning.

As a longtime employer myself I recognize that we cannot expect employing units, most of whom are operating these days on rather narrow margins, to reduce the present efficiency of their work force and take on people who produce less than the value of the stipend they receive without some kind of compensation.

Mr. Edward Robie, vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, testified before our committee on behalf of the Industry Youth Corps, and he testified very clearly the efforts that the life insurance industry would make and that the 25-percent subsidies would not cover all of their costs, but with that kind of assistance from the Federal Government he was confident that other companies would engage in this kind of help to youth.

You may not have liked the substitute which has been offered and you may not have liked the idea that we would change the operation of the present poverty program, but this is an addition to the language that is presently in the bill. This is to use the same amount of money in section 2 of the bill for title I, but designated \$70 million for this addition. I am confident anyone who has taken the time to read this amendment and study it and talk to employers about it will know that this will be an effective means of training youth, not make-work programs but in meaningful kinds of jobs.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. The proposed amendment, it was called to my attention, in the District of Columbia alone for the summer program could have been worked out but was prevented because

of minimum wage regulations which made it impossible for the employer to train the youths. I take it your amendment would take care of this problem. It would be my understanding this would also apply to the District of Columbia. Is that not true?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. QUIE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. It would give the opportunity for a small employer to take part in this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are no large industries, as the members of the Committee know, in the District of Columbia and the same thing is true in many areas of the country. Small businesses like the retail trade could participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is agreed to, then those people who come under the purview of the language of the amendment on the farms would be included as well. There is a great opportunity for employment of youth in rural area on farms if this subsidy were paid to get them started.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is the program which the gentleman in the well proposes in addition to the programs that the Office of Economic Opportunity now undertakes to have industry train people?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how is your program going to be financed? Does your proposed program call for additional funds for the purpose of financing it?

Mr. QUIE. No. My amendment does not propose additional funds. There would be in title I that came up in section 2 yesterday the sum of \$874 million, a sum which I believe is greater than this Congress is going to appropriate. But it would be sufficient to fund my amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this would be a very effective tool to be used in helping the small businessman to help himself in providing these services.

Mr. QUIE. That is right; it is similar to what the gentleman himself was engaged in in his flying industry before he came to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned the farmers. This, of course, spins off the delegated authority from the Office of

Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor.

Mr. QUIE. Exactly like the way it operates now, where the Office of Economic Opportunity has already delegated those programs to the Department of Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Under your proposed independent Youth Corps, anyone so participating, including farmers, would be under the supervision of the Department of Labor? That is my question.

In other words, the farmers would have to deal with the Department of Labor, is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I do not think that is treating farmers unfairly, because they are having nothing but trouble now in dealing with the Department of Agriculture. All NYC programs in the rural areas are presently handled by the Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of my making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3:25.

The question was taken and, on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE), there were—ayes 78, noes 55.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. ARENDS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 90.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the limitation of debate several Members were standing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make an announcement with regard to Members who were standing upon conclusion of the 5 minutes of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].



Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a good idea. Had it not been for the action taken by the Committee with respect to the committee bill, I would have been inclined to support his amendment with some amendment.

As he indicated, the gentleman from Minnesota wants to involve private industry.

The trouble is the gentleman from Minnesota started talking about this too soon—about 6 months ago—and he convinced us.

So when this bill was before the committee, we inserted a provision designed to do just exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota has been talking about, by unanimous consent.

We have a provision in the committee bill designed to involve private industry in training programs under this act.

Let me read to you from page 160 of the bill where we say that the manpower program under this part shall include:

(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. One provision stands out in my amendment, which permits the Federal Government to subsidize up to 25 percent of the wages. I see nothing in the committee language that permits the subsidization of the wages an employer must pay.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is precisely correct. I would like to direct my attention to that fact.

The difference between what the gentleman from Minnesota is offering and what the committee has already done—and this is the essential difference—is that the gentleman from Minnesota proposes a wage subsidy. The community action agency would have the power and the authority to pay a wage subsidy to some employer or to several employers in that community with respect to low-income youths employed by them.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It is, however, in the Neighborhood Youth Corps where we now pay a 100-percent wage subsidy with the liberal interpretation of 90 percent and a 10-percent contribution in kind. This would be a one-quarter wage subsidy for jobs in private industry.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would want—and every Member of this House

should want—a good deal closer look at the whole idea of subsidizing wages for some private industries and not for others, for one employer and not for his competitor, before they get into this sort of thing.

If you do not mind my saying so, I am afraid that what this amendment would do would be to take a part of the bill that everyone agrees has been useful and constructive, and create controversy that would endanger the entire concept of job training for the unemployed poor. I do not want to take that kind of risk without thorough hearings and without a thorough exploration of all the implications of this kind of program.

I would welcome such hearings. As the gentleman knows, I am sponsoring a guaranteed employment bill, and I would like to have some hearings on this subject by our committee. But I do not want to get into a subsidy of wages for some private employers and not their competitors without a good deal more thought and consideration than this amendment has received.

MORE MONEY FOR JOB PROGRAMS—BUT WILL THEY HELP PEOPLE GET JOBS?

As much as 50 percent of all title II money would henceforth be available only for manpower programs proposed by the local job opportunities boards. The uncertainty arises from the fact that some part of this money would have to be made available for qualified substitute agencies approved under State plans or by the OEO.

This is a drastic shift in the past uses of title II funds. The money set aside for manpower programs would presumably be in addition to other funds provided expressly for those purposes under other titles of the substitute proposal. Compared to other needs in particular communities, this may be a case of overkill.

In any event, the local job opportunities boards will be grossly unrepresentative both of organized labor and of many other relevant interests within their communities. At least half the membership of those boards must consist of representatives of private employers. The remainder shall be representatives of the poor. In other words, organized labor may be shut out completely from the development of programs which vitally affect its interests. Moreover, there will be no representation of public nonprofit agencies in the community service fields which constitute the second biggest labor market in the country today.

The kinds of programs which job opportunities boards may develop for use of this half of all title II assistance are curious, to say the least. They must be designed to eliminate conditions which inhibit or prevent the poor from seeking full-time jobs. Those conditions are relatively few: discrimination, physical disability, and the problem of mothers with small children. The basic employment obstacles suffered by the poor are those which prevent them from securing—rather than seeking—decent jobs. The sponsors of this proposal are apparently not concerned with underemployment, substandard wages, and other obstacles to employability of those who seek employment every day.

They certainly are not concerned with substandard wages, because they have made no provisions for a minimum wage rate in these programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

At the time of the limitation of debate there were 12 Members standing. The Chair computes that each one shall be entitled to 20 seconds.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the difference in the manpower training programs operated under present law, the Manpower Development and Training Act, is that under that act we can fund on-the-job training and the expenses of on-the-job training, but we cannot fund the difference in wage that is necessary to pay an unproductive individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMANS].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMANS. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, on the question of wage subsidy to small private employers, we had extensive testimony directly on this subject during our hearings by the Secretary of Labor, who testified that this approach would be wasteful and extravagant, because the small businesses that got the subsidy would simply be hiring workers that they would hire anyway, and in any event were unable, because of their limited resources and capability, to establish the effective training and counseling programs which are indispensable to providing a real boost up the job career ladder.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would say, in answering the comment just made, that we had a number of people come in on the hearings on the Industry Youth Corps proposal before the committee who testified in favor of this proposal, and they were employers. They were from private industry. They were academicians who said this should be tried. We can go directly to employers and give private employers the help they would need to employ the poor in productive jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us differs in no substantial way from the amendment we just voted down. I think the House has already expressed its understanding of the problem and its will, and I hope it will repeat the vote of just a few moments ago.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, this is the program which I believe we all understand is in addition to what is in the committee bill and what is now in the law. This program would in no way interfere with a continuation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps or the other programs in the community action field.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

(Mr. BROCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand the opposition to the amendment. This concept has been tried and proven. It is cheaper while being more effective. It offers challenge rather than charity. It involves people rather than politics. I urge you to rise above partisanship and support an honest effort to solve a problem of immense concern to us all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in 20 seconds one can hardly explain why this should not be treated in any manner different from what it was as a part of the overall package. One might conclude by saying that it is tacked together in even a less scientific manner than in the last amendment, which was defeated. We should defeat their amendment too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to bother the Members from the other side that the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages to private nonprofit agencies who might be competing with each other. We ask to have an opportunity to make a real, worthwhile program, in which we would subsidize a necessary amount of 25 percent of the wages in private enterprise only for the period of time that is necessary. Vote for my amendment and you will be proud of an effective antipoverty program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked by the proponents' lack of knowledge of the program. Last year at this time, at the time of the debate, we made it possible, and it is possible, and it is being done now, to employ private industry in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

I do not know where the Members have been for the last year, but obviously they have not been involved in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, not only are we involving private industry in the

Neighborhood Youth Corps, but we also are involving it in the MDTA in certain projects which are good projects. We are presently giving substantial financial assistance to programs in which private industry is participating. We have authority to do it.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. QUIE and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 104, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 102?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 157, line 24, strike the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, however, That all such programs shall be delegated, effective July 1, 1968, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be administered under such delegation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we can agree upon a limitation of time here, say 15 minutes? This is the same amendment, essentially, upon which the House has previously acted. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, since we have already voted upon this amendment, I move that all debate thereon close in 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for that purpose.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER], the gentleman in the well, has stated that he does not yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for the purpose of making a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion which has been made by the gentleman from Kentucky is not in order. We have not as yet had any debate upon the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, quite simply, is to solely transfer the authority for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps from the Department of Labor where it is now located to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], perhaps, did not clearly understand the amendment, since this is an amendment upon which we have not acted prior to this time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not interfere with, it does not diminish, or would not in any way impair the ongoing operations of the NYC program.

All it seeks to do is that come July 1, 1968, delegate by statute, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that which has already been delegated by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, the chamber of commerce has recommended:

The stated purpose of the in-school program and its operation by the public school system would make it advisable to transfer the in-school part of NYC to the Office of Education to be run in coordination with and funded through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, does not go quite that far. But it will provide for the coordination between those programs funded by ESEA and those programs which are similar in nature funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the Committee know, the stated purpose of the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps is, among other things, an attempt to find the basis on which we can insure that young men and women will be motivated to remain in school and not to drop out.

Mr. Chairman, as a training program, the NYC, in my judgment, has not done an extremely good job; it has failed in its role because of its delegation of authority to the Department of Labor.

If, in fact, we are going to be concerned with, as I think we should, attempting to prevent the dropout from ever occurring, then it would seem to me to make good sense to delegate the NYC program to the one office of our Federal Government which is that office responsible for educational programs, the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we might adopt this amendment as being a first step toward improving this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not offer this amendment in a destructive fashion. I do not offer this amendment for the purpose of hampering the program. But, I would think it would make a great deal of sense to attempt to coordinate something which is not now being coordinated.

The in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, which are serving some



138,951 young men and women, have some 35.8 percent of them now being sponsored by public schools throughout the country. Some 48,193 are serviced through community action agencies. As I say, the number of those enrolled in public school in-school NYC programs is larger than those enrolled in CAP agency programs, 49,774 to 48,193.

All of this is to indicate to the Members that I believe NYC's apparent lack of success demonstrates a need for increased and perhaps redirected counseling components in many projects which will emphasize treatment of problems which cause the youth to withdraw from school initially.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I offer this amendment which can strengthen the present operations and which I hope that the chairman of the full committee will accept as a delegation of authority, not a transfer, for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps program to a program which can serve well but which is not serving as well as it could be were it to be operated on a delegated basis with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of this Committee will see fit to adopt this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it will serve no useful purpose for us to march up this hill and down again. This amendment would require OEO to delegate to HEW the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps and for this reason I oppose it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I regret to do this, but I was informed that there would be no other speakers on this amendment from the other side. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close within 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I informed the gentleman that I did not think there were any other speakers on this side. I took 1 minute in order for the gentleman from Wisconsin to clarify one point. The gentleman now in the well is not on the committee, and I know of no one else who is going to ask for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amend-

ment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERLBORN) there were—ayes 84, noes 65.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 76.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to transgress on your time, but I believe I have been present on the floor for 75 to 80 percent of this debate. While I do not serve on the legislative committee, I happen to serve on the subcommittee which will eventually fund this program, so we do have an interest in it.

Mr. Chairman, we have been involved in a debate for the past week over proposals to remove various programs from the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity and place them under the aegis of other Federal agencies involved in related areas.

I would like to suggest that perhaps these proposals would never have been made if the Office of Economic Opportunity had ever shown any willingness to listen to some constructive criticism. This is a new program and naturally it has had its problems in getting off the ground. But every time those of us on the committees overseeing the operation of this program have raised a question concerning a problem area we have learned of, we are accused of trying to destroy the program, we are against the poor, and our questions are cleverly avoided. It would seem that OEO has developed a paranoid survival instinct and is spending more time and money trying to convince the Congress of what a good job they are doing than they are in trying to do the job we have assigned them.

For instance, last spring before our appropriations hearings, I requested cost figures on the individual Job Corps centers. We received only the royal run-around for over 2 months and to this date have never received the figures we requested.

On the other hand, we receive more than enough information concerning every complimentary article written about OEO programs. Every time an article appears in one of my district papers favorable to one of the poverty programs in our area, "Sarge" Shriver kindly sits down immediately and writes me a letter enclosing a copy of the article. He also manages to keep me informed on how our two Senators from Illinois vote on OEO programs. I often wonder if OEO has an employee assigned to following the news from my 18th District of Illinois. It might even be that they have someone assigned to each of us. With a public relations budget like theirs, this is quite possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that OEO takes cognizance of the fact that when the Congress is critical of a program, it is not necessarily trying to destroy it. After all, we created it. As representatives of the American people, we are charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that their tax dollars will be used in the most efficient manner—and to benefit the people these programs were designed to assist—not to assure perpetuity for a bureaucratic Minotaur.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest that we can continue this debate and finish our work on this bill much more expeditiously if the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will cease making motions to limit debate before the Member who has offered the amendment even has the opportunity to explain it, as he did on this amendment. At the time the chairman made his second motion on which we voted there was only one Member standing seeking recognition. As long as the chairman continues to try to shut off debate on this side I will continue to object to his unanimous-consent request and ask for a division and tellers on every one of his motions to limit debate. We will use up a great deal more time that way than if we permit orderly debate to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have plowed this ground several times. The principle contained in this amendment is subject to the same conclusive arguments directed to previous amendments rejected by the Committee. I ask the Committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 163, strike the period and insert a semicolon in line 6, and after line 6, insert the following:

"(5) no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party."

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple but necessary amendment. In a nutshell, it would prohibit OEO from financing any work training programs, including Neighborhood Youth Corps, which are administered by pres-



ent or former members of the Communist Party.

To those who might suggest that I am trying to raise a red herring issue here—that nobody hires or would dare to hire ex-Communists to head critical programs involving the Nation's youth—let me remind them that we have already seen evidence of such employment.

In my own city of New York, unfortunately, the mayor not only hired an ex-Communist, but he bragged about it. The present director of the New York City Neighborhood Youth Corps is an ex-Communist named Robert Schrank. When I raised the question of Mr. Schrank's fitness to lead and guide New York City youth, the mayor's press assistant acknowledged Mr. Schrank's Communist background as follows, if I may quote the New York Daily News:

Robert Laird, his press assistant, said he understood that while Schrank had been a member of the Communist party for fifteen years, he gave up his membership prior to his Mobilization For Youth appointment three or four years ago.

The mayor of New York later admitted that he knew all about Schrank's subversive record when he hired him. Let me quickly point out that Schrank was thrown out of the Machinists Union for being a Communist and during the early 1950's he worked for the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, a notorious Communist front expelled from the AFL-CIO. Believe it or not, the mayor of New York went on to call this man a "distinguished public servant." And do you know what has happened since? Schrank has just been promoted to assistant commissioner of the New York City poverty war.

The amendment I am offering would prevent the poverty warriors here in Washington from giving taxpayer dollars to any work and training programs administered by a current or ex-Communist. My amendment would cut New York City's work and training programs off from Federal funds until the mayor of New York fires his "distinguished" ex-Communist, which he will never do unless he is forced.

I do not think I have to dwell on the interest that the Communist movement has in young people. They regard them as the most opportune target for their propaganda. I believe that we in Congress have an obligation to keep these Federal youth programs from coming under the domination of longtime Communists. I will say frankly that anyone who was a Communist during the Korean war is no man to be shaping the lives of our young people today and if the mayor of New York thinks so, then that is his shame, but I hope that it will not be the shame of this Congress.

I urge the adoption of my amendment to prohibit OEO from funding work-experience and other youth programs without making sure that the programs are free of present or former Communists.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I will be very happy to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection if the language as we understand it reads.

(5) no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party.

Is that your amendment?

Mr. FINO. That is the text of the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. We accept that amendment.

Mr. FINO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 102? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

"(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interests and affected citizens, can be made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

"(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

"(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

"(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, pri-

vate religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

"It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

#### "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

##### "DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—

"(1) has power to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

"(2) is designated as a community action agency by the Director.

A community action program is a community based and operated program—

"(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

"(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

"(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

"(c) The community for which a community action agency is designated to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicounty, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision); but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

"(d) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit



agency as a community action agency other than a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

"(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a State, or of any political subdivision or combination thereof, if the elected or duly appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

"(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.

#### "COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

"SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(d), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.

"(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations with respect to the character, extent, and administration of programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making such policy determinations affecting particular areas, such subsidiary board, council, or similar agency shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(d) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the

total membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.

"(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

#### "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis

on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regulations governing matters relating to partisan or nonpartisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or



agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

#### "EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 214. (a) In determining whether, in what amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assistance to a new community action program, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity to the purposes of this title. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on such a program, consistent with needs and with due allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific function and duties to this end. The Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering: the number and incomes of persons or families served and seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the extent to which those persons and families have been aided in establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those goals; the extent to which resources have been committed which are over and above the contributions required by this title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor and area representatives, have actively participated in the formulation and implementation of the program in question; the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements among agencies operating different components and related agencies in the community; and the extent to which activities or approaches initiated as part of the program have been incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

"(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by him or by community action agencies, the Director may provide for, or require community action agencies to provide for, independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

#### "PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

##### "DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

#### "GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of community action programs, the Director may provide general financial assistance to those programs in accordance with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be used, as approved by the Director, by community action agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning, coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsibilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be used for the development and operation of approved program components which are necessary for a fully effective program and for which assistance is not available, as needed, from other sources. These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment; to make better use of available income in connection with efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills needed for employment, family self-help, or successful participation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain housing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake family planning consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent and effective use of programs available to help in overcoming specific problems. Components providing these or other services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly, the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance, but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family participation and progress.

"(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community, and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

#### "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance

or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of his title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as 'Project Headstart' focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

"(2) A program to be known as 'Follow Through' focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential.

"(3) A 'Legal Services' program to provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information, as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

"(4) A 'Comprehensive Health Services' program to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and

"(B) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.



Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.

"(5) A program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary education success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate.

"(6) A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services' designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange with other Federal and State agencies or officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.

"(7) A 'Day Care' program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise attain objectives related to the purposes of this Act. Projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed, together with necessary related facilities and services. Reference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under this Act and to other children whose parents have especially critical needs for day care service which could not be secured under any other program. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

"(8) A 'Family Planning' program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

"(9) A program to be known as 'Senior Opportunities and Services' designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 55 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) In developing programs under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private. The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under subsection (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

"(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include essential training, research, and technical assistance directly related to program development and implementation, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

"(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this section, including their impact in terms of the needs or problems at which they are directed, and their relationship to and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director.

#### "ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to sections 220 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data,

so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 22(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services, except that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution shall be in cash.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise to qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

#### "PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

##### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a



period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

#### "STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 604 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

#### "RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

#### "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

##### "ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

"SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Di-

rector for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

#### "RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

"(b) In order to further implement the policy described in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

#### "COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE FUNDS

"SEC. 242. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of the purposes of this title

with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice, information, or assistance, including the establishment of working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific problems of coordination arising under programs authorized in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range plans where justified by prior progress.

"(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

#### "SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 243. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

#### "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 244. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the



Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

"(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

"(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 245. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

"(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month."

"(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 223 have been complied with; the Director may,

however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

"(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

"(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"SEC. 246. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue such regulations, or impose such requirements, as may be necessary or appropriate to insure that programs assisted under this title are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with (1) any partisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or any voter registration activity. Rules or regulations under this section shall provide for enforcement procedures, which shall include provision for summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 247. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such

fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 103, starting on page 168 and continuing to page 211, be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 168, after line 16, strike out everything through line 4 on page 186 and insert in lieu thereof:

#### "TITLE II—COMMUNITY ACTION

##### "PART A—GENERAL

##### "DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title, as amended, to establish programs, policies, and structures through which the Director can play an appropriate role in assisting the States and urban and rural communities therein to rehabilitate the poor by dealing effectively with the principal causes of poverty. In undertaking this role, it shall be the policy of the Director to assist only those programs or activities which focus upon principal causes of poverty.

"The Director shall pursue the purpose of this title—

"(a) by involving in a meaningful way, at the State and local levels, the poor and other interested individuals, groups, and private and public agencies and organizations, including private enterprise and labor; and

"(b) by encouraging the creation and support of community action agencies and neighborhood organizations responsible for identifying causes and conditions of poverty in the community, and for discovering, planning, and executing programs aimed at breaking the poverty cycle, including, but not limited to, imaginative and innovative programs of education, job training, employment and improvement of services to enable the poor better to help themselves.

"It is the finding of Congress that the continued mass migration of the poor from rural America to the Nation's cities is not in the best interest of the Nation or of the poor since such migration tends to further congest already overcrowded slums and ghettos where opportunities for meaningful employment and a decent life are lacking. Therefore, it is declared to be the purpose of this title, and it shall be the policy of the Director, to place special emphasis upon arresting such migration by attacking the causes of poverty in rural America as well as urban America, so that the poor may become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the policy of the Director to encourage or assist, directly or indirectly, such migration.

##### "RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DIRECTOR

"SEC. 202. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the 'Director') shall be responsible for the administration of this title.

##### "ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

"SEC. 203. There shall be appointed two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects de-



signed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

#### "RESERVATION OF ALLOTMENTS

"204. (a) Not less than 10 per centum of each State's allotment under section 213 shall be reserved for grants to the State agency of such State pursuant to section 232.

#### "FEDERAL PRIORITY

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the sum allotted to each State under section 213(a) shall be reserved for the funding of programs proposed by job opportunities boards of qualified community action agencies or by qualified substitute agencies.

#### "POVERTY CRITERIA

"SEC. 206. After consultation with each commission (established pursuant to section 211) and on the basis of income, cost of living, differences between urban and rural life, and other relevant factors, the Director shall establish and promulgate appropriate criteria for determination of those individuals who shall be considered urban poor and rural poor for purposes of this title. Such criteria may vary within reasonable limits from State to State, as the Director and the State commission of each State, if any, may determine (or the Director acting alone if there is no such State commission in such State) deem appropriate, but the criteria must be uniform throughout any one State. The Director shall apply such criteria annually, using the most current information available from the Bureau of the Census, together with any additional data which may be furnished by the State commission or from other reliable sources, to determine the number of urban poor and rural poor in each State and in the Nation.

#### "PART B—STATE PARTICIPATION

##### "STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 211. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant or otherwise participate under this title shall designate or establish a State action commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'State commission' which shall be broadly representative of local community action agencies, public and private education, welfare, rehabilitation, manpower, health, and other public and private human resources agencies, Headstart agencies, business and labor organizations, minority racial groups, the elderly poor, and such other groups and organizations as may be appropriate: *Provided, however*, That no more than one-third of the membership of the State commission shall be State and local officials of their representatives.

"(b) A State commission established or designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

"(1) be the sole agency responsible for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under this title;

"(2) undertake to identify areas of concentration and general characteristics of the poor, and to determine fundamental causes of poverty in each State;

"(3) initiate and conduct comprehensive planning, including the determination of State priorities and policies (including criteria for the allocation of funds to qualified community action agencies or substitute agencies subject to the provisions of this title) to eliminate the causes of poverty in each State;

"(4) promulgate and submit to the Director and to each qualified community action agency and delegate agency in each

State, in advance of each fiscal year after fiscal year 1968, at a time determined by the Director, a State plan for action, which shall review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning the funding of each of the programs proposed to be conducted by each qualified community action agency or substitute agency in the State in each fiscal year, taking into consideration any other relevant public or private program to assure that programs funded under this title are focused upon meeting those needs which cannot be or are not met by such other programs;

"(5) select, in accordance with the provisions of this title, qualified community action agencies and, when appropriate, qualified substitute agencies, to receive assistance or conduct programs under this title; and assign to any agency which is found an area over which it shall have jurisdiction for the administration of programs under this title, which area shall be coterminous with a major State political subdivision, such as a city, county, or parish, except that if such subdivision is not of a size or population to permit the agency to serve it efficiently and effectively, such area shall be coterminous with more than one such subdivision or a lesser portion of such subdivision, so long as due consideration is given to meeting the needs of the poor in the remaining portion of such subdivision;

"(6) consult with and provide assistance, including technical assistance, to community action agencies and qualified substitute agencies; assist in the preparation and administration of annual plans; assist in the training of personnel; assist in coordinating programs to be conducted by any such agency with other ongoing programs serving the same area or any of the poor therein; and assist in mobilizing and making maximum feasible use of public and private resources in carrying out the programs of such community action agencies;

"(7) review, evaluate, and approve or disapprove (in whole or in part) the annual plans of the community action agencies in accordance with criteria set forth in the approved State plan for action, taking into consideration any ongoing State or local programs of a similar nature to determine whether the programs proposed in the annual plan would duplicate or disrupt such ongoing State or local programs;

"(8) report to the Director on the expenditure of Federal funds in such State under this title during each fiscal year to enable the President and Congress to evaluate the progress of the States under this Act;

"(9) establish liaison with State commissions in other States to exchange ideas and information pertinent to comprehensive planning for the elimination of poverty and the avoidance of inefficient or duplicative programs;

"(10) establish for the personnel of the State commission a salary schedule comparable to that of other agencies within each State: *Provided, however*, That the Director in his discretion may modify or adjust such schedule or any provision thereof; and

"(11) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to insure proper disbursement of and accounting for all funds under this title, and to insure that in no case shall Federal funds be commingled with non-Federal funds in financing programs under this title."

On page 186, line 6, renumber section 222 as section 212; lines 12–13, strike "under sections 220 and 221" and insert in lieu thereof "elsewhere in this title".

On page 194, line 20, renumber section 223 as section 213; lines 22–23, strike "sections 220 and 221" and insert in lieu thereof "this title"; line 24, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212".

On page 195, line 24, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212".

On page 196, line 9, strike "pursuant to sections 220, 221 and 222 (a)," and insert

in lieu thereof "under this title"; line 22, strike "sections 220, 221, and 222(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "this title"; line 19, after "services" strike the comma and insert a period in lieu thereof; and strike the balance of line 19 and all of line 20.

Beginning on page 197, strike out all that follows line 11 thereon through line 8 on page 200, and insert in lieu thereof the following new part C:

#### "PART C—PARTICIPATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY; DELEGATE AGENCIES

##### "COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY DEFINED

"SEC. 221. (a) For the purposes of this title, a community action agency shall be a public or private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) which satisfies the following requirements and is designated as a qualified community action agency by the State commission under section 211(b)(5) or by the Director pursuant to section 233:

"(1) Policies are determined by a governing board or a constituent overall governing group thereof, such as an executive committee, the membership of which board or group shall be representative of various community interests as follows:

"(A) at least a third of the members represent the poor, which members are residents of the area served by such agency and selected by the residents of such area, by processes, such as elections or assemblies, in which the poor are given opportunity to participate to the maximum feasible extent; except that for the purposes of this section, any member who is selected by and represents a neighborhood organization as defined in section 222 shall be considered a representative of the poor;

"(B) officials (duly elected or appointed) of local government, or their representatives, not to exceed one-third of the membership of the board: *Provided, however*, That such officials or their representatives are available and willing to serve; and

"(C) the remainder of the membership of such board or group are representatives of and selected by educational, welfare, religious, business, labor, and other organizations, including, in areas served by cooperative extension services or technical action panels, representatives of such services and panels. No person selected under subparagraphs (A) or (C) above as a member of such board or group shall serve more than three consecutive years or more than a total of six years thereon.

"(2) Adequate authority and competence exist to enter into contracts with or receive grants from the State commission and the Director under this title and to carry out the programs for which it requests Federal assistance under this title efficiently, effectively and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this title either directly or by contract with delegate agencies pursuant to section 225.

"(3) Is willing and competent to assume the responsibilities which may be assigned to a community action agency under this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), any neighborhood organization as hereinafter defined shall be authorized to propose programs to be assisted or conducted by such community action agency, and to require such agency to terminate its assistance to or conduct of any program in the neighborhood represented or served by such organization, whenever in its judgment, such program is not in the best interests of the neighborhood.

"(c) The State Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Director, promulgate and publish rules and regulations relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which in the case of a community action board shall not be less than 50 per centum of its total membership), procedures, establishment of committees and



similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that community action boards provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on these boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such rules and regulations shall not preclude any community action board from appointing an executive committee or similar group which fairly reflects the composition of the board to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.

#### "NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION DEFINED

"Sec. 222. For the purposes of this title, a neighborhood organization shall be any public or private nonprofit organization which represents the poor in a single impoverished neighborhood within the area assigned to a qualified community action agency and consists of residents of such neighborhood selected at least annually by residents thereof through processes such as elections and neighborhood meetings in which the poor participate to the maximum feasible extent.

#### "RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

"Sec. 223. It shall be the responsibility of any community action agency which desires to receive assistance under this title to—

"(1) mobilize and make maximum feasible use of public and private resources (including volunteered services of individuals) to eliminate the causes of poverty in accordance with the provisions of this title;

"(2) establish and appoint, within a reasonable time after such agency determines to seek assistance for job oriented programs, as provided in subparagraph 3 of this section, a Job Opportunity Board, a majority of whose members shall be representatives of business and at least one-third of whose members shall be representatives of the poor;

"(3) authorize and direct such Job Opportunities Board to develop programs designed to enable the unemployed and underemployed poor to rehabilitate themselves through meaningful job training, counseling, work experience, supportive services and placement for jobs, including special programs, where appropriate, to eliminate conditions which inhibit or prevent the poor from seeking full-time jobs;

"(4) further authorize and direct such Job Opportunities Board to—

"(A) encourage the contribution of or use of funds, services, facilities, and property from all sources public and private, to carry out the programs described in subparagraph (3) of this subsection;

"(B) encourage the participation, on a voluntary, nonpaid basis, of professional and nonprofessional individuals from the business community willing to devote their time and services to make personal contact with, counsel, advise, and otherwise assist unemployed or underemployed poor individuals to assess and develop potentially marketable skills, prepare for employment interviews and testing, and make the adjustment to full-time and productive employment;

"(C) through direct communication with community leaders and groups, including civic, religious, labor, business, professional, social, and educational, to develop an awareness of the needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor as well as an appreciation of the programs proposed by the Board to encourage support for and voluntary participation in such programs, and to secure commitments from such individuals, groups, and organizations to work for the elimination of unfair hiring practices and similar circumstances which raise obstacles to the employment of the poor;

"(5) submit to the State commission in advance of each fiscal year after fiscal year 1968 an annual plan which shall describe the various programs for which assistance is requested under this title in such fiscal year (including the various programs proposed for inclusion by the Job Opportunities Board pursuant to subparagraph (3) of this subsection), set forth a proposed budget for such programs as well as justifications for such budget, and evaluate the various programs on the basis of criteria established by the agency to assess the relative needs of the poor in the area served by the agency;

"(6) provide for reasonable public access to information, books, and records of the agency, its governing board (or any constituent group thereof), the Job Opportunities Board, and any delegate agency, including reasonable opportunity for hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, in accordance with regulations adopted by the Director;

"(7) seek the cooperation of agencies administering existing programs at the community level significantly affecting the poor; coordinate its own programs with existing programs in order to avoid or eliminate duplication, conflict, and waste; and refer the poor to services offered under existing programs whenever appropriate;

"(8) arrange with a reputable private, independent auditing firm to (A) review, prior to receipt of any assistance under this title, administrative procedures, the recordkeeping systems and fiscal controls of such agency, delegate agencies thereof, and the Job Opportunities Board, and (3) conduct a complete audit of each program included in each annual plan of such agency six months after final approval of such plan to insure that adequate procedures, records, and controls are kept and enforced;

"(9) expend sums granted to it under this title in a manner conforming to and at a rate not in excess of that proposed under its approved annual plan;

"(10) adopt and enforce (or require enforcement of) rules and regulations promulgated by the State commission (subject to approval of the Director) or by the Director governing the wages, benefits, and conduct in performance of duty of its own personnel and the personnel of delegate agencies and the Job Opportunities Board;

"(11) insure that all such personnel described in subparagraph (10) are informed of such regulations and standards therein described; and

"(12) adopt and enforce (or require enforcement of) rules and regulations promulgated by the State commission (subject to approval of the Director) or by the Director governing the payment of expenses to board members attending meetings of the governing board of the community action agency.

#### "APPROVAL OF DELEGATE AGENCIES

"Sec. 224. (a) Any community action agency may contract with one or more public or private nonprofit organizations described in subsection (b) of this section to act as a delegate agency to carry out programs approved for assistance under this title, but only if it determines that such organization—

"(1) has full authority to receive and spend as required by such contract any funds which it may receive thereunder;

"(2) is competent to administer and conduct such programs as may be contracted to it; and

"(3) provides assurances that it will comply with all statutory requirements, rules, standards, and regulations applicable to community action agencies under this title.

"(b) Such organization shall be—

"(1) a neighborhood organization as defined in section 222; or

"(2) any other local, public or private, nonprofit organization (other than a political organization) which has had experience in administration of similar programs.

#### "SUBSTITUTE AGENCIES

"Sec. 225. (a) In the absence of a community action agency, any organization which meets the requirements of a delegate agency under section 224 shall be eligible as a substitute agency to conduct programs under this title.

"(b) In the case of an area served by a community action agency, any organization which meets the requirements of a delegate agency under section 224 shall be eligible as a substitute agency to conduct programs under this title, provided that—

"(1) the program or activity to be conducted is of a demonstration or experimental nature and will not be in conflict with any program or activity being provided by the community action agency; or

"(2) the program or activity to be conducted is unsuitable for inclusion in the annual plan of the community action agency; or

"(3) the program or activity to be conducted is required to meet an urgent and temporary need of the poor, to which the community action agency and local public authorities, if any, are unable or unwilling to respond, when requested in writing by the State commission or the Director to do so."

Page 200, strike lines 9 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### "PART D—FEDERAL FUNCTIONS

##### "APPROVAL OF STATE PARTICIPATION

"Sec. 231. The Director may approve the participation under this title of any State which has accepted the responsibilities described in section 211, but he shall not finally disapprove the participation of any State without first affording it reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

##### "GRANTS TO STATES

"Sec. 232. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make grants to the States out of moneys reserved under section 204 for the use of the State commission designated or established under section 211, to enable it to carry out its responsibilities under sections 211 and 243.

"(b) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission concerned, finds that such commission has failed to meet any of its responsibilities under section 211, he shall suspend grants to such commission and notify the commission in writing that he will make no further payments to the State under this title until such time as he is satisfied that the commission will meet its responsibilities; *Provided*, That, at his discretion, the Director may make further payments to the State during such period of suspension for activities not affected by such failure.

##### "FEDERAL REVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 233. (a) At his discretion, the Director may review the actions of the State commission in determining qualified community action agencies or qualified substitute agencies as provided in section 211(b)

(5), and he may overrule such actions, determine that a community action agency is qualified or disqualified, as the case may be; and designate or redesignate, if need be, the area assigned to any such agency. In the absence of any action by the State commission pursuant to section 211(b)(5) and after reasonable time for the State commission to act upon a request, the Director, on his own initiative and in the manner prescribed for the State commission, may determine the qualifications and area of any organization seeking to be a community action agency and make direct grants thereto from the State allocation.

"(b) If the State fails to designate or establish a State commission or if the State commission fails to meet its responsibilities under this title, the Director shall, to the



extent possible, assume the responsibilities of such State commission and assure that the functions of the State commission are performed until such time as the State shall designate or establish such State commission or shall comply with such obligations.

#### "APPROVAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"

"SEC. 234. (a) After consultation with the State commission, the Director shall approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, the State's plan for action required under section 211 (b) (4): *Provided*, That, in any instance of disapproval, he shall reconsider his decision at any reasonable time that the State commission may wish to present new evidence in support of any disapproved part of its plan or in support of any modifications of such parts. The authority of the Director shall include the authority to disapprove any component program which the State commission has approved and incorporated into its plan. Such disapproval shall be reported to the State commission within thirty days following the determination of the Director, together with the Director's justification therefor.

"(b) In accordance with the approved portions of the State plan for action, the Director shall make grants to qualified community action agencies or contract with qualified substitute agencies for programs authorized under this title.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of part C of this title, the Director shall make grants to any qualified community action agency or contract with any qualified substitute agencies for any program authorized under this title, but not incorporated into the State plan for action, provided that—

"(1) in the case of a qualified community action agency, such agency has included the program in its annual plan and has proposed it for inclusion in the State plan;

"(2) the Director first resubmits the proposal to the State commission for thirty days for review and recommendations; and

"(3) the program is consistent with those criteria, priorities, and policies, if any, included in any State plan previously approved by the Director.

"(d) If the Director has not approved, or has disapproved, the participation of the State because of its failure to (1) designate or establish a State commission, (2) to develop a State plan, or (3) to meet substantially its responsibilities under this title, he may make grants to qualified community action agencies or contract with qualified substitute agencies for programs authorized under this Act. If the Director subsequently approves the participation of the State, in whole or in part, under section 231, he shall not be required to reconsider any grant or contract made under this section during the period in which the State was without such approval.

#### "DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 235. The Director is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research and demonstration projects to develop and to evaluate programs designed to accomplish the purpose of this title. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated for such year to carry out the purposes of this part. No grant or contract for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having

demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of his annual report or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and to the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, indicating the time or period in which such activities were undertaken and to the extent possible the manner in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed with him for review and recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing.

#### "RESTRICTIONS ON ACTIVITIES"

"SEC. 236. (a) For the purposes of chapter 15 of title V of the United States Code, any State commission or community action agency funded under this title shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of that title, any delegate agency or substitute agency funded under this title shall be deemed to be a State or local agency. The Director shall issue such regulations or impose such requirements and restrictions as may be necessary or appropriate to enforce the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) Programs assisted under this title shall not involve the use of program funds, the provision of property or services, or the employment or assignment of personnel which—

"(1) supports or results in the identification of such programs with (A) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (B) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or (C) any voter registration activity, or

"(2) which tends to incite, promote, encourage, coerce or carry on a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of any Federal, State, or local law; which facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, coercion, or carrying on of any such riot or civil disturbance; or which assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or be involved in such riot or civil disturbance.

The Director shall promulgate and publish rules and regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this subsection. Rules or regulations under this subsection shall provide for enforcement procedures which shall include provision for summary suspension or discharge of individuals, or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis. Such regulations or requirements shall not be construed to deprive any person of his right to vote as he may choose and to express, in his private capacity, his opinions on any political subject, public issue, public officials, or candidate for public office.

"(c) Whenever the Director has reason to believe that any of the rules and regulations promulgated or published pursuant to subsection (b) have been violated, he shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the individuals and agencies involved, take corrective action to insure the termination of such violations, which action may include (1) suspension or discharge of any individual involved in such activity or responsible therefor; and (2) the suspension of funds in whole or in part to such agency.

#### "LOBBYING PROHIBITED"

"SEC. 237. The Director shall take such steps as are necessary to insure that the provisions of section 1913, title 18, United States Code, are communicated to all employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and to all employees of any State commission, community action agency, delegate agency, or substitute agency funded in whole or in part under this title or any other title of this Act."

On page 201, line 2, strike "241" and insert in lieu thereof "238"; line 9, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212"; line 11, strike "232" and insert in lieu thereof "235".

On page 203, line 9, strike "242" and insert in lieu thereof "239".

On page 204, line 22, strike "243" and insert in lieu thereof "240".

Page 205, line 14, strike "244" and insert in lieu thereof "241".

On page 207, line 23, strike "245" and insert in lieu thereof "242".

On page 210, after line 22, strike all that follows through line 15 on page 211.

On page 211, strike "247" and insert in lieu thereof "243".

On page 211, after line 21, insert the following new Part E:

#### "PART E—STATE BONUS COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM"

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 241. It is the purpose of this part to further encourage and enable States to act as partners with the Federal Government in carrying out programs under this title.

##### "ALLOTMENTS TO STATES"

"SEC. 242. (a) From the amount allocated to carry out this part for a fiscal year, which shall not be less than \$20,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the Director shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount being allotted as the amount allotted such State under section 213 bears to the amount allotted all the States under such section for such fiscal year.

"(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallocation to other States from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix.

##### "SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PLANS"

"SEC. 243. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Director a supplement to the State plan for action, which supplement—

"(1) provides for carrying out, or supplementing the financing of, community action programs which are eligible for assistance under other parts of this title, but are not being, or are being inadequately assisted thereunder; or

"(2) provides financial assistance to qualified community action agencies or substitute agencies for other programs, including statewide programs, which conform to the policies and priorities of the approved portions of the State plan for action.

"(b) In the same manner and subject to the same procedures as provided under sections 231, 232, and 233, the Director may approve or disapprove the participation of any State under part E of this title.

##### "PAYMENTS"

"SEC. 244. The Federal share for each State for programs under part E of this title shall be 50 per centum."

Mr. GOODALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record at this point.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] cannot explain his amendment until the reading thereof has been dispensed with.

Therefore, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I note that the gentleman from Illinois has been complaining about insufficient time for the purposes of debate. I hope that the gentleman will no longer object now that we are extending additional time under the 5-minute rule to the minority.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most significant areas of the bill, the community action program. I respectfully believe that the amendment I have offered is one of the most significant amendments.

Mr. Chairman, true community action implies three essential elements. The action must result from a decision taken democratically by those affected. Its goal is the sharing of mutual benefits impossible or difficult of attainment individually. Finally, it must be undertaken by the people themselves through maximum contribution of their own labor and intellect.

It is important when we are talking about this community action title, that we understand it.

Mr. Chairman, the three essential elements are immutable, although the process has been variously named over the years. It is a tradition which must be understood and reinvigorated. It is the essence of our ingenious American political system.

Time honored and time tested, it grew from initial expression in the classic division of labor between man and woman. Cavemen structured their fledgling social organization as its practice began to develop into theory. It is rooted in the long history of social and governmental evolution. It is a primary font of economic development.

It typifies the frontier settlement from Jamestown to Virginia City. Men and women struggling to carve home and fortune from the wilderness organized to survive through community action. No government intervened. Such government as existed resulted from decisions taken by the people in town meetings themselves, a form of community action. Homes, schools, and churches were built for the people with their own labor and resources. Such works were executed by a committee of the people.

So grew the theories which dominated the politics of the colonies. Limitations upon this new-found freedom triggered the Revolution.

Formal expressions of community action became known as the Declaration of Independence.

The unique contribution of the American system is total commitment to the community action concept. The key difference is preservation of the democratic expression of the will of the people in application of its techniques.

Community action throughout the world has served as a substitute for despotism. It made possible the cherished common law system nourished by the English and transplanted to America. Elsewhere in the world a comprehensive code of human behavior often emerged to serve as a vehicle for the forces of oppression.

Only in America today is the ideal of government as the last resort for problem solving still pursued. This philosophy is a product of applied community action.

To some, the issue before this House is a cornerstone of our national heritage.

It is strange indeed that those who insist that people can and should solve their own problems oppose this program. People, and people alone, are the exclusive raw material of human progress. People, and only people, are competent to solve those national problems which are in fact the macroism constituted by millions of individual cases.

Few affluent Americans pass a day untouched by the product of community action. From the car pool to the country club, Americans outside the ghettos enrich their lives through sophisticated concert of action. The poor stand, in stark contrast, chained in poverty, without the substance to help themselves in the sophisticated society of today.

Mr. Chairman, one of the examples of community action in a society today is the civil rights movement, the NAACP. Negro people are utilizing the same ingenious system that powered this Nation to greatness. Constructive courses must be available. Militant and irresponsible zealots, those exploiting particularly community action must be replaced by responsible advocates. If one looks through our history, Sam Adams, John Hancock, John Brown, Tom Paine, and—yes—Patrick Henry, were zealots. Without Tom Jefferson and some others like them to channel those forces constructively, they could have been just militant protestations going for naught. Tom Jefferson became safe in the 19th and 20th centuries. He was not very safe in the 18th century when he spoke most

of the things that we quote today as American gospel.

The problem with community action in too many areas is that the Tom Jeffersons have not involved themselves to give constructive courses to deep frustrations generated in the dark ghettos of America.

My amendment is in the form of a substitute to the first few sections of community action. It would preserve the basic intent of community action, the independence of the community action board. It would insist upon representation of local government, but not dominance by local governments over community action boards. It would reverse the action of our committee to set an arbitrary 51-member ceiling in the community action boards because in many areas of our country this would impose a major hardship. It would reverse the action of our committee to require local government involved in every level right down to your neighborhood organizations with one third of such members on the neighborhood boards.

Once again, this becomes unworkable in most of our large cities.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues this is a crucial issue. We must preserve the basic genius of community action in this program. This does not mean we are going to present unregulated and undisciplined opportunity for militant exploitation of Americans. Our amendment brings the States into community action under the Director. The Director of the poverty program in Washington can bypass the States as long as the State programs are not being implemented properly. But where the States are willing to come in, and as long as they are administering the programs to the liking of the Director—and I emphasize that—to the liking of the Director, the States can be utilized. But the Director, if he does not like the way the States are administering it, can bypass the State entirely.

Community action boards would be required to have at least one-third representation of the poor. They would be required, if the city or local government wishes to be represented, to have some representation of local government up to a maximum of one-third.

This program, Mr. Chairman, offers us the opportunity to unite on a bipartisan basis.

I say to you, it does not bypass the local government. It reinforces the strength of the local government. It keeps the community action agencies independent as an instrument to work with the local government and all other elements in the community in partnership. But it avoids the trap, which the committee walked into, I am sad to say—it avoids the trap of making the community action boards subservient to and the creatures of city hall.

If that provision prevails which is in the bill, we will lose the potential of community action. We will have the community action boards in our cities turned over to city hall. If you think politics has been involved in this program up to now—when it is turned over to city hall in the form in which it is included in the committee bill, you will



see the worst and most egregious kind of abuses.

I call upon all my colleagues to support this amendment on a bipartisan basis. There has never been anything partisan about community action. It has had bipartisan support from the beginning. I rise here to call upon all my colleagues who represent Americans all over this country to give the ghetto area people their opportunity to have a voice and a responsible voice in partnership with their elected officials so that we can go forward and motivate people to help themselves.

That is the key element and I hope it will be preserved in this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from New York who offered the amendment, if I may have his attention.

Does the gentleman understand who appoints all the members of the citywide CAP program in the largest city in the country today; that is, New York City? Do you know who does that?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr. CAREY. Is it the mayor of the city of New York?

Mr. GOODELL. I also know that the mayor of the city of New York has contacted me and you and a great many other Members in opposition to the provisions in the bill. He wants very much to have this restored so that the community action boards can be independent.

Mr. CAREY. And the mayor, of course, is an elected public official and he appoints all the members of the present board, that is correct; is it not? He does not want that for other elected officials but just for the mayor?

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman, he does not appoint all the members of the present board.

Mr. CAREY. I must disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The involvement of the board has been met in New York City not only on community action but it has been made at the neighborhood level throughout the programs in New York.

Mr. CAREY. The record is clear that the mayor appoints all members of the citywide umbrella agency in New York City.

I have one further question. Is it not true under the gentleman's substitute, he does make provision that one-third of the board would be public officials elected or appointed, under your substitute amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Did the gentleman say one-third of the poor?

Mr. CAREY. One-third of the public officials would be elected or appointed.

Mr. GOODELL. The amendment provides that there must be a representation of local government if the local government wishes the representation up to a maximum of one-third.

Mr. CAREY. And they may be public officials elected or appointed?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. They are representative of the local government.

Mr. CAREY. Evidently, when the gentleman puts them in his amendment, they are annointed and deserving and truly diligent and worthy public officials, but when they are in the committee bill, they are low-grade politicians.

Mr. GOODELL. Of course, that is not the distinction, if I may say so.

The gentleman is well aware that the key issue here is not representation on the board. The committee moved to require one-third, one-third, and one-third—from the poor, from the city officials, and from agencies generally in the community.

Ours is somewhat different in that it would require up to one-third, and it would require that they be represented from the local government, if they wish to be. But the key issue here is whether the board that is functioning is going to be independent, whether it is going to have its own voice and set its own priorities, or whether it will be the creature of city hall. The committee bill makes it the creature of city hall.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, many Members in this Chamber have spent perhaps the greater part of their lives connected with governments, whether they be local, county, or municipal, in an effort to serve the people that they were privileged to represent. It goes without saying, and it is an elementary principle, that if we do not have cooperation at the local level of government, whether it is in the city, in the county, or in some rural area, with the local governmental officials, we just are not going to accomplish anything or obtain any results.

We have \$1,062,000,000 in community action programs. All of us want to see every penny of that billion-plus dollars spent wisely and not wasted.

There was evidence before the House Committee on Education and Labor that some funds had been loosely spent. Many are convinced it was because of the lack of involvement of local governments. The record speaks for itself, and I invite you to examine those four volumes of hearings that we have conducted since last June 12.

We must get the local governments more involved in this program if we are going to have a constructive program and if we are going to have a program that is going to endure and survive the next year, the next 5 years, or the next 10 years to serve the people in the ghettos and serve the people in the rural areas. To do so we must get the local governments involved, more so than they have been in the past, or somewhere along the line we are going to have too much trouble in the enactment of this program in the future.

To my way of thinking, every Member in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, can vote against this amendment. Sections 210 and 211 of the committee bill to which the amendment is directed were carefully worked out on a bipartisan basis in committee.

In the language worked out in com-

mittee for sections 210 and 211 we simply provide that a community action agency shall be a State, municipality, or a local subdivision of that State. Or they may, if they wish, designate a private, nonprofit agency or some other public agency to serve as the community action agency. But in all instances the poor are represented.

The amendment adopted in the committee provides in each instance for a board, at least one-third of which shall consist of representatives of the poor. Another third shall be elected public officials or their representatives. The remainder shall be civic leaders, business, labor, church groups, patriotic groups in the communities or throughout the area that the community action program covers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down. The provision in the bill is reasonable. I am hopeful not only that we will vote down the amendment but also, when we go to conference, that this provision will remain unaltered in the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to join my distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky in what he has just said. This is a good and important provision in this bill. A lot of work has gone into it. It is important that this bill not be splintered.

Those who are in favor of moving this bill to a final and successful conclusion will, in my judgment, support the gentleman. I ask my colleagues to defeat the pending amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact, I ask the chairman of the committee, that there was testimony before our committee that in Newark a rump organization took over a community action board, ran away with it, and gave neither the city administration nor the OEO nor anyone else any control over the activities of that community action board?

This amendment, offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, would prevent that kind of runaway activity; is that not a fact?

Mr. PERKINS. That is absolutely correct.

First let me state that in the Newark hearings before the committee there was no evidence that the workers in the so-called poverty program incited the riot. There were some statements on the part of some people that they may have created a certain climate, but there was no evidence that they incited a riot.

The amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon certainly will eliminate this situation, and eliminate it in many other cities of the country where it crept up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentlemen that the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, has been recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say further that the provision referred to as the amendment of the gentlewoman Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is a part of the bill reported by the committee. It



is true that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon did have a major part in the formulation of this amendment, but it is a provision which was worked out by the committee and it is a part of the bill. It is not a pending amendment; it is a provision in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, we have heard time and time again that the local members of the OEO staff and others and local members of the committee have supported the committee bill, but in this particular case we have a situation in which again and again and again the local people involved in the war on poverty are indeed against the committee bill in this section.

What we are doing with this amendment is just this: We are providing for a balanced committee to operate the war on poverty—a balanced committee between local public officials, private agencies and, most importantly, the poor themselves.

Whereas the statement by the chairman and others indicates that the committee bill will involve the poor, I say it will involve the poor only indeed in an advisory capacity. Under the committee bill the delegation of authority goes directly to the local political subdivisions. Might I note parenthetically, what a strange contrast in philosophy. Whereas the majority leader and the chairman of the committee have on occasion in the past rejected all concepts of local political subdivisions controlling education programs, they are now coming out and saying that we want to give this authority to the local political subdivisions.

Are we not now at the heart of the matter? It is do we or do we not believe that we should have the poor effectively involved in making their own decisions and in having adequate and effective representation in the war on poverty. Or do we intend to give the control back to the bosses in city hall?

Now let us recognize that there have been in some city administrations an effective involving of the poor. Yet the events of the last summer point to the fact that the poor are not adequately represented under the present program. They have been promised things that they have not received and they have not had a voice. I suggest to you that we need a balanced program involving local public officials, private agencies, and especially the poor themselves, not just in an advisory capacity but involved in the decision making. The method to do that is through the Goodell amendment proposed today.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. ERLENBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, there may be some confusion in the minds of the Members as to what the difference between the provisions in the committee bill known as the Green amendment and the provisions of the

Goodell amendment might be and how they conflict. I think very simply put, it is this: The Green amendment provides that the community action agency, the one with the executive authority to make decisions as to what a community action program will be and how it will be carried out, shall be the State or a political subdivision of the State. The Goodell amendment provides for a community action agency with representation from local elected officials to have this executive authority, or the authority to make the decisions. The Green amendment does provide for a board, but it is only an administrative board, a board without decisionmaking power and a board that would be empowered only to carry out the decisions made by the State or the political subdivision of the State which is the community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, the question has often been asked, "Why not involve and bring into community action locally elected officials?"

Mr. Chairman, many of us have complained in the past that the structure of community action bypassed the State and local officials to set up a separate, independent branch of Government so to speak in the local community. It is completely bypassing the locally elected officials. This should be remedied.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will remedy that situation. However, the Goodell amendment does not turn the program around 180° as does the Green amendment which is contained in the bill and referred to as sections 210 and 211.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill in order to make this 180° turn takes the poor and the local businessman out of the decisionmaking process in the community action program.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we have another problem here that goes beyond sections 210 and 211. Once we say that the State or local municipality is the community action agency, then look at section 212 that defines what a community action agency must be able to do. It says here that—

A Community Action agency—

And this would be the State or local municipality or subdivision of the State—

must have the authority under its charter or applicable law—

I presume that would be the State constitution or the charter of a city—  
to receive and administer funds under this title.

That means Federal funds going to the State or local municipality.

Then, Mr. Chairman, later on at page 177 it says that these funds channeled through the State or local community can go to public or private nonprofit agencies acting as grantees, contractors and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this raises a real question as to whether a State or local community has the authority under its constitution or under its charter to receive Federal funds and then channel them to a nonprofit agency or to a private agency to act as the grantee of these funds.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it raises a real question as to whether church-related schools operating Headstart programs could receive these funds through a State or local municipality, or whether the State or local municipality could be designated under the law as a community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion many of the States would be precluded, under their respective constitutions, from having the powers which are set forth in section 212 and meeting these qualifications.

Therefore, the State in many instances would be prohibited from acting as the community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, we have had no testimony presented before our committee as to how many State constitutions and local charters would allow a community action agency, State or local group, to exercise the functions required under section 212.

It is my further opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the church-state relationship is raised by the wording of this section.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois can clarify for me, as a colleague of his from the great State of Illinois, what the present attitude of Mayor Daley of Chicago would be toward this amendment?

Does the gentleman think he would be for or against it?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] that the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is probably in a better position to answer the gentleman's question, since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has a more direct line to the office of the mayor than does the gentleman who now occupies the well of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have listened very carefully to debate on this amendment. Obviously those who oppose the committee bill have not taken the trouble to read all of its provisions. I do not know where they were when the bill was being discussed in committee. I call the attention of my colleagues to page 171 of the committee bill, which provides in section 210 that a community action agency shall be a State or political subdivision, then, on page 174, we provide in the committee bill that this community action agency shall administer its programs through a community action board. Get that straight. No funds can be spent by a community action agency until the programs have been approved by the community action board and we carefully spell out how that board is to be chosen to assure community participation.

Then on page 175, it clearly states that the Director shall provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in pro-



grams assisted under this title. To suggest that the victims of party will not have a voice in formulating these programs is to depart from the facts.

We say that the taxpayers' money shall go to an agency controlled by the electorate, either a municipal, county, or a State, but none of that money can be spent until a community action board has been set up, and, I repeat, it is spelled out how this board is to be set up and what it is to consist of. Then it provides that the Director shall promulgate regulations which will give that board the say-so on these programs.

So, do not let these people kid you that somehow or other we have eliminated the poor.

If this provision of the bill is defeated in the Committee, I shall ask for a rollcall vote, and I want to spread across the RECORD those Members who do not have confidence in the elected officials of their respective communities, in the mayors, the city councils, county boards, and, yes, in their State Governors—those who do not have confidence in letting elected officials control the taxpayers' money.

We are talking about millions of dollars here. I want the RECORD to identify those who do not have confidence in these elected officials. I want the mayors of these communities to know how their congressmen voted in giving them basic control over the money spent by the poverty program.

I want to show who the Members are who—

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Not at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to show who the Members are who support the establishment, as the gentlelady from Oregon said, of a separate government—a shadow government—that is not elected by the people. Who are the Members of Congress who believe in operating these programs and spending vast sums of the taxpayers' money by people who have no one to account to.

I say to the Members that what we did in the committee bill is to assure that this program goes forward with the full cooperation of the duly elected officials of the community who have the respect and confidence of the electorate, men and women who periodically must go before their electors and account for their stewardship.

Mr. Chairman, I say that defeat of the committee bill, and substitution with the Goodell amendment will put this program right where it is now. We saw this summer the mayor in Aurora, Ill., who witnessed a riot in his city, unable to improve the poverty program to help eliminate the conditions which led to the rioting because the nominating committee of the community action board in his community refused to have any public officials on the board. Can you imagine a community board keeping a mayor of its city off the board. Well it happened in Aurora under the amendment being offered by the gentleman from New York.

The chairman of the committee mentioned a moment ago about the testi-

mony of Newark witnesses. I invite the Members to read that testimony. Do not take my word for it, read it. See how a renegade group of self-styled leaders took over a community action board in Newark and by the testimony of city councilmen and members of the police department who came before this committee, helped set the stage for mass disturbances in that community. When we asked why these troublemakers were not fired we were told no one had any authority to fire them because the board was completely autonomous. Not even the OEO could interfere once a contract was signed. What kind of colossal foolishness is this?

All over this country in the smaller communities of America, public officials are excluded from the program. No wonder they do not want to participate, because they have nothing to say, and they are not willing to take the responsibility for being in this program and not having anything to say about how these moneys are spent.

So I say to you, my friends, look this over carefully, and then reject the Goodell amendment. Stay with the committee if you want to make this poverty program worth while.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Not at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that there are about 1,010 community action programs in this country, and I might say to my colleagues that a vast majority of these are in communities where a Republican local administration is in control. So this is not a partisan matter we are trying to put over on this Congress. I invite you to talk to your own mayors and talk to your own public officials in your communities, and ask them why they are not participating in the program. They will tell you the reason they are not participating in the program is because they do not have a voice in the program. The committee bill corrects this serious shortcoming in the present law.

So I urge the rejection of the Goodell amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest a moment ago to my colleague on that side of the aisle, the gentleman from Illinois—[Mr. MICHEL]. I must say that I was in agreement with a great deal that the gentleman said.

It seems to me we have been reading in the papers of late about a Congress unresponsive to the needs of the poor. It seems to me it is desirable to get the facts straight.

It was the Congress and not the Office of Economic Opportunity which appropriated \$1.7 billion last year for the poverty program.

It was the Congress and not the Office of Economic Opportunity which has voted the funds amounting to more than \$20 billion for urban and rural development, for social security, for aid to de-

pendent children, for aid to the elderly, for educational funds for disadvantaged children, and so on and so on.

It is the Congress and not the OEO who will be held accountable by the people if these funds do not go to those for whom they were intended and for the purposes for which those funds are intended.

I must say to my colleagues, I am thoroughly tired of the OEO casting itself in the role of the "White Knight in Shining Armor," the champion of the beleaguered poor, and assigning to the Congress the part of the "Ugly Dragon." The facts of the plot are quite different, for it is the so-called dragon that gave the so-called white knight his armor and his mission.

It is ridiculous for the OEO to call "foul" every time they are questioned about whether the mission is being accomplished. It makes just about as much sense as telling someone who makes a donation to a charity that he has no right to know if his donation was spent for the stated purpose.

In this case the American taxpayers are the donors; they have entrusted the Congress with the task of allocating those funds wisely, and it is far past the time that the Office of Economic Opportunity realizes that they are the dispersal agency—nothing more—not the donor—and not the recipient. They owe it to all: the taxpayer, the poor, and the Congress an accurate accounting of how the funds are spent and whether, indeed, the purpose is being accomplished.

I might add as an aside, if the poor are really interested in improving their condition, they should be equally concerned to see that all of the funds are handled properly and that there is fiscal accountability and that the money does go for the purposes for which it was appropriated.

May I say in addition, this amendment in the committee bill which is being discussed at this time is not the "Green amendment," as our majority leader has so accurately stated. This was an amendment that was worked on by several members of the committee and many hours were spent on it. It was also a bipartisan amendment to the bill by the committee. There were just about as many Republicans who supported this amendment as there were Democrats on the committee. May I also say, that as I sat through the hearings through the last several weeks on this bill and now for the last week on the House floor, I wondered at times whether it was city hall or poverty that was the enemy being attacked with Federal funds. It was impossible not to question whether we were using Federal money to organize or encourage rival and harassing power centers, to the duly elected community authorities.

What a tragedy it would be if the community action against poverty becomes perverted to an attack on local government as though it were the cause or even held the cure for the problem.

For whatever grievances the poor may have—and the list is long—the picket line around the courthouse, the demonstration at the police station, or the angry



rally in the core of the ghetto are not places to learn a skill or to find a willing employer. The goal of the Economic Opportunity Act is for every American to have a decent place to live, enough good food on the table, and a chance to walk with his head held high because he makes his own way in the world and his wife, his children, and his neighbors know it.

Mr. Chairman, when I have heard in the last 2 weeks attacks made on State or local officials—on city hall—I must say to you that I take no personal umbrage because I have never had the honor of being the mayor of a city, a member of a city council, or one of the county commissioners. But I do count many very distinguished Members of this House who did serve with distinction at the local level. The honor roll is long. Among Members now serving in this House we have 30 former mayors. Do you mean to tell me that there is some kind of political metamorphosis that takes place when an individual travels from his hometown to Washington, D.C., and that when he was mayor of a city presiding over city hall, he was unresponsive to the needs of the poor, that he did not concern himself about programs that would help them, but when he came to Washington he suddenly was endowed with all wisdom and all compassion and all concern? I cannot believe that. He had the same concern and compassion as mayor that he has as a Member of Congress.

In addition to 30 Members of this House who were former mayors, we also find we have 34 former city councilmen, 33 former city and county judges, and 57 local and State board chairmen, county commissioners, and supervisors. By what divine wisdom does anyone in this House now argue that future Members of this body must not be and, indeed, cannot be entrusted with this program as they serve today at the local level?

As I said the other day, if State or local officials, duly elected to office, charged with the responsibility and required by law to give an accounting of the funds spent—if such State or local politicians are unresponsive to constituency needs, blind to poverty, and deaf to the needs for change, the answer, as I see it, is to be found in throwing them out of office at the next election. But do not place all of this responsibility and money in the hands of a board that is responsible to no one.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been endorsed by the National Association of Counties. It has been endorsed by the National League of Cities, representing 14,300 cities across this country. Why are these people concerned? Why are they anxious that this amendment be retained in the bill?

I think there are several reasons, but let me give you one. I think there comes a time in the hearings when you finally make up your mind that there must be a change in the legislation if you are going to be able to support it. That moment in the hearings came when a gentleman who was a community action representative, or chairman of a community action program in Oregon, testified before the committee. He had said that he wanted more power put into the hands

of the local CAP agency. He had been critical of the local school board.

I asked him how the school board was chosen. He said they were elected by all the people in the community. This is the testimony, and allow me to read from the hearings that were held this year, just a couple of months ago. I said to him:

How are the CAP people chosen?

And this is the chairman of the CAP agency in Oregon. If he is chosen this way, they are chosen the same way in countless communities across the country. The chairman of the CAP board in Medford, Oreg., said:

We are very undemocratic in this way. We choose ourselves initially. We went to the county court and we said, will you approve this. This was for the first board.

I said:

A school board that is elected by the people supposedly has the best judgment to run the educational programs. You would like an agency that is self-selected and approved by the judges, or whoever it is, to have superior authority over the duly-elected representatives?

Mr. Day said:

This bothers me. We sit there not responsible to anybody and we are handling something like \$400,000 a year of taxpayers' money. Not a one of us is elected by the public generally and I realize that it is a tremendous responsibility, but it is not the school boards that we have difficulties with. It is the administration establishment.

And then I said, in effect, "You said that you would like to see CAP get more power to compel other agencies to work with them"—other agencies that have been elected—and he said, "Yes." I said:

What do you mean by this?

Mr. Day said:

We have several examples. . . . We see the Neighborhood Youth Corps, for instance, being improperly handled.

I wish I had time to quote the entire colloquy because it bears on this amendment. It appears on page 2695 of the hearings. Mr. Day continued:

The schools are running the in-school program, and some outfit with the Labor Department is running the out-of-school program.

He continues:

I would like to see CAPs have the first shot at funding any type of program and let them delegate it to a school, for instance. I would like to see the CAP board have a real meaningful write off authority or veto authority on this type of program in our area.

Mr. Chairman, if this board for one community action agency can be self-selected, not one of them elected by the public generally—and as the chairman of the board said—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired. (By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And as the chairman of the CAP board said:

We sit there not responsible to anybody, and handling \$400,000 of the taxpayers' money.

If this can happen here under the present law, this same thing can happen

in any community action agency in the country. Others, we know, have been elected by 1 percent of the poor, quote unquote, 2 percent of the poor, or 6 percent of the poor.

If we are going to provide hundreds of millions of dollars ostensibly to help so many of our people find their way out of "that air-tight cage of poverty," then we ought to make every effort to indeed see that the money goes to the poor.

I would give one example that surely everybody in this House is aware of—the accounting of funds in the Haryou Act of central Harlem. This was one of the reports I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] that I have been trying to get, but have been unable to.

The preliminary audit of that shows that \$383,000 in the Haryou program alone has been disallowed by the auditors, though, a post audit does little to help the poor. The committee bill simply asks that elected people bear the responsibility, that they be held fiscally responsible for all of the funds, and that we stop this nonsense of doling out money from the Federal Government to any agency that wants to qualify.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentlewoman refer to parks in California?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will discuss that if I am allowed to offer an amendment tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other thing and then I will yield to Members.

I do not think the Congress aimed to create autonomous groups to displace decisionmaking processes of State, county, and local governments, or to fund with Federal dollars dissident groups intent on reversing decisions which the duly elected school boards or duly elected county or local governments have made.

As I said the other day, no one challenges the right of dissent, but we do question the wisdom of requiring others to pay taxes to finance it. The committee bill does not intend—nor do any of its provisions provide—that poor people will no longer be able to help shape decisions affecting their lives. The opposite is true, for the bill specifically provides that community action boards shall insure participation of the poor through giving poor people at least one-third of the seats on such boards. But it also provides that those who are helping to pay the bill and who also live in this same community shall have a voice through their elected officials on how their money is to be spent and how programs can be coordinated with other existing programs.

In the committee bill we are defending the right—indeed the responsibility of State and local governments—to make hard decisions on local problems. In fact, the bill demands engagement by local elected politicians so that they cannot avoid tough decisions on the battlelines of the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Goodell amendment will be defeated and that this House will give their support to the



committee bill which was worked out on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the issue here on this particular vote is quite simple. The question is, will we involve State and local governments as partners but not as masters? Will we make local governments—again I include both State and local governments—participants but not the dominating participant.

I am not here to speak up for the Office of Economic Opportunity. I believe my record here is clear on my reservations concerning certainly the Washington aspect of the Office of Economic Opportunity. My record is clear in voting for a substantial reduction in the funds in the overall program.

I happen to think that the Headstart ought to be transferred to the Office of Education. I think there ought to be a great many other revisions made in the management of the program and the responsibilities of the Office of Economic Opportunity at the Washington level.

However, I do think that the Goodell amendment in this instance ought to prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall vividly the arguments in the last 3 years when proponents of this community action program spoke in the well of this House. In justifying the community action program they argued that we must break the traditional methods of dealing with poverty and the poor. They argued that it was essential and necessary to encourage the poor to help themselves in the unfortunate circumstances in which they were living. They argued that the traditional role of local government was inadequate; it had failed in the past and therefore we had to have a new technique by which the disadvantaged would have the hope of participating and helping themselves with the assistance of Federal funds.

I must confess that I was not sold or persuaded. I did not really believe that this new technique would work. However, I come from a community of 220,000, a county of 385,000, the fourth largest in the State of Michigan, and a substantial industrial county, with our share of the poor, the unfortunate and the disadvantaged. Last week, a week ago today, as a matter of fact, I met with about 150 people who followed the course that was outlined in the bill for community action for the last 3 years. These were people from all walks of life. They were the most affluent and the poorest; people who had made this program work by following the formula that has been in the law up to now. I admitted in their presence that I was wrong—that this new approach to involve the poor was a better one than what we had followed over a long period of years in this country. I was proud to see those who were affluent in our community and those who were the poorest sit down and discuss with me and perhaps to some ex-

tent disagree with me about the dollars but sell me that the community action program, where you have a partnership of local government, State government, and the poor, is the best answer. On my right during this 2½ hours of discussion was the mayor of my community, an able nonpartisan local official. He agreed with me that he was apprehensive initially that the program would work with the new technique but he was pleased with the way it was operating. He was not urging me to change the old formula because it had worked. He found that this community of 220,000 by working with this group, the people from the poverty-stricken areas, was doing the job and that this was the best way to get the results we wanted with the dollars we invested at the Federal level.

So I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle we have traditionally felt and we do today that we want local government to be strengthened and not to be weakened.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD, by unanimous consent, was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, based upon my personal observations of a relatively large industrial community, I am sold on the idea that we can get the best return from our Federal contribution, we can get the best return from the contribution made locally, in cash or in kind, by having a partnership between local government and the State government, as recommended in the Goodell amendment, and by the vigorous participation of responsible people from the poverty-stricken areas. It is my hope and belief that they will no longer be hesitant to come in and participate with the local people in the resolution of the problems, problems which they could not heretofore solve.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say if we really want to make local government work in the solution of these problems, we should join with the poor as partners and not exclude them from participation. We should not turn the program over to the big-city politicians and any others who might use it for purposes not intended in the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the concern of the distinguished minority leader for the poor and for local government is touching, indeed.

Now, let us examine what can happen under the plan being advocated in the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. Chairman, the paradox is that State governments should be arbiters of specific needs and solutions of the local

communities which, of course, are their creation; that they should be the arbiter to be left out of a modern State legislature. It goes squarely against the trend toward increasing home rule.

Mr. Chairman, what does it add to the existing statutory framework of community action? Delay, friction, and confusion. Delay, because the State's review of local proposals and formulation—subject to reconsideration at the Federal level—cannot help but add another 3 or 4 months to the funding process if the State is to take its responsibilities seriously.

There is bound to be friction because a State is not required to contribute any program resources and community residents are bound to resent being told by someone in the State capital that they have not properly conceived their own local problems and needs. Suppose, for example, the community agency proposes to run a legal services program and the State disapproves because the head of the State community action program thinks family planning is more important. It is possible. Confusion is certain, because State governments have little competence to assess grassroots needs and formulate programs to meet them. In other words, the sponsors of this proposal recognize this when they provide that the Director could override any or all of a State agency's planning and could even assume the functions thereof. In other words, the whole idea is hedged. When someone does not have the courage of his convictions, it is time to consider whether they are good convictions or not.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the community action agency can appeal over the head of the State agency to the Federal Government, it still has no certainty about where its program proposals stand until the very end of a long process.

Mr. Chairman, delay, friction, and confusion are only a part of the problem. A State plan could not provide an interlocking and mutually consistent program such as the committee bill proposes to do. Community action is not a single action as envisioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The committee, after a considerable debate, has provided a well-balanced structure relating our existing law, plus some significant changes, to go after this.

I am against the amendment by the gentleman from New York, very strongly, as is the gentlewoman from Oregon who just indicated so in her speech, but I am against it for entirely different reasons than indicated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. Because I not only was present at the Newark, N.J., hearings in the committee, I, as a matter of fact—and the record will so show—asked more questions perhaps than anyone else. And not one iota of evidence was adduced from those three witnesses from the city of Newark to connect one single poverty worker with the disturbance in Newark. And any statement to the contrary is answered flatly by the record.

Mr. Chairman, each of us have a variety of reasons for being for or against an idea. I am against this idea because



I am convinced in my own mind that the States do not have the resources, the competence, to handle programs, as are set forth in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, because I know the hour is getting late, but I believe it might be helpful to try and clarify this debate slightly—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see a number of Members standing. Are they all seeking recognition on this amendment? And if so, we will not be able to finish by 5:30.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 p.m.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] is recognized.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very clear that there are two provisions in the pending committee bill that are unwise. The first of these is the Green amendment, because very clearly, in my judgment, the thrust of this is to turn out the community action agencies, and turn over direct control of them to governmental entities, such as city hall which with some exceptions—notably New York City—would stifle innovation and flexibility. It could move the community action agencies back into the smoke-filled rooms and into the arena of the political clubhouse. I believe in this respect it is very clearly a mistake.

I would submit the principal purpose of a community action board is to mount a meaningful campaign to assist those living in poverty to obtain a better way of life with lasting jobs. It is not—and I repeat—it is not a proving ground for officials elected to other positions of public trust in other areas of competence. I believe that the Green provision should be amended in the committee bill to insulate the innovative capabilities and capacities of the CAPS from political domination.

The second provision, Mr. Chairman, that is unwise is to place a requirement on local community action boards that they must put up 10 percent or one-half of the local share in cash.

It is very clear I think that many communities and many CAP's could not meet this requirement and that these new cash requirements might have to be met from tax funds and that many localities do not have the tax resources to provide those additional funds.

More tragically, there would no doubt be local officials who would be unwilling to obligate public tax funds to this pur-

pose. The supreme irony is that there might well be communities whose residents most need the help that would be unwilling to take this action.

Clearly this cash requirement is inimical to voluntary support and wide support on the part of a number of philanthropic agencies, religious organizations, YMCA's and church groups.

Mr. Chairman, I think both of these provisions in the bill should be changed.

The Goodell-Quie substitute clearly does several things.

First, it removes the upper limit of 51 as the maximum number on a community action board, which would be very helpful in New York City.

Second, it removes the local share cash requirement.

Third, it says that at least a third of the members should be public officials.

It makes no requirement that a third be public officials and clearly it is the intent of the substitute not to place community action agencies in city hall.

The debate today has touched on what several mayors believe about this, and it is my understanding that Mayor Lindsay of New York believes that the Goodell substitute in respect to its amendments relative to the Green provision is an improvement.

The mayor of New York does, however, have serious reservations with regard to the State plan in the Goodell substitute because he believes this would add another administrative layer, lessening the involvement of the community in community action and making it more difficult for New York City to proceed effectively.

It is my understanding that, on balance, Mayor Lindsay would oppose the Goodell substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the substitute and if it is defeated I would urge the adoption of amendments to clarify and improve the deficiencies I have noted in the committee bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, last week and again yesterday, I spoke to my colleagues in the House about the importance of retaining the specialized and concentrated focus on the problem of poverty which is provided by the independent Office of Economic Opportunity.

The thrust of my remarks on those two occasions was that poverty is a matter of urgent and special concern, which required urgent and special solutions best provided by an independent Federal agency whose sole responsibility is the war against poverty.

The same argument applies even more strongly to local antipoverty efforts. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now before the House to strike committee revisions of title II, which would require that community action agencies be public agencies, is essential to the effective continuation of these local programs. I heartily support this crucial amendment.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act as it now stands, local programs may be administered by nonprofit, private com-

munity action agencies. These agencies have grown in many communities to be important social forces, inspiring both public and private concern and action in behalf of innercity economically deprived residents. Most important is the involvement of the poor themselves in directing and implementing the policies and programs of these agencies. The independent community action agencies afford a unique exercise in democracy for many people who otherwise would have little or no opportunity to direct the course of their neighborhoods and communities.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that if the anti-poverty programs on the local level were submerged into the structure of local government organizations, that this involvement of the poor in helping themselves and their neighbors would be lost, as would the flexibility of an independent agency whose sole concern is carrying out a successful antipoverty program in the community.

The case for this amendment could not be better stated than it was 2 weeks ago by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], when he said:

The goal of Community Action is to help people help themselves, rather than to subject them to welfare-type services. It is a means to allow the poor to act, not simply be acted upon. It is a source of innovation and new approaches to break the shackles of poverty. To have any hope of success, Community Action Boards must have real authority and balanced membership, including the poor themselves. They cannot function effectively as a part of City Hall.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will see the compelling logic of this statement, and that we will preserve independence and citizen-participation in this vital aspect of the poverty program.

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodell substitute and urge the Committee to adopt it as a progressive step. It is aimed at maintaining the innovation and creativity of independent community action agencies and furthermore it is aimed at providing the job opportunity board, as proposed in the Goodell substitute, as a means of insuring that there shall be job orientation in meaningful jobs for those to be served through local CAP agencies.

If we do this, we will prevent the regressive and backward step contained in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am utterly amazed that people who serve in elective office at the Federal level would take the position today that some



do and say, "You can trust me as an elected official, but you can't trust anybody else." If you support the Goodell amendment, you have said to every elected official at the State level and every political subdivision below the State level that you represent, "I stand above you. You can trust no one but me." Defeat the amendment. Give the responsibility for community action agencies to responsible elected officials who have a responsibility to their electorates. Remove them from those who have no responsibility to anyone. I trust the elected officials in my district and I believe they trust me. Why do you not do the same?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

[Mr. ESCH addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discovery on the part of the distinguished minority leader that the community action program is working, I would hope that he would support the present statutory framework. I am opposed to "city hall" domination as proposed in the Green amendment. I am equally opposed to "statehouse" domination as proposed in the Goodell amendment. I urge support, when it is offered, for the Hawkins amendment, which will strike from the bill the Green amendment and retain the present language.

The unique feature of the community action program is the direct involvement of the poor in planning for their own needs. The very failure of the traditional approach necessitated new thinking and innovation. Community action has stirred fresh hopes and aspirations which it would be cruel to stifle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

(By unanimous consent Mr. GURNEY yielded his time to Mr. QUIE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, paraphrasing the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the last few days, if we leave the Green amendment in the bill, it will destroy community action as we know it now. What the Green amendment does is to say that the States and the local political subdivisions shall be the community action agencies. The three-legged board consisting of local public officials, the interested agencies, and the poor will not be the governing board in that case. The community action board will strictly be acting in an advisory capacity. The poor need to have a voice in these programs. We do not want city hall to dominate the program. Let them have a voice. City hall ought to have a voice. But they should not dominate the program as they would under the Green amendment. I ask support of the Goodell

amendment in order that the work under the community action agency will continue to give hope to the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I believe that local decisionmaking is what we are all for. Officials at the State level have traditionally been disinterested and unconcerned with the problems of the poor; that is why we have a Federal poverty program—most State administrations—with a few notable exceptions—could not have cared less. Hopefully, the States will rapidly mobilize their resources and leadership to meet headon the challenge of urban and rural poverty alike. But until that time arrives, we should defeat this amendment and others like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE].

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, as I believe it is the most meaningful way to carry forth the poverty program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. It is a misnomer if we say that State participation in the Goodell amendment would give the State control. The Director would permit them to do so only if they devised a plan acceptable to the Commission, and then the money would go directly to the local community action agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the Goodell amendment would require the involvement of local officials on community action boards. Both the status and the composition of the boards would, in my opinion, be improved. It would increase the involvement of local government without giving it domination, and it would, in addition, perform the very important task of creating a Job Opportunity Board with the features about which Mr. STEIGER spoke.

In addition, it will eliminate the requirement that one-half of the local contribution must be in cash. Without this amendment a great many desirable community programs will be forced to end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose substituting a State stranglehold over community action programs for municipal. I am opposed to both.

I believe there is a hooker in the Goodell amendment, in that it requires 50-percent contribution from the local community, and therefore would kill community action effectively altogether.

Nobody has mentioned that. As I read the amendment, that is in the amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. That is not true. That is a State bonus provision. If the State puts up a dollar the Federal Government will put up a dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, since obviously no one can present an argument in 30 seconds, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

Since so many have been asking me what the end result might be, when we get down to the voting on this bill, I should like to announce if Members are relying on the passage of the Green of Oregon amendment to determine what might be in motions later on, I would be very careful not to assume that if the Green of Oregon amendment should prevail there will be provisions in the motion to recommit to protect their opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a brief word in support of sections 210 and 211 of the pending bill, the so-called Green amendment.

The House Education and Labor Committee, as we all know, devoted a great deal of attention to this subject of community action agencies. A bipartisan majority of that committee believed that locally elected public officials should have more of a voice in the antipoverty effort in their own communities. I agree.

The basic objective of the language in the committee bill is simply this: to insure that authority over the conduct of community action programs is not divorced from accountability to the people in the community for the honest and efficient operation of those programs.

The pending bill does not do away with participation of the poor—it requires that one-third of community action board members be representatives of the poor.

The bill would not force unwilling communities to include themselves in the community action program of a State or other political subdivision. Section 210 (e) preserves local freedom of choice in this area.

Nor do I fear abuse of this arrangement by local elected officials. Their conduct of local programs is, by definition, reviewable at the polls by local citizens. If mistakes are made, if inefficiency or malfeasance has occurred in the program, I trust the judgment of the voters to make the necessary corrections.



Under the present arrangement, the local electorate is, in many cases, deprived altogether of a voice in these programs. Large sums of money are granted to privately organized agencies which have broad authority to spend in the community but their decisions are not reviewable by that community. Programs that could be part of a coordinated, long-term community development plan are sometimes undertaken independently and, perhaps, without regard to parallel or preexisting plans by the elected leadership of the political subdivision. The committee bill, on the other hand, fosters integrated planning, the increased commitment of local resources, and responsiveness to the expressed wishes of the electorate as a whole.

I might say that I look forward to support for the committee bill on this point by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUÉ]. He expressed intent to support this type of measure well over a year ago. At the House Education and Labor Committee hearings on March 8, 1966, he said, and I quote:

Any time you let the poor have a voice, and let the State come in to coordinate a program, I am willing to vote for this (antipov-erty) bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statement describes rather well the intent of sections 210 and 211. Under these sections the voice of the poor is preserved and the States are encouraged to coordinate antipov-erty programs. I look forward to the approval of the committee language and to Mr. QUÉ's support for it as well.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OLSEN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. CAREY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, the choice before the Committee is now clear.

We have before us a committee bill, supported by a large majority of the majority party and by a substantial number of the minority party when it was discussed in committee.

I might put it this way: If you are looking at two eggs before you, this one has been candled and the other one is scrambled. We know what is inside this amendment but no one knows what went into this minority omelet.

The Green of Oregon amendment, so-called, was constructed by a considerable number of people on the committee, and clearly provides for the participation of the poor. It mandates the participation of the poor. At least one-third of those on the community board must be poor. In fact, more than one-third of those on the community board may be from the poverty sector.

Under the Green of Oregon amendment we do not put politics into the poverty program. We say, "politics out, but public servants in." Public servants in the field of education, public servants in the field of health, public servants in the field of elected office. We provide ways in which they can bring their considerable talents to bear on the problems of the needy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT and Mr. PERKINS yielded their time to Mr. CAREY.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], observed, there are hangnails in this amendment, and hidden pockets.

The so-called bonus for the State really is the beginning of a State-matching plan. Some States can do this and some not. It will bring about a disorderly redirection of the program. It will probably penalize the poorer States.

This was not well considered. It was not an amendment tested in the committee. We have not had adequate discussion of it in the Committee of the Whole. It comes late in the day.

If the Members will consider carefully, what we really want to do in community action is to carry on phase 2 of community action. The first phase was to get a total awareness of problems of the poor. We have that.

Now we move into the phase where we bring to bear on the problems of the poor all the talents of society.

That means bringing into the community to help the poor all those who can do a constructive job—as provided for in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Goodell amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] to close debate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, there is only one issue here and that is whether we are going to adopt something which is clearly thrown together at the last minute like the last Xeroxed amendment we had up here or whether or not we are going to stick by the firm bipartisan approach we had in the committee.

The Green of Oregon amendment—that is, the principal amendment under discussion here—was put together by a bipartisan group in the House Committee on Education and Labor. Let us not tear it apart here at the last minute, because if you want to build responsibility in this program, you will vote for the Green of Oregon amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GOODELL and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, yeas 205.

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

#### POVERTY HAS BECOME BIG BUSINESS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, every right-thinking person is opposed to poverty. In this battle we are not dealing with attitude, but rather with the weapons that are employed.

It has become increasingly evident that overemphasis has been placed on

questionable methods, and little or no credit given to the proven approaches. This gives rise to confusion. Enlightened people are made to wonder if we are not using 2-ton trucks, in many instances, to do the work of a pickup. Let us keep this problem and its treatment in proper perspective.

In the first place, from the excessive publicity that has been given to the so-called war on poverty, one might conclude that except for this legislation little if anything is being done in this country in behalf of the unfortunate who receive low incomes. The truth is that the so-called war on poverty crusade represents a relatively minor factor in support of the overall upward trend of low incomes. After all, the chief weapon is to keep the doors of opportunity open.

#### WAR ON POVERTY IS NOTHING NEW

In fact, at the time—3 years ago—that amid ballyhoo and arm twisting the war on poverty was put on the books, the Congress had already that year provided in excess of \$30 billion for Federal antipov-erty purposes.

As the gross national product has increased and as industrial development has advanced, low income earnings have steadily moved upward and the number in that category has steadily decreased. This war on poverty has been going on ever since the Republic was established. It has been waged—with gratifying success—in the home, in the churches, in local communities, in job opportunities provided by business and industry, in the field of education, and on scores of other fronts.

Mr. Chairman, if one should judge by the reams of publicity concerning the war on poverty in recent years he would conclude that masses of our people are living in hopeless squalor. The "poverty cult" has estimated that from 20 to 80 million Americans are hopelessly trapped in poverty. Few have bothered to examine the validity of these figures and claims.

#### IS EXTENT OF POVERTY OVERDONE?

There appeared in the U.S. News & World Report on September 4, 1967, a most significant article written by John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois. He meticulously developed the facts and concluded that the poverty claims is terribly overrated. Here, in brief, are some of his findings:

Ninety-six percent of all American families have an adequate minimum daily intake of nutrients. In 1920 only 50 percent were so fortunate.

Automatic cooking equipment is found in 99 percent of U.S. households.

About 99 percent of all American families have purchased electric or gas refrigerators.

Television is found in 92 percent of our homes.

Today nearly 92 percent of all U.S. households have telephones. Only 35 percent had them in 1920.

In 1910 only one of 10 families had access to hospitals for childbirth. Today 98 percent are born in hospitals. The number was 97 percent in 1960.

Professor Parrish exposes as a myth the assumption that all who make less than \$3,000 a year are poverty stricken. This is described as a numbers game.



He points out that many college couples with an income as low as \$1,500 manage to get along. A retired couple with a \$2,000 income, who own their home, can live very well. They may sport a house trailer, as thousands do, and live modestly as they see the national parks. The average family in that category may have some savings to draw upon if need be.

Moreover, it is pointed out that the poverty cult statisticians base their assumptions—that \$3,000 is the magic figure—upon national consumer price indexes, not realistic as applied to the good shoppers and bargain hunters. There are always food items which sell for less but are wholesome.

There is the school lunch program, with low-cost noon meals for nearly 20 million children.

One million take advantage of the food stamp privilege, where the Government pays a part of the cost of purchases.

The total number of low-income persons reached by various food-subsidy programs came to nearly 30 million in 1966.

These advantages are not taken into account by the statisticians who say all who make less than \$3,000 a year are "trapped in poverty."

Thus, the dire picture painted by the politicians and the poverty cult seems very exaggerated.

As an indicator of how well we were doing before the new war on poverty began, the number of American families which made less than \$5,000 a year was reduced by 27 percent between 1947 and 1963—a 16-year period.

It must be kept in mind that except for birth control, jobs constitute the only real answer to poverty. Providing jobs is essentially the role of private industry and the business community. The Government does provide generously in the fields of job training and education. The Federal Government has more than 79 separate training and education programs, administered by 15 different agencies and bureaus.

There are at least four major different federally financed job training projects going on. Although very expensive, perhaps this program does some good. There are, however, many recent reports of job training being conducted even more successfully by private industry and in local communities without any Federal aid.

In Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., the Job Development Corp. was formed by a group of community businessmen, without Federal, State, or local financial assistance. They found permanent jobs for 550 individuals, and they are currently training 300 prospects.

Similar job training programs, financed locally, have recently made remarkable records in Rochester, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. It is said they work out much more satisfactorily than do the government-operated training programs.

#### WELFARE BEGETS WELFARE

There is mounting evidence that excessive fanfare and publicity over welfare programs, particularly the so-called war on poverty, tends to encourage more people to turn to the government as a primary source of livelihood.

In 1950 about a billion dollars was spent on relief; that figure is now approaching \$8 billion a year.

In 1960 there were 7 million people on relief. There are now 8½ million—and the number is increasing each year.

All this talk about poverty and its rewards has inspired the so-called poor to organize in order to put pressure on Congress to give them more—not more job training or education, but bigger relief checks. The National Welfare Rights Organization held its first convention in August, with delegates from 26 States.

Only recently Dr. George A. Willey, director of this organization, was quoted as saying:

Not much of the public has grasped the potential of this movement. It could have much greater power than the civil rights movement. There are 8½ million welfare recipients with a very strong common interest. Welfare is a right.

An August 2, 1967, article in the Philadelphia Post-Dispatch reported that Prof. Richard A. Cloward of the School of Social Work at Columbia University, was spearheading a drive to organize the 8 million now on welfare rolls in order to get higher welfare payments.

Later, on February 26, in Washington, the professor was quoted as saying, regarding more funds for welfare:

Congress will have to act. It's acting badly now because not enough pressure has been built up.

Those people are not interested in jobs. Their announced objectives do not mention jobs. They are interested in welfare, and more of it. They are organized for a massive raid on the Federal Treasury.

This does not relate to the unfortunate who cannot help themselves. Nor to the self-reliant who strive to make the most of their talents and opportunities. I am speaking of the lazy and trifling, many of whom are organizing to obtain higher rewards from society for being professional beggars. Stripped of personal pride and self-respect, they prefer a handout to a job.

Mr. Chairman, why not absolutely prohibit welfare checks to any able-bodied person when there is a job available, of any kind, that person can do? And there are unfilled jobs of some kind in nearly every community. Look at the want ads. Call the local employment office.

Abraham Lincoln once said that you cannot permanently help a man by doing for him that which he can and should do for himself. Devices employed in the war on poverty violate that admonition every day.

When the good Lord turned Adam out of the Garden of Eden, He said: "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread."

#### DISTURBING SOCIAL PROBLEMS ARISE

Along with all this is the serious social problems that are being created. Not long ago the National Capital Housing Authority, wanting to help in the war on poverty, offered to pay \$1.40 an hour for up to 16 hours a week to teenage children of public housing residents for part-time jobs. Although 154 jobs were offered, there were only 98 takers. This prompted William Raspberry, a Negro writer, to report in the Washington Post:

Right now there are jobs going begging—jobs that the underprivileged poor could have for the asking.

The embarrassing truth is that some youngsters from poor families simply don't want to work.

#### ILLEGITIMACY

A multitude of Federal-State programs seem to have generated an explosion of illegitimacy. The reason is obvious: The more children welfare recipients have, the bigger the welfare checks.

Seventeen percent of those receiving help under aid for dependent children—ADC—are born out of wedlock. A Chicago study of the problem there revealed that 53 percent of ADC children are illegitimate.

Today one out of 12 born in this country each year is out of wedlock. One out of every four Negro births is illegitimate. And it is most disturbing that at the present increase rate, every 10th child born in America in the 1970's will be out of wedlock.

In October of 1966 Dr. R. Frank Jones, medical director of Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D.C., reported that 75 percent of girls in one of OEO's Neighborhood Youth Corps projects got pregnant.

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Along with this is the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency, the rate of which has doubled in the last 10 years. While all of this is not due to poverty and the craze for welfare, they figure in the upsurge.

While general employment has increased, unemployment among youngsters under 20 has steadily risen: slightly for whites and sharply for nonwhites.

These new social problems are being dumped into the laps of the schools and police. But discipline is different to achieve in the schools, and without discipline education is next to impossible. And compulsory racial integration is creating new antagonisms and problems.

Mr. Chairman, just as excessive and provocative civil rights agitation in this decade has given rise to demonstrations, violence and rioting, so it is that too much welfare and poverty talk have added to our social ills. Too many of our young people are being powerfully molded in a Federal pattern, with less and less chance to know the virtues and rewards of self-reliance.

We are today faced with the problem of keeping children from being infected with a life on public assistance. Welfare recipients, it so often happens, seem to discount standards of achievement and integrity because come what may—illiteracy, drunkenness, illegitimacy, crime—there is always a welfare check.

#### WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. Chairman, what does the new approach—the war on poverty—offer as a solution? I have already pointed out that under this program relief rolls have increased. Let us examine its usefulness.

The pending bill would authorize an additional \$2 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity to use, superimposed on many other antipoverty programs, in the so-called war on poverty.

This fits in with the philosophy of those who believe that you can cure any problem on the face of the earth if enough Federal money is spent.



When this particular program was begun 3 years ago the Congress did a most unusual thing. In its haste it practically gave the executive branch a blank check to spend billions to finance almost any conceivable scheme designed to improve the lot of the poor.

Consequently, under the guise of helping the poor, hundreds of projects have been activated throughout the land—by no means confined to the areas containing the “pockets of poverty.” In a sense it has been a massive scatteration of Federal money. Ingenious schemes have been initiated. In many of these the poverty angle has been purely incidental.

#### GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME

Only 2 weeks ago, it was announced that \$620,000 in antipoverty money was set aside by OEO for an experiment in Government-guaranteed minimum income for those in low-income brackets—whether they work or not. The idea is to lift the annual income of all American families to a \$3,000 level. It is being tried out on 800 New Jersey families, with the annual income of each to be supplemented by Government checks in amounts sufficient, when added to what any recipient earns, to total \$3,000 a year.

The New Jersey experiment is to be but the beginning. It is to break the ice for a nationwide new and revolutionary venture in State welfarism. The plan would reward the drones and would naturally discourage incentive to work and get ahead. Because the recipients would know that, whether they work or not, they would still get that \$3,000 a year.

The Congress has never specifically approved this scheme. It is a glaring example of how a Government agency can spend the taxpayers' money under the blank-check authority granted by the Congress in the war on poverty legislation. The approval of the pending bill would, therefore, approve the concept of a guaranteed annual income for all American families—whether they choose to work or not.

#### OTHER EXAMPLES

Mr. Chairman, the news media have carried hundreds of reports on how the antipoverty program has functioned. It is recognized that there are explanations for many of these accounts, that remedial actions were taken in some cases; but they serve to point up the abuses in the administration of the war on poverty throughout the land. An examination of some of these reports should be revealing and throw light on how the program is working and how recklessly the taxpayers' money is being spent.

In the February 28, 1966, issue of the New York Daily News it was stated that the OEO paid for keeping 37 poor people in the Hotel Astor—plus \$9 a day per person for meals. The excuse was that the weather was cold and the favored people lacked adequate heat in their homes.

#### LEGAL AID FOR POOR

A U.S. Senator reported that under antipoverty's legal aid, Eldorado, Ill., with a population of 3,573, including four lawyers, was allotted \$59,589. And in the

town of Karnak, Ill., with a population of 677 and no local lawyers, there was an allocation of \$65,805 to pay for legal aid to the poor.

There has been much criticism of OEO for hiring lawyers to represent anti-poverty workers or enrollees who were accused of crime. In New York an anti-poverty group is reported to have provided OEO funds to defend 10 peaceniks who interrupted religious services in St. Patrick's Cathedral in order to protest our involvement in Vietnam.

While there is something to be said for Government aid to help the poor when they need legal aid, in proper cases, any such program by the Federal Government should, of course, be administered by the Department of Justice.

Out in Cleveland, OEO's Community Action for Youth—CAY—was granted \$700,000 for 1966. Neither the money nor the equipment was cared for very well. The press said that one Ellen McCulloch was paid \$1,632.50 ostensibly to do some confidential research. But it turned out no person by that name could be found. She was evidently a fictitious name used to pad the payroll. Local OEO officials seemed unconcerned.

It was also reported that from CAY's offices in Cleveland between \$13,000 and \$20,000 worth of business machines and typewriters were stolen. The place was not burglarized. The machines just disappeared. An alert newspaper reporter happened to uncover these infractions.

#### WILLOW VILLAGE, MICH.

The town of Willow Village, a community in southeast Michigan, according to news stories, received an OEO award of \$188,252 to finance a program of self-help for 4,500 residents. The township supervisor said the poverty report was absolutely false. There was not a home in the town, they insisted, over 10 years old, and the homes had an average value of \$12,000. It was said no one could be found who was unemployed.

A New York City poverty consultant was hired at \$500 a week. Two other consultants were put on the rolls at \$60 and \$65 per day, and a program director drew \$22,500 per year.

A Houston policeman, Lt. M. L. Singleton, chief of Houston's police intelligence division, testified before a Senate committee that Negro militants on the payroll of the Houston antipoverty program repeatedly tried to stir up riots and other disorders last summer.

#### ANTIPOVERTY SUBVERSIVES

In Berkeley, Howard Harawitz, a member of the antipoverty board there, admitted that he was a former member of the notorious pro-Communist W. E. B. DuBois Club.

The New York Daily News charged that more than 37 employees of Mobilization for Youth, sponsored by OEO, had subversive backgrounds. Wholesale penetration of MFY by the Communists was charged.

OEO recently granted \$400,000 to Southwest Alabama Farmer's Cooperative, of Selma—over the protest of the entire Alabama delegation, local officials of OEO and a report to OEO that the

project was not economically feasible. Two of the project's leaders were Shirley Mesher and John Zippert.

Shirley, the coordinator, was in Alabama in early 1965 to join in the Selma-Montgomery march, and is said to be a close associate of Dian Bevel who recently went to Hanoi and is the wife of Black Panther advocate James Bevel of Chicago.

John Zippert, former president of the student body of City College in New York and a fieldworker for CORE, was an agitator against the U.S. war effort in Vietnam. He was a member of the American Youth Festival Committee and aided in promoting the Ninth Communist Youth Festival in Algiers.

In New York one Robert Schrank has been director of work experience programs under OEO's Neighborhood Youth Corps. He has along record of Communist activity.

A year ago in New York the Black Arts Repertory Theater in Harlem was raided. It was funded by OEO's community action program and reported to have received \$115,000 in Federal money. The raid netted an arsenal of deadly weapons, a pipe bomb, sharpened meathooks, pistols, knives, clubs, and a cache of ammunition.

#### MORE ANTIPOVERTY TROUBLEMAKERS

The mayor and three other Newark officials said antipoverty workers there made significant contributions to the city's riots. A leftwing group known as Students for a Democratic Society is said to control two of that city's eight war on poverty efforts. Another new left group, Newark Community Union project, also controls an antipoverty program and holds that the United States is a “warmongering, racist society.”

A Newark antipoverty liaison, Jesse Allen, was reported to have gone to Puerto Rico last spring to take part in Communist-led agitation for Puerto Rican independence. The trip was financed by the Communists.

#### NASHVILLE'S “LIBERATION SCHOOL”

From Nashville the story of a “liberation school” which was subsidized by OEO. It was run by an official of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC. Operated by one Fred Brooks, a black power advocate and chairman of Nashville's SNCC, the school preached hatred for whites. One instructor was George W. Ware, who accompanied Stokely Carmichael to Cuba. He praised the Detroit riots.

Nashville officials cited a “flyer” advertising the school which said it would train people in “activist civil disobedience” and take action “by any means necessary.”

#### AGITATORS AND STRIKES

In Buffalo seven of nine city councilmen, according to the press, wanted “all Federal antipoverty activity removed from Buffalo because of the agitation and disruptive action on the part of the antipoverty workers in local affairs.”

In Perth Amboy, N.J., last summer the mayor was reported to have accused a local antipoverty leader of “seeking to foment and incite unrest, agitation, and



disorder." And a similar charge was said to have been made by the city manager of Rochester.

A Washington newspaper reported that neighborhood poverty workers from the Near Northeast Neighborhood Development Center went on a 5-hour strike to protest impending budget cuts in the city's antipoverty program. The story continued:

The strikers decided yesterday afternoon to return to work and submit a citywide poverty workers' strike plan to the Underground organization at a strategy meeting Monday.

On May 10, last, the General Accounting Office reported it had found "extensive evidence that Federal antipoverty funds were used in efforts to unionize farmworkers in Florida last year." That was revealed in the Washington Post, May 30.

In Fresno, Calif., 50 pickets appeared at four entrances to a store, carrying signs which read: "Black Power says, 'Strike, Baby, Strike.'" It was revealed that 16 of the pickets had come up from an OEO training center in Watts and joined with union members as a part of their official war-on-poverty training.

Mr. Chairman, is this kind of misuse of taxpayers' money going to help poor people? What is the connection? How absurd can they get? There are a lot of hard-working people in my district who do not want to pay taxes to support this sort of irresponsible waste and extravagance.

The case of Mr. and Mrs. William S. Clark has been cited during debate. It was found that both were on two poverty war payrolls at the same time. They drew a total of \$5,178 plus expenses during 12 weeks of 1965. Clark was director of the Headstart program and at the same time served as supervisor of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project. Mrs. Clark was listed as overall supervisor of the NYC program and was on the Headstart payroll as an instructor.

In the Bronx a preacher was found serving three churches and at the same time was a civil defense inspector. He got on the OEO payroll and was soon charged with stealing \$9,000 of antipoverty money.

Beryl Bracewell of Kennedy, Minn., wrote his Congressman complaining about an OEO project hiring one of his employees whom he had trained as an apprentice in plumbing and heating for 2 years, conforming with the wage and hour law. In his letter he concluded.

Now we have my former employee around town trying to look employed, and I am short on help . . . This makes me feel real good about paying my income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, this experience can be repeated all over the Nation, a thousand times. A mayor in my district recently told me of a Negro janitor who was making nearly \$300 a month and was happy and contented until an OEO project was developed. The janitor understandably resigned to take over a local antipoverty job at \$800 a month.

Is it any wonder that so many of our people—the taxpayers who are footing the bill—are bewildered by the way they see their money wasted right before their eyes, in broad open daylight?

Earlier this year I sent questionnaires to the registered voters in the district I represent. The interest was refreshing and the rate of returns was high. One question was: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" The answers: 87.5 percent said "No," and 6 percent said "Yes."

#### SEARCHING FOR NEEDY

The Houston Post on August 30, 1967, said Francis Williams, executive director of Harris County Community Action Association got OEO and Labor to grant \$900,000 for a manpower program for Houston and added:

The Neighborhood Centers Association will be paid \$177,000 (out of the \$4.9 million) to pay workers to conduct a door-to-door search for those in need of help for the new program.

From this it would appear that the poverty people are going from door to door, searching for business. While this procedure may be desirable in an extraordinary situation, its general practice is very reprehensible. A good many people who are working may, after such contacts, decide they can make more by boarding the poverty bandwagon.

Another Houston poverty story—Houston Tribune, September 7, 1967—refers to a new theater being financed by OEO. This subsidy enables the theater to pay rent, lights, sets, costumes, and salaries. This nationalized theater will compete with three or four others in Houston. Due to the antipoverty subsidy the Pilot Theatre charges \$1.75, while the competitors are hard pressed to stay in business by charging \$5 per seat.

The question follows: Is this helping the poor people in Houston to increase their incomes? Is this a proper function of the war on poverty?

#### POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Scores of instances have been reported involving VISTA volunteers and others on the OEO payroll, who have engaged in voter registration drives and other political activities. Documented cases to this effect have come from Omaha, Nebr.; Gary, Ind.; Atlanta, Ga.; Durham, N.C.; Des Moines, Iowa; Santa Clara County, Calif.; and Arlington, Va., to mention but a few.

Mr. Chairman, is this any way to run a poverty program, to advance the income of those in low-income levels? Is this a responsible way to handle the taxpayers' money?

Here is another indicator of how money is being wasted: During debate on this bill it has been disclosed that OEO put up the money for a \$376,000 program through the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to establish a student exchange program. Instead of getting 150 participants, as planned, only 15 were placed—costing \$25,066 per enrollee for a one-semester project.

The Detroit News of September 15, 1966, revealed that that city's antipoverty program had been paying \$500 a month since the preceding March for a youth center which at the time of the report had not even been opened.

#### OTHER MISUSES OF FUNDS

OEO has financed distribution of books and booklets, supposedly for the reeducation of the unfortunate and under-

privileged. One of them, entitled "Negro Self-Concept," says:

Much of the aggression of the Negro is a very healthy thing . . . Sit-ins, freedom rides, and other demonstrations are indicative of a mood of aggressiveness—significantly led by young Negroes—that in turn speaks of a more positive racial image.

An OEO outfit in Houston ordered seven telescopic rifle sights, saying they were for conversion to microscopes to be used in manpower programs, in case they should be needed. The explanation did not make sense, and the purchase was blocked by people outside of OEO.

#### THE JOB CORPS

The financing of OEO's Job Corps has been scandalously expensive. Designed for a year of training of school dropouts between ages of 16 and 21, the annual cost per student has averaged \$8,000.

It has been revealed that, by Internal Revenue figures, two out of three American wage earners make less money than it costs to put one boy or girl through a year of Job Corps training.

A General Accounting Office investigation revealed that from January 20, 1965, to December 31, 1966, the average cost per enrollee at the Parks Job Corps Center in California, was \$11,000 per year. OEO did not deny this but said this amount was later cut down to \$6,500.

It must be assumed that out of this vast expenditure some good must have been accomplished. But many reports indicate the opposite.

The Omaha World-Herald carried a story in September 1967 saying that of the 1,506 trainees who went through the Lincoln, Nebr., Job Corps Center this year, the whereabouts of more than one-half are unknown, and that only 338 are known to be employed.

A report from Kansas City, Mo., dated July 23, told of Mrs. Grace Phillips, director of a Women's Job Corps center at Excelsior Springs, being served with a warrant charging her with maintaining a public nuisance.

The complaint was signed by 20 residents of the area. They complained that girls at the center were loud, profane, sometimes drunk, and often on the town's once-quiet streets after curfew. They said the girls were promiscuous, sometimes in the yards of residents.

A San Antonio Evening News story reported that Roger Flores who operates a beer and wine lounge posted this notice: "Notice. Sorry—No Job Corps Allowed."

He told the press:

I'm doing it in self defense. Those boys are edroughnecks . . . uncontrolled and uncivilized. They bust up my place every time they come in.

The troublemakers were from the Gary Job Corps Center.

There have, of course, been scores of other complaints about the Job Corps. While the results are, at the best, not impressive, the exorbitant cost of the operation cannot be justified.

Perhaps the Headstart program has more to show for the money that has been expended. If it is desirable to have the Federal Government continue to help finance kindergarten schools, then it would seem logical that it be administered by the Office of Education.



Mr. Chairman, there is no point in belaboring this matter. I believe that from my meager files on the subject I could cite perhaps 50 more instances comparable to those I have mentioned. Now I know what the explanation is: that corrective actions are undertaken when appropriate, and besides the number of people involved in infractions represent but a limited percentage of the overall total of those engaged in the war on poverty. One is made to wonder how many equally indefensible instances of waste have gone undetected and unrecorded.

But as I see it these many intolerable developments cannot be dismissed as isolated instances. There are simply too many of them for that. I recognize the difficulty in running herd on such a massive, disjointed program. It presents an administrative nightmare. Someone said the poverty crusade has come apart at the seams. Certainly if it is continued it is in need of some major surgery.

#### MORE BIRTH CONTROL NEEDED

The one thing that stands out as a bright spot in this entire picture is OEO's allotments for family planning and birth control. Its awareness of the relationship of poverty control and birth control is commendable. OEO's commitments in this area have been limited and should have been much more. But it helps.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, birth control is the only real and meaningful answer to this problem, so far as a substantial number in the low-income category is concerned. I am referring in particular to those who have neither the capacity nor the motivation to train, work, and get ahead. Therein we find the hard core of poverty. An antipoverty program, regardless of cost, whose major interest and effort is devoted to family planning would have my wholehearted support.

But as the program is now set up, one must engage in some painfully wishful thinking to expect any long range and significant help in reducing the number of people on relief and in elevating the earning power of those in the lower brackets. If real progress in this area is forthcoming, it will come through the old time-tested methods which have been so successful in the past.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, the debate in this House on the economic opportunity legislation—and particularly on the community action program which is at the heart of its success as well as its controversy—has developed a very interesting pattern.

My colleagues who oppose the program, whether their method is to break it into fragments, amend it to death, or abolish it entirely, practically always manage to avoid addressing themselves to the hard facts of what the community action program is doing in the communities. They snipe at isolated mistakes and temporary reversals, but they are wise to shun discussion of the amazingly constructive impact that community action has made in specific slums, on specific poor people. If they got into that kind of discussion, Mr. Chairman, they would have no way to conceal the weakness of their negative case.

I am for community action, Mr. Chairman, because it works. There is impres-

sive testimony from all parts of the Nation of how well it works, but let me dwell for a moment on a city where I have seen it work at firsthand and gather strength and effectiveness over a considerable period of time.

In Providence, the keystones of community action are education and manpower programs, striking directly at the root causes of poverty.

Eight community schools, administered by Progress for Providence, the community action agency, and the Providence School Department in eight marginal income neighborhoods, run afternoon and evening courses for youngsters and adults. Some 4,000 are enrolled. They get remedial assistance. They receive individual attention. They receive psychological and social guidance. They get hope and a stake in their neighborhood. If community action is gutted, some, most, or maybe all of them will be thrown back on the scrap heap.

Progress for Providence has a flourishing manpower program. In the quarter ending September 30, in just 3 months, this program placed 160 people in full-time jobs with good wages, 40 in on-the-job-training programs and 76 in various other training programs. What happens to them, and people who come after them, if community action is gutted? Forget them? They will be back on the streets and on the dole.

The legal services program, which gives the poor not only vitally needed legal assistance but also, respect for the orderly process of law, handled 851 cases and advised 128 more poor people—again, in a period of just 3 months. A credit union has 782 poor members who are learning to shop, save, and plan wisely. Community workers have in the last quarter referred well over 1,000 poor people desperately in need of various kinds of help and totally ignorant about where they could get it to the appropriate agencies. More than 500 children are enrolled in school department Headstart programs.

And so it goes, Mr. Chairman, and so to my mind it must continue to go. I have just touched on the high points of the Providence community action program, but sufficiently, I hope, to demonstrate how it is tied together, how it is reaching people who have never been reached before, and how essential it is to the life of this particular city.

I might add that over 60 percent of the employees of Progress for Providence, nearly 800 people, are nonprofessional aides who give vital support to the work of the professionals. We hear a lot from those who would wreck the program, Mr. Chairman, about the so-called poverty bureaucracy. Here is the bulk of that bureaucracy: Poor people, recruited from the slums at minimal wages to help their neighbors and to be trained to help themselves. If community action is gutted, we can forget about them, too.

We may also have to forget about what these people can contribute to the maintenance of law and order in the innercity. Without them last summer, Mr. Chairman, Providence would have had a riot. As it was, there was only a minor incident. These nonprofessional aides

of Progress for Providence, these poor people from the slums, formed an impromptu "soul patrol," and to put it succinctly, Mr. Chairman, they "cooled" it. My good friend and the distinguished mayor of Providence, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., said at the time:

As far as I'm concerned, if it wasn't for the poverty workers, there is no telling how bad the situation might have been.

I am not willing to wait and see how bad the situation may be next summer in our cities. The war on poverty may be considered to be in an embattled state in the House today, but it will be the cities and urban areas of our country who will be in a state of seige if this program is gutted by the House.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I have been a consistent supporter of the war on poverty because I believe that through this program—through a partnership of Federal, State, and local resources—we can help the disadvantaged help themselves and make taxpayers out of tax-eaters. This massive program of human renewal merits the support of every thinking, compassionate citizen.

I recently received a report on activities in the village of Freeport, N.Y., a truly cosmopolitan community located in the heart of my congressional district on Long Island's south shore. The village of Freeport, which last month celebrated its 75th anniversary of incorporation, is a suburban community with a population of more than 40,000.

The religious leaders of all faiths have been cooperating on a community program which could stand as a model for others.

The Freeport Methodist Church has been in the forefront of efforts to strengthen the war on poverty and I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from its distinguished ministers and a report on community relations and employment programs of the Freeport Economic Opportunity Commission which they forwarded to me:

THE FREEPORT METHODIST CHURCH,  
Freeport, N.Y., November 10, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We are concerned along with a great many other persons about the anti-poverty legislation currently being proposed and debated. It seems clear to us that the bill, as currently designed, will have negative effects on the problems of alleviating poverty, if it is adopted.

It is apparent to us that the effect of adoption of the present anti-poverty legislation will be to reduce, perhaps undermine, the effectiveness of moderate Negro leadership in this and other communities. In the vacuum of leadership that would follow such reduced leadership capacity, it would be likely that the Black Power ideology could take firmer root than has been possible to this time. Thus, it seems curious and ironical that our government could, by its own voice and vote, foster the growth of social unrest, not to say anarchy. If our governmental structures cannot deal imaginatively with this most urgent problem, then it seems clear that in the long run there will be hardly any course left to the poor and those who work with them but to establish paragovernmental structures, or indeed, to work in opposition to established government. It is not difficult



to imagine that such time may come if the anti-poverty program is made ineffective now.

Attached is a document detailing some of the work of the Freeport OEO program. We can attest that hopeful signs were coming visible in this place by their good work. We dare not have them fail now.

We know that you are concerned and that you intend to stand for the kind of legislation which will allow the anti-poverty program to function effectively. Be assured of our support of your stand and our keen interest in the coming vote.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER E. HODGSON.  
MICHAEL MCINTYRE.

#### DETAILS OF FREEPORT, N.Y., OEO PROGRAMS COMMUNITY RELATIONS

##### *Ad-hoc committee on urban renewal*

This committee was established to open the channels of communication between the Urban Renewal Authorities and the citizens of the Bennington Park (initial Urban Renewal site) section of Freeport. It is composed of fifteen (15) elected members representing all of the families residing in the target area. The neighborhood aide assigned was most effective in organizing this group. The Legal Service Committee of Nassau County will act in an advisory capacity.

##### *Freeport Housing Council*

A tenants' association was organized by a neighborhood aide as the outgrowth of the many complaints received from tenants living in the public housing facilities provided by the Village of Freeport. Initially many tenants were slow to join due to fear of reprisals. At present there are more than forty (40) families involved of the total occupancy of one hundred (100) families. The goals are:

- a. Management will recognize the tenants as a bargaining force
- b. Vandalism can be reduced
- c. Council will initiate a self policing policy placing responsibility on tenants

##### *Youth Council*

The need for reaching out to the youth of Freeport is very much in evidence. The Southeast area (Bennington Park) has received some assistance from the Family Service Association of Nassau County. However, most areas are without facilities or guidance. It is obvious a youth center is of paramount importance. Meetings are presently being held between this office, Village Officials, and members of the Freeport School System, to make a year round youth program and adequate youth center a reality. There are at the present time about one hundred fifty (150) young people involved in this effort.

In conjunction there are twenty five (25) youth meeting three nights each week in our Child Day Care Center rehearsing. In hope of presenting musical and dramatic plays, this group also participates in career clinics and provides a volunteer service to the community.

*Boy Scout troop* has been formed in partnership with the Freeport Methodist Church. We feel this is an excellent opportunity for our youth to participate in a well supervised program and come into close contact with boys of varied cultural backgrounds. During the summer more than forty (40) boys were sent to camp, for some this was the first such experience. We are working closely with the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Nassau in presenting two hour tutorial service each Saturday for school youngsters who may require additional assistance in such subjects as Reading, Math, History and Languages. There are presently more than seventy five (75) school children enrolled in three (3) schools. Ages range from 7-14 years. This tutoring will last for four months.

#### FREEPORT E.O.C. EMPLOYMENT SECTION MARCH 1967 TO OCTOBER 1967

The Employment Section of the Freeport E.O.C. has directly affected over five hundred (500) Freeport families. Two hundred seventeen (217) applicants have been employed or placed in training classes. All other applicants have problems which are keeping them from being employable at the present time. These are active cases shared between the employment section and the Family Service Section. Our focus is on the unemployed and underemployed. We work very closely with the Domestic Worker finding that 30% are high school graduate who have never applied for employment other than Domestic. We have taken them directly from the train station with their belongings, secured lodging, immediate funds and on-the-job training for them. This action initiated the idea for a Domestic league in Freeport. The Domestic League is not for employment and training advice alone—it will include:

- A. Recreational Pursuits
- B. Advice on job opportunities and Training Programs
- C. Consumer Education
- D. Discussion on legal rights, pay scales, working conditions, etc.
- E. Assistance in planning for future growth
- F. Intervention where necessary with employees and employment agencies.

Since opening, we have come in contact with most of the in school and out of school youth from below the poverty line. We find them uninformed about career opportunities available to them. Therefore, the employment aide is assigned to the youth group and is present at all meeting not only to inform them concerning employment but also to direct other activities.

Emphasis is on finding employment that will utilize existing skills to their best advantage and upgrading of those individuals who are working below capacity. We have contacted by mail, telephone, and personal interviews all of the business establishments in Freeport and surrounding areas. As a result of this campaign, we have not only compiled an extensive file on job opportunities but have established very fine working relationship with the business community. We share job information with other C.A.P. agencies in an effort to obtain maximum exposure for our clients.

On the job training programs have been established in the Freeport Community. Employers and employees are very receptive to this Federally subsidized program.

A late opening of the Multi-Service Center made it impossible for us to be effective in obtaining summer jobs for "in school" applicants. Because of this experience last summer, the Employment Section has already mailed out over fifty (50) applications for summer work with government agencies. (Federal, State, and County) with the help of our youth organization, we are presently working on a flyer to be distributed to the home owners of Freeport to list household and handyman jobs that our youth can perform (babysitting, shopping, errands, lawn care, painting, cleaning garages and attics, etc.). We shall also list summer jobs from local business men.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress faces a challenge in our debate on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967—a challenge posed by those who would strike at the heart of the war on poverty by cutting back on the vitally needed resources to continue the struggle on behalf of the disadvantaged.

I urge my colleagues to heed the warnings expressed by those who have been involved in war on poverty efforts at the local level—to heed the cry for justice

from the disadvantaged who want and deserve an opportunity to help themselves—and to heed the nonpartisan appeal for support from religious and civic groups across the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the Minneapolis Tribune has editorially given strong support to the war on poverty and to the \$2.06 billion antipoverty authorization bill that is now before this body.

The Tribune feels that Congress has been ignoring the major issue before it, mainly poverty itself. While OEO has had problems in its short existence, it had achieved tremendous gains in the overall effort to help the poor. Perhaps OEO's greatest problem is that it has been given too little money and support in relation to the massive needs.

Any cut in funds for the program will cause incalculable loss to the poor. Headstart, neighborhood centers, legal aid programs, VISTA projects, health centers, Upward Bound, and foster grandparents programs and a number of other efforts ought to be expanded, not reduced.

A more serious effect of fund reductions would be to deprive the poor of hope itself. I do not know how the poor, or anyone, can believe that we in the Congress are truly serious about alleviating poverty when this body is inclined to slash funds from such a vital program.

We must, at least, provide OEO with the \$2.06 billion authorization. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that all of us are serious about giving our Nation's poor the help and the hope that they so desperately need. Yet, as the Tribune article concludes:

If Congress does slash the OEO funds, it will indicate that a majority of its Members are not very serious about trying to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment and related human troubles.

Mr. Chairman, with unanimous consent I include the full text of the Tribune editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### DOES CONGRESS CARE ABOUT POVERTY?

The Nation's antipoverty program is in serious danger of going on the rocks in a storm of controversy over its political, administrative and fiscal complications. What Congress seems to be largely ignoring is poverty itself.

The economic opportunity program has had many growing pains in its short life. It can profit by some revisions. But it also represents a major effort to solve America's greatest social problem—to help its people who, by reason of race, meager education, lack of opportunities and qualifications, are poor and deprived. Its greatest weakness so far is that it has done too little, measured against the massive needs.

Yet the House has passed a resolution to cut the 1968 funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity from \$1.6 billion to \$1.2 billion. Funds for some existing programs already have been cut off. Such future projects as the Pilot City program for the Minneapolis North Side may never get launched. A more realistic federal budget for OEO would be the \$2-billion figure which is getting slim support in Washington.

A catalogue of what would be lost with the big slash includes much of the promising Head Start program for children; cuts in the citizens community centers and legal aid services, and complete loss of the summer job program for young people. It would



affect OEO activities in rural areas and on Indian reservations as well as in cities.

In the larger view, the cut in funds would mean a rebuff where hope has been built among the nation's poor. It would mean a weakening of basic efforts to ease racial problems. It would mean losing experienced staff people and undermining the momentum of strong community organizations which have brought together low-income residents and civic leaders.

If Congress does slash the OEO funds, it will indicate that a majority of its members are not very serious about trying to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment and related human troubles. To be realistic, constructive and fair, it seems to us, Congress should approve appropriations for the war on poverty at the \$2-billion level.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 103?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the poverty bill, S. 2388.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 925)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the reserve components of the armed forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act".

Sec. 2. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 136(b) is amended by inserting below the first sentence the following: "One of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. He shall have as his principal duty the overall supervision of manpower and reserve component affairs of the Department of Defense."

(2) Section 136 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs there shall be a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Subject to the supervision and control of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall be responsible for all matters relating to reserve affairs within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs."

(3) Section 175(a) (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs;"

(4) Section 175 is amended by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Whenever the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of Transportation may designate an officer of the Regular Coast Guard or the Coast Guard Reserve to serve as a voting member of the Board.

"(c) The Board, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs is the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters relating to the reserve components.

"(d) This section does not affect the committees on reserve policies prescribed by section 3033, 5251, 5252, or 8033 of this title.

"(e) A member of a committee or board prescribed under a section listed in subsection (d) may, if otherwise eligible, be a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board.

"(f) The Board shall act on those matters referred to it by the Chairman and, in addition, on any matter raised by a member of the Board."

(5) Section 262 is amended by striking out "the reserve components" and inserting "each reserve component" in place thereof.

(6) Section 264 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 264. Reserve affairs: designation of general or flag officer of each military department; personnel and logistic support for reserves; reports to Congress

"(a) The Secretary concerned may designate a general or flag officer of the armed force under his jurisdiction to be directly responsible for reserve affairs to the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as the case may be. This subsection does not affect the functions of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Chief, Office of Army Reserve, or the Chief, Office of Air Force Reserve.

"(b) The Secretary concerned is responsible for providing the personnel, equipment, facilities, and other general logistic support necessary to enable units and Reserves in the Ready Reserve of the Reserve components under his jurisdiction to satisfy the training requirements and mobilization readiness requirements for those units and Reserves as recommended by the Secretary concerned and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and approved by the Secretary of Defense, and as recommended by the Commandant of the Coast Guard and approved by the Sec-

retary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operated as a service of the Navy.

"(c) The Secretary concerned shall submit a written report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives each year regarding the extent to which units and Reserves in the Ready Reserve of the Reserve components under his jurisdiction have satisfied the training and mobilization readiness requirements pursuant to subsection (b) of this section for the year with respect to which such report was submitted. Reports under this subsection shall be made on a fiscal year basis and the report for any fiscal year shall be submitted within 60 days after the end of the fiscal year for which it is submitted."

(7) The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 is amended by striking out "264. Reserve affairs: responsibility for."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"264. Reserve affairs: designation of general or flag officers of each military department; personnel and logistic support for reserves; reports to Congress."

(8) Section 268 is amended by inserting the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof and by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) Within the Ready Reserve of each of the Reserve components defined in section 261 of this title, there is a Selected Reserve, consisting of units, and, as designated by the Secretary concerned, of Reserves, trained as prescribed in section 270(a) (1) of this title or section 502(a) of title 32, United States Code, as appropriate.

"(c) The organization and unit structure of the Selected Reserve shall be approved—

"(1) in the case of the Coast Guard Reserve, by the Secretary of Transportation upon the recommendation of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and

"(2) in the case of all other Reserve components, by the Secretary of Defense based upon recommendations from the military departments as approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with contingency and war plans."

(9) Section 269(e) (1)–(6) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) he served on active duty (other than for training) in the armed forces for an aggregate of at least five years; or

"(2) he served on active duty (other than for training) in the armed forces for an aggregate of less than five years, but satisfactorily participated, as determined by the Secretary concerned, in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve for a period which, when added to his period of active duty (other than for training), totals at least five years, or such shorter period as the Secretary concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department, may prescribe for satisfactory participation in an accredited training program designated by the Secretary concerned."

(10) Section 270(a) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) participate in at least 48 scheduled drills or training periods during each year and serve on active duty for training of not less than 14 days (exclusive of traveltime) during each year;"

(11) Section 511(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, a non-prior-service person who is under 26 years of age, who is qualified for induction for active duty in an armed force, and who is not under orders to report for induction into an armed force under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (50 App. U.S.C. 451–473), except as provided in section 6(c) (2) (A) (ii) and (iii) of such Act,



nothing to bring about peace, or indeed to improve the lot of the African in this country. All they have done is they have brought despondency. If they were really interested in the welfare of this country I challenge the hon. gentleman who signed this document as attached to come down to Rhodesia themselves and do the fighting themselves. If they do not want to expose their skills to the bullets of our Forces then they at least should come down and solve issues in Rhodesia because our issues, I believe, will have to be solved in Rhodesia or never at all.

I have said the welfare of these people in western Matabeleland is in danger and it is our Forces who are gallantly trying to preserve peace in that part of the country. I may, in short, try and bring before this House the aims of these infiltrators. First of all, I would like to know where they have had the training, where they have had the arms and the ammunition—from people who would like to see this country destroyed. It is from people who would like to impose a worse type of government in this country, a worse type of persecution of the lower races by their members because they have not got enough room in their own countries and they would like to find room in Rhodesia.—[Mr. Chigogo: In Africa as a whole.]—I say again praise to our Forces who are trying to preserve law and order, who are fighting, who are losing their lives and who are facing difficulties to try and maintain law and order in this country . . .

I speak as a family man; I have love for my family; I believe it is the same with every one of us here and apart from anything else I would love to see my children grow up happily and because I am involved in politics is no reason why my family should suffer from injustices. I believe indeed that if it is a sin that I am a politician then those sins must grossly come upon me and never upon my children because I made my choice and I will let my children grow up and make their choices. I believe it is the duty of everyone, every citizen of Rhodesia at this time when we are faced with foreign doctrines, to stand together, to forget politics and to strive never to bring politics into matters of national importance. I believe it is the duty of every citizen in this country to fight to preserve peace. It is the duty of every citizen to take up arms and defend this country from foreign infiltrators, indeed to defend this country from communism. I believe that our Forces at this moment need both moral and physical support, and this is one institution where such feelings should be voiced.

In conclusion, I would like to confirm and redirect the words of the reverend gentleman, the Dean of Bulawayo, who said that terrorism is lawless and must be condemned by all sections of this country, by all spheres, because it knows no law. We know that when these people have had the chance of infiltrating into this country they have killed at random people they had nothing against. They have killed for the sake of killing, for the sake of demonstrating that they can kill, and they have robbed not people like myself who can defend themselves but they have robbed elderly poor people, say, in the Mrewa District, elderly poor people who cannot defend themselves, and they have forced them to give them money. Why should such actions be condoned? Why should that be mistaken for politics? I believe that is not politics, it is only because a few people who are keeping themselves very safe in another country are satisfied to send their own brothers to come and die here in order that they may enjoy the fruits of life wherever they are.—[Mr. Majongwe: They will not enjoy them for long.]

Mr. RUBATIKA. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to comment on this motion on the adjournment. In fact I am bewildered at times when I see men holding

responsible positions paying lip service to the principle of the maintenance of law and order in this country. When it is to their convenience they uphold law and order but when it is not to their convenience they do not uphold law and order. I have seen men some time ago who have gone almost weeping to the Minister of Law and Order asking for protection, but to-day those are the people who are giving the Minister of Law and Order a hard time because he has brought tranquillity to this country. They have one foot among the terrorists and another foot among the decent people for fear that should the terrorists win they will be accepted as having championed their cause.

Today there are some who are being intimidated because of these people. I am surprised that some of these people are still moving around and yet some of them are being paid by Government in certain institutions of Government. Wherever we move we are told that we are the people who support—I am sorry to use unparliamentary language—"I support Smith and Lardner-Burke". We have plainly told them that as far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

I must register my strongest protest to Britain for lack of foresight. Let us say that these terrorists were given the MIGS to land in Zambia and the communists bombed our territory, what does Britain think would happen? The Rhodesian Air Force would start bombing the bases from which those MIGS came. Would this not escalate? We expect Britain, since it says it has responsibility over us up to date, to act as the Prime Minister stated, by exercising his influence on Zambia to stop terrorism and at least to register a protest on behalf of the African people whom it is stating it is championing. We do not want any loss of blood.

As far as my electoral district is concerned and all the electoral districts, all of us hate the chaos and disorder which happened some time ago. We stand in admiration of Government's stand on bringing about law and order. If by any eventuality the white man should fall we must pay the price and I am prepared to tell them to shoot me because I am dedicated to a cause and I shall live and die by it.

Mr. CHIGOGO. I must heartily thank the Hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) whose electoral district adjoins mine and, as he has said, these troubles are really taking place in his electoral district and equally the same in the Gokwe area. All I have to say here is not much, because a multitude of words is not going to help us at all. I will as the Prime Minister to ask the Prime Minister of Great Britain whether this is a trick by which Britain would like to arm itself against Rhodesia to say people are fighting and there is chaos. If not, could the Prime Minister of Great Britain tell us where these people are being trained, whether he has any alliances with those training camps where the Rhodesian people are being trained to come and disturb the lives of the innocent Tribal Trust Land people and the innocent farmers who are feeding the 4,000,000 Africans and the 200,000 Europeans in this country?

These are the only questions I would like the Prime Minister to convey to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Let us know if he is doing any good to those crying for freedom as such, whether the situation that he has been experiencing not only in the Congo, but in Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana. One needs to mention all of these. Is that what Britain would like to see? May I know again through our Prime Minister whether Great Britain is going to honour Ghana and Nigeria to sit on the Prime Minister's Conference? Those people not only took their freedom but killed their own Prime Minis-

ters; for what reason? I would like to know these answers if the Prime Minister would convey them.

Mr. NEWINGTON. As a back-bencher, may I say how grateful we are on this side of the House to see honest courageous and determined men opposite, men who have the same purpose at heart as we do on this side of the House, and that is the safety and security of Rhodesia. I would like to give them my wholehearted congratulations and my appreciation for their courage. I feel though, at the same time, the finger should be placed firmly and fairly on the guilty and evil men.

The PRIME MINISTER, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) on bringing this matter up and the other members who have joined in this small debate on the adjournment. It is indeed very refreshing to find that in times of national emergency when we are challenged as a country, that we can have people on both sides of the House taking the stand that we have, over the last 20 minutes, witnessed.

I believe that this attitude that has been portrayed here this evening is the attitude which goes throughout the length and breadth of this country. This is, in the main, the feeling of the broad mass of Rhodesians. There are exceptions of course, as there are exceptions in this House, Mr. Speaker, and this was quite evident earlier this afternoon but I am pleased to say that this is confined to a few people. I believe the majority concur with the views that have been expressed here.

How right it was to point out, Sir, what good have these people done to anybody in Rhodesia when they have come here killing people indiscriminately, black and white. Who can they claim to be assisting? The hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) put his finger very firmly on the spot when he said these are agents of communism, and I believe particularly the yellow communist, and that they would love to have this country for themselves. If they did ever get to this stage, then, Mr. Speaker, God help all Rhodesians, not one section or another section. I go along all the way with him and the other hon. members who supported him when they said that whatever problems we have in Rhodesia can only be solved by Rhodesians. This should be a golden rule.

I have no idea what Mr. Wilson is after. I am sorry, I cannot make a constructive reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for Gokwe (Mr. Chigogo).

I have tried to get him to face up to his responsibilities on a number of occasions and he has failed to do so. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going on flogging a dead horse. Let us make up our minds that we here have got to produce the right solution for Rhodesia. Let us enjoy the system of democracy whereby we can argue and criticize one another; this is healthy. Opposition is part and parcel of our Government and we must have it. But when it comes to infiltration of people from outside, bringing in outside views and outside doctrines, this will only be to the detriment of everybody in Rhodesia because Rhodesia will be divided and people from outside, Mr. Speaker, I believe will ultimately come in and win the day and reap the benefits. There is room for all of us in Rhodesia, in this wonderful country which is the envy of so many other parts of the world. They are green with envy and this is why I believe so many of them are waging the war against us; they would love to have what we have.

So, as long as we can keep together and as long as we can have the sort of constructive debates which we have seen in this short adjournment, then I believe they will never succeed. I once again would like to compliment the responsible hon. members of the Opposition benches for their contribution.—[Hon. Members: Hear, hear.]



(Mr. RARICK (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RARICK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS MAKING A GOOD CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION

(Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the contribution that the 94 Job Corps conservation centers are making to preserve and enhance the forests, parks, and natural resources of this Nation is an achievement that deserves recognition and praise second only to that for the recuperative impact which the Job Corps program is having on the youngsters themselves.

I would like to take this time to insert in the RECORD a sample of the many newspaper reports that have appeared recently in praise of the great work that these youngsters are doing in partial repayment for the chance and experience that the people of this Nation have afforded them.

You will note that these articles which come from six different States, describe some of the activities at eight conservation centers and reflect the positive relationships that have grown between the various centers and the neighboring communities.

I would also like to insert several letters written in thanks to the corpsmen of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps Center in Grants Pass, Oreg., for their assistance in the search for information which would lead to solving the disappearance of one of the citizens of the local community.

This is just one example of the effort—beyond duty—that the Job Corps men are making in times of emergency and disaster.

Under unanimous consent I place these items in the RECORD at this point: [From the Montana Standard, July 30, 1967]

##### JOB CORPS PAYS OFF DOUBLE

(By Frank Quinn)

The Anaconda Job Corps Center on Foster Creek, 11 miles west of the Smelter City, is paying dividends. The center is now in its 17th month of operation.

The dividends are accruing not only in the field of human resources but in financial returns to Montanans living within the Deer Lodge National Forest. The bigger return, however, is to the nation in the development of productive citizens.

##### NEAR CAPACITY

There are now 214 men between 16 and 21 in the center program. That is within four enrollees of capacity. There are only four of the boys who were enrolled when the camp opened in March, 1966.

A good majority of the first enrollees are now in the armed forces. They completed the entire program including basic education and job training. Some who did not go into service are now employed in various parts of the country, many in their hometown districts.

Nationally, according to Mike Paplich of Anaconda, program specialist for the Job Corps, the AFL-CIO is cooperating with the Office of Economic Opportunity to acquaint local labor leaders and members and others with the program. Through combined sponsorship of the AFL-CIO, the OEO and others, visits are planned at Job Corps Centers soon. The first Montana visitation will be at the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center Aug. 11. The center is located two miles south of Ronan on U.S. 93.

Steve Sherick of Butte, director for the Anaconda center, and Raymond Karr, Deer Lodge National Forest supervisor, commented on the financial return to the nation in the field of human resources. They put it this way: "A 17-year-old youth who becomes a social and economic failure can cost \$140,000 in public funds over his lifetime if he lives to be 57. This would be based on \$3,000 a year in welfare costs and \$500 a year in income taxes he would have paid if employed. The boys who completed the full course at the center are now productive citizens, either in the armed forces or in some type of industry."

The Anaconda center's work program for this fiscal year, has an approximate appraised valuation to Deer Lodge National Forest of \$430,800. Because there is a Job Corps in the forest area the estimated total cost of the planned work will be \$237,472.

Karr noted that the work setup includes backlog work never allocated for in forest circles. It is only through the corps that the Forest Service can do the outlined work, Karr explained.

##### LOW DROPOUT RATE

There are boys from all parts of the nation at the Anaconda Center and they like it. Sherick says the dropout rate at the Foster Creek center is something between 5 and 7 percent—much lower than the national average.

Most dropouts, personnel say, result from homesickness, although the extended winter, with accompanying cold, snow and the long spring rains accounted for many. Some of the southlanders yearned for the odor of magnolia blossoms.

It's a learning and earning process for the corpsmen, and they will be even more productive under the forest program outlined for this year. The most extensive program since the center was opened was prepared by Sherick and Frank Stillwell, work program director.

The projects, some already well under way, include installation of 69 units of camping facilities in the Philipsburg Bay campground area on the north shore of Georgetown Lake. About 10 of the units are completed and the other 59 will be complete before the summer is over.

Each unit includes a table, fire place, tent pad and parking area, all near water and sanitary facilities. The Corpsmen have also cleaned up considerable litter around the lakeshore.

##### FENCING PROJECTS

Other work includes fencing in the Skalkaho area, parts of Deer Lodge County, and in the Silver Star, Buxton and Brown's areas. This work is not only a productive asset for the Forest Service, but for farmers and ranchers.

Cross fencing and rotation of pasture land are a part of range water developments under way around Dempsey, near Deer Lodge, and in the area west of Silver Star.

Timber thinning is continuing in the Spring Creek area above Foster Creek, in the Storm Lake district and in Peterson Creek area, east of Deer Lodge. This work will make the second-growth lodgepole pine more valuable. Some of the timber cut in the thinning process is sold by the Forest Service for use in fencing, for posts of various types and in some instances for firewood.

There is some prescribed burning under way throughout much of the forest area. The clearance by control burning of slash areas and diseased timberland sections has an appraised valuation of \$14,500. The estimated cost is \$355.

##### ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Under road construction and improvement, the principal projects are on the Pikes Peak forest road in Granite County and the extension of the Foster Creek road west of Anaconda. The Pikes Peak road appraised valuation is \$60,000. The estimated cost to the Forest Service with the Job Corps help is \$31,751. The Foster Creek roadwork has an appraised valuation of \$98,000 and the estimated cost to the service is \$65,093. Forest trails are also being improved.

The Philipsburg Bay campground program and one at Delmoe Lake have an estimated appraised value of \$72,000 with an estimated cost total under the Job Corps of \$29,172.

Center projects at Foster Creek include an addition to the gymnasium and to the maintenance building.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Oct. 8, 1967]

#### HIKING TRAILS PROVIDE ROOM TO ROAM—WABENO AREA PROJECT HERALDS START OF CONSTRUCTION OF MAJOR SYSTEM OF TRAILS IN NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST

(By Bob Woessner)

WABENO.—The first miles of what eventually will be a major network of hiking trails are being cleared in the Nicolet National Forest.

Badger Trail, a joint venture of the United States Forest Service district at Laona and the government's Job Corps camp at Blackwell, will eventually wander through nearly 40 miles of forest country.

Work should be completed this fall and winter to allow hiking on the trail next year, according to Stanley Novak of the Laona Forest Service district.

Eventually there will be trails from the Lakewood area north to the Michigan state line, Novak explained.

The trail represents something of a departure in outdoor recreation usage. Most users of the woods in the last two decades have been fishermen and hunters.

But the boom in camping, especially family camping, has led to a need for more elaborate facilities.

Trails, hopefully, will provide part of the answer to family fun on northwoods vacations.

Novak blazed the Wabeno trail with an eye to scenery, history and nature study.

Starting at the logging museum on Highway 32 in Wabeno the main trail heads west out of Wabeno and crosses the North Branch of the Oconto River at the site of an old sawmill.

The trail, hilly through much of its length, overlooks several timber plantations, then heads northeast toward Trump Lake.

Novak has routed the hikers through a variety of terrain and across various timber stands. Trails will be marked both to provide directions for hikers and to point out items of interest.

Two campsites will provide spots for hikers who want more than a day's journey. The trail also follows Otter Creek for part of its length and skirts the Johnson spring pond.

Heading back toward Wabeno, the route passes through two Indian burial grounds with their covered graves and the sites of several old mills.

The main trail is nearly 18 miles long. It follows some of the area's old Indian paths for much of its length. Side trails will also provide 18 miles of walking and will visit such spots as the ghost town of Padus, another spring pond and campsites.

Work on the side loops will be started after the main loop is completed. Routes will be



mapped out offering the hiker either a short stroll through areas of his choice or a several-day jaunt through the entire area.

Following Novak's directions, the Job Corps crews have laid out the 24-inch-wide trail, cleared brush and will make and install the needed signs.

The trails are ample for hiking, Novak explained, but are narrow enough to discourage cyclists and snowmobile operators from using them.

"Those machines can tear up a trail in pretty short order," he said.

The hiking paths now give the Nicolet visitor three types of nature study trail to follow. There are two major auto tours—the Oconto and Peshtigo River tours, and detailed nature trails at Boulder and Bear Lakes.

The project also provides an outlet for the energies and skills of the Job Corps contingent from Blackwell.

"It gives the boys something tangible to build, something that can be used by the people who visit the area," one work leader explained.

[From the Durango (Colo.) Herald, July 30, 1967]

#### PAGOSA JOB CORPS CENTER SEEN AS WAY OF AVOIDING CITY RIOTS

(By Martin Sollars)

PAGOSA SPRINGS.—Several Colorado labor union leaders and members of War on Poverty programs visited instructors and trainees at the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Center on Friday.

Purpose of the meeting was "to acquaint the interested group with the Pagosa Job Corps and to view first-hand what the Corps is actually doing," said Herrick S. Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council of the AFL-CIO. Roth and Mark A. Reimers, center director, presided at the programs and tour.

Authorized March 1, 1965, the center provides residential quarters for out-of-work, out-of-school young men, 16 through 21 years of age, who lack the education and skills necessary to obtain jobs. Corpsmen participate in programs of basic education, development of skill training, and constructive work experience for an average of nine months.

After graduation, corpsmen are assisted in finding jobs, returning to school, or entering the armed forces.

Approximately 45,000 young people will be enrolled in Job Corps by the end of 1967. Graduation rate is high and is about 70 percent in the Pagosa Center, according to Reimers.

The Pagosa Springs Job Corps is located seven miles northwest of Pagosa Springs and is administered by the San Juan National Forest of the U.S. Forest Service. Capacity of the center is 112 boys.

Roth said that "There is little doubt that the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Conservation Center is doing the job it was created to do; moreover, I would say that the ten AFL-CIO union leaders from eight different jurisdictions of our labor movement who visited the Center on Friday were in general agreement that the investment is worth every dollar plus some.

"The riots in Newark and Detroit are a renewed warning to all of us in America—three years after Watts—that the nation is sitting on a tinder dry powder keg. Most of the powder and tinder relate to the teenage and early 20-year olds in our rural and urban slums.

"The cost of rebuilding just the properties destroyed by the insurrection in Detroit will be the equivalent of \$40,000 per youth who lives in the area; the cost of one year's Job Corps Training at Pagosa nets out to the taxpayer at around \$3,000 for an entire year; the young men being trained at Pagosa come

from the ghettos like the one that was literally blown up in Detroit."

Roth added, that "there is some contrast in the cost of destruction as compared with the cost of giving hope and pride to young people who can be productive citizens. At the moment, most of the like-situated youth in our nation have little reason to see hope; they are alienated from us. They intend to war upon those of us who seem so undisturbed, albeit fearful, of the whole mess.

"But the young men who come to Job Corps in Pagosa cease to be warriors; cease to be antagonists. They see hope instead of despair; it's obvious that Mark Reimers and his staff are building confidence, literacy and skills into the fabric of each of the individuals who manage to get there.

"We would have to conclude many things from our day at Pagosa, Roth emphasized. Two of the prime ones are: (1) Our Colorado AFL-CIO needs to give more vigorous support than ever before to major funding of the Job Corps program of the Office of Economic Opportunity; in fact, we realize that Colorado could provide the setting for 100 centers like Pagosa; and (2) the U.S. Forest Service, as a contracting agent with Job Corps—OEO, has learned in these past two years not only how to do the job, but it is doing it as probably no other comparable agency, public or private, could do it with dedication and skill.

"Every citizen of any affluence or influence or both in our state ought to be speaking out, for the Pagosas may be the saviors of the great urban centers of our nation—and this could induce our own Colorado urbanites—Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo."

The group toured departments within the Center consisting of basic education skills, basic work vocational skills, and social development. All buildings and facilities at the center were open to the group including dormitories, educational buildings, supply buildings, the office, and the shop.

General areas the corpsmen are trained in include clerical, culinary, conservation, construction, maintenance, medical, and auto mechanics. On the job training is emphasized in the facilities at the center. Learning by doing is the main theme at the center's program, according to the 32-member staff.

[From the Missoulian, Sept. 10, 1967]

#### TRAPPER CREEK JOB CORPS: MONTANA'S FIRST JOB CORPS CENTER—A PROGRESS REPORT

(By Bob Olson)

DARBY.—The Trapper Creek Job Corps Conservation Center, located South of Darby, in the southern end of the Bitter Root Valley, has been in operation for just over a year and a half.

At the end of that time, Robert Steiner, corps director, said that the program is going well. With a potential capacity of 216, the center now has 200 boys between the ages of 16 and 21, representing about 30 of the states, including Montana and Alaska.

There are 52 staff members including two clerks, two cooks and a nurse. As the first center in Montana, Trapper Creek opened on Jan. 1, 1966, and the first corpsman arrived on Jan. 12.

#### BIGGEST PROBLEM

Director Steiner said that the biggest single problem at the center is the lack of social life for the corpsmen. However, recently instituted trips to the Moses Lake, Wash., Women's Job Corps Center has improved the attitude of the local corpsmen greatly.

The activities at the Trapper Creek Center take three directions: education, work and vocations.

In the education department basic skills such as reading, math and writing are stressed, as some of the corpsmen arrive at the center unable to read, write or do simple

arithmetic. Other areas of instruction are typing, history, arts and crafts and vocations.

#### VARIETY OF WORK

One instructor was especially enthusiastic about a course called the "world of work." Here, the corpsmen are exposed to a variety of different jobs and are shown what is expected of one who is employed in specific jobs. Reading and math are taught with programmed materials, allowing each student to work at his own level of accomplishment while the instructor works with individuals or small groups.

In the work program, the center is attempting to do the kinds of projects that will both provide basic on-the-job training for the corpsmen and benefit the community as well. When the work program supervisor was asked if corpsmen were doing jobs that would reduce the employment opportunities for local workers, he answered, "Definitely not. The boys are doing projects that would not be done, either for lack of finances or time, if they were not doing them."

#### NUMEROUS PROJECTS

Some of the projects which corpsmen have done or are now doing include: three miles of reconstruction and cleaning on the White Cap Trail; spring flood control work on the Nez Perce Road, the East Fork Road and the Bitter Root River; Improved three miles of road on Bear Creek west of Victor; thinned five acres of pine on Lick Creek; cleared a mile of road right-of-way on Vapor Creek; constructed 1¼ miles of fence and put in four cattle guards on Guide Creek; built 22 fireplace grates for Forest Service campground fireplaces; constructed 18 double-pit prefab toilets for Forest Service campgrounds, as well as a number of small projects including cleanup of Riverview Cemetery in Hamilton. This does not include work done at the center itself.

#### NEW CONSTRUCTION

The corpsmen are currently engaged in constructing a new ranger station at Sula, 16 miles south of the center. About 10 boys are working with staff carpenters and electricians doing the basic construction of the station which will house the ranger's offices, radio room and rest rooms. While at Sula, the boys live in a spike camp, returning to the center on the weekend.

The work program and the education program operate concurrently, with each corpsman alternating one week of work and one week in the classroom.

#### THIRD PHASE

The third phase of the program, vocational education, or as the director calls it, "residential living," is important because it prepares the boy to return to his own community as a contributing citizen, at least partially equipped to earn his own way.

In this phase, the young men are introduced to a variety of vocations and are given basic instruction in them. The areas of work include carpentry, welding, electrical wiring, building maintenance, service station attendant, cooking, body and fender work, auto mechanics and laundry work.

After satisfactorily completing the Trapper Creek program, a corpsman may attend an urban center and receive specialized training in a selected field.

#### LONGRUN SAVINGS

A spokesman for the program said that, while per pupil costs are quite high at the center, it should be a saving in the long run because a boy should be able to return to his home area as a wage earner rather than a recipient of welfare.

The corpsmen are housed in dormitories which accommodate 54 boys each. They are fed in a dining room cafeteria. All janitor work in the buildings is done by corpsmen as a part of their training program.



Everything is furnished to corpsman, and he receives \$30 per month for spending money. Social security and income taxes are deducted from his allowance. After a month at the center a corpsman is eligible for a \$75 clothing allowance. Also, by earning points for working or for progress in education, a corpsman may become eligible for four \$5 raises during his stay at the center.

#### STRICT DISCIPLINE

Trapper Creek operates under strict rules of discipline, with counsellors on duty 24 hours a day. Steiner said that about 25 per cent of the enrollees leave before their program is completed for a variety of reasons including parental requests for their return or homesickness. A few have left and then asked to be allowed to return.

Optimistic about the future of the center, Steiner said, "We just aren't having many problems now."

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREG.,

Grants Pass, Oreg., August 1, 1967.

Mr. JAMES STOOP,  
Director, Fort Vannoy Job Corps Camp,  
Grants Pass, Oreg.

DEAR MR. STOOP: The Josephine County Board of Commissioners wish to express our appreciation to your staff and particularly your young men who participated in Lake County in the search for information which would lead to the solving the disappearance of one of our local citizens, Mr. Cy Bernet.

Commissioner Ringuette commented that your men had one of the most difficult portions of the search inasmuch as they covered areas by foot under hot and dry conditions which could not be searched by jeep or on horseback.

This was a public spirited act on the part of the Job Corps over and beyond the regular line of duty. We hope you will inform all those involved in the search how much their efforts are appreciated.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. MCGREGOR,  
Chairman.

STATE OF OREGON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,  
Medford, August 3, 1967.

Mr. JAMES STOOP,  
Center Director, Fort Vannoy Job Corps  
Center, Grants Pass, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our appreciation for the assistance rendered by members of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps on July 28, 29 and 30, 1967 in Lake County.

The Job Corps members were not only energetic in the search for missing hunter Cy Bernet, but followed directives promptly and enthusiastically. Their courteous attitude toward supervisors and search directors was favorably noticed and commented upon.

Please convey our thanks to supervisors Leroy Palm, Edgar Hite and Donald Howell as well as participating members of Fort Vannoy.

Very truly yours,

HOLLY V. HOLCOMB,  
Superintendent.

By E. W. TICHENOR,  
Captain.

[From the Grants Pass Daily Courier,  
Aug. 8, 1967]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: SEARCHERS  
THANKED

DEAR SIR: I would like to make known my gratitude to the members of the Josephine County Sheriff's Posse, who traveled at their own expense to partake in the search of July 28-30. They spent the greater part of Saturday under the desert sun and they covered large areas with little personal reward other than their collective blisters and callouses.

In addition, one can but praise the Job Corps for the manner in which they performed the arduous task they were called upon to undertake. Friday afternoon, the entirety of Saturday, and Sunday morning they walked mile after mile about that sun-raked earth. Keeping horseplay at a minimum, they searched acre upon acre and wore out a state policeman or two. Those who came in contact with the Job Corpsmen enjoyed that contact as they proved to be an exceedingly amiable group. As one who also trudged the same parcel of inferno, I can appreciate their endeavors.

Once again, I would like to thank every one who participated in the search for Cy Bernet.

TOM C. BERNET.

LAKE COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,

Lakeview, Oreg., August 8, 1967.

GENTLEMEN: It was a pleasure to have your Job Corps assistance in the recent Lake County search for Mr. Cy Burnett of the Grants Pass area.

These Boys, under the supervisors Palm, Hite, and Howell, not only did a thorough job in the area assigned to them, but were extremely easy to work with. They are a credit to the Job Corps movement.

Again thanking you for the participation, I am,

Very sincerely,

E. L. MCKINNEY,  
Director.

[Speed message]

GRANTS PASS SPORTING GOODS AND  
WESTERN WEAR,

Grants Pass, Oreg., August 2, 1967.

JIM STOOP,  
Fort Vannoy Job Corps.

DEAR MR. STOOP: Please accept and give my thanks and appreciation to the boys who aided in the search for my husband this past weekend. From all reports they acted and did a magnificent job and felt truly sorry they were unable to find any clues.

Our son, Tom, Sgt. Gardner, and all others have talked with have nothing but praise for these boys.

It was a hard, long and unrewarding job but they did no griping.

If possible I should like to thank, personally, each boy. Again my sincerest thanks to you and your group.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Cy BERNET.

[From the North Dakota Union Farmer, September 1967]

KIDS ESCAPE GHETTOS OF CITY, GHETTOS OF MIND

The Dickinson Job Corps Center has a mimeographed newspaper called the Hilltop news. It's pretty largely devoted to ballgames, with an occasional reflection on what the Job Corps experience is all about. One of these is "A Poem of Hope" by Franklin Scott:

"He like the bird, who  
Halting in his flight  
On limb too slight  
Feels it give way beneath him.  
Yet sings  
Knowing he has wings."

Now that is a pretty fair expression for a young man who is just learning to handle the language. Really a lot better tribute to the program than all the reams written by politicians, bureaucrats and sociologists. There are a great many limbs too slight for perching, and a fellow needs the best pair of wings he can get. It's the business of the Job Corps to provide flight training.

The urban and rural slums that Corpsmen come from might—with great determination and expense—be eliminated in 20 or in 30 years. Meanwhile there must be escape routes for those who are young enough and brave enough to take them.

One such route is the Corps, a voluntary residential training program for young men and women 16 through 21. Most of them are out of school, unemployed or underemployed. Many are illiterate and untrained. Some have minor police records. Not all of them make it, but an impressive number do—going on to college or specialized training or good jobs or military service.

North Dakota has two of the 93 Job Corps conservation centers—at Dickinson and Bismarck. There are also 10 urban centers for men, 18 for women, and two special centers. As of August 21, there were 19,196 youths enrolled. The program, including capital outlays and other costs is financed by \$303,400,681 in obligated federal funds in fiscal 1966. \$205,037,270 in fiscal 1967.

The Corps is an agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity and is a part of its so-called War on Poverty. OEO Director Sargent Shriver recently described his war aims for a House committee in this way:

"I want to say a word about ghettos. Right away we think of a city slum. But there is another kind of ghetto—an interior ghetto of the mind where we seal off parts of democracy that don't suit us, where we box off our obligations to justice and shut out our commitments to fairness. This ghetto of the mind is no less stinking and rotten than the ghetto of the city. Right now, all of us have ghettos to get out of. The sooner we begin, the sooner this country can become what its founders meant it to be. In truth, the War on Poverty is not being fought for the poor. It is for all Americans—because all Americans stand to gain by it. Not just with peace in our cities, but also peace in our hearts."

But of course this war for peace costs money, and OEO's armies are much sniped at by pennywise Congressmen. Job Corps Director William P. Kelly has admitted "our share of failure," but claims that 70 percent of his 75,000 graduates are employed or in school or military service. And he says these grads will save the country a lot of cash.

Mr. Kelly told a Senate committee that a youth of 17 who becomes a social and economic failure can cost \$140,000 in public funds over his lifetime if he lives to age 57—based on \$3,000 a year in welfare costs and \$500 a year in income taxes he would have paid if employed.

If just 2,100 youths were turned into productive citizens, said Mr. Kelly, it could offset the \$295 million the Corps wanted for this fiscal year, and he said if the Corps reached its goal of 56,000 successful graduates this year, it would be doing about 25 times better than that.

The dropout rate is admittedly high, but has dropped from 65 percent to 40 percent. The program is after all a voluntary one, and Mr. Kelly points out that enrollees are "the hardest core of the hard-core poor." Four of 10 Corpsmen are from families on relief; 3 of 10 can't read or write; 6 of 10 are from broken homes, and 8 of 10 haven't seen a doctor or a dentist in the past 10 years.

Conservation centers, like the type in North Dakota, are for boys with less than an eighth-grade reading level. They concentrate on basic reading and math, and work skills like carpentry, welding, auto mechanics and cooking. Each Corpsmen proceeds at his own speed, and the basic hitch varies from 90 days to two years. They produce things like fuel and water tanks, cattle guards and small buildings, and work on fences, roads and dams on Forest Service and National Park lands. Directors say the skills themselves are less important than the development of good work habits and attitudes. Basic graduates can get more specialized training at the urban centers.

Corpsmen are paid \$30 a month, with merit raises to \$50, plus board and room, some clothing, medical and dental care. They get two days of home leave for each month served. Discipline is enforced by fines, extra



duty, or restriction of passes. Ted Butler, education director at Dickinson, says "just plain talking to" is usually enough.

Most of Dickinson's 200-odd Corpsmen live in supervised dormitories. For the couple of dozen top students there is an honor dorm where the boys elect their own government and operate their own credit union.

There are intramural sports and matches with town teams and other nearby Corps centers, occasional trips, and work periods in other Forest Service areas.

The Dickinson center recently observed its second anniversary with a well-attended open house. It was activated June 15, 1965, and occupies a former Air Force radar camp on a windy hill north of the city. Relationships with townpeople have been fairly good, barring a few expected minor incidents, and a Community Council meets with the Job Corps staff once a month.

The advanced urban centers are run by corporations under contract with OEO. One of these, International Telephone and Telegraph, is sponsoring an ad in 65 newspapers and magazines. The ad shows a Corpsman reading a Sax Rohmer paperback, "The Invidious Dr. Fu Manchu." The caption says "He's not exactly reading Shakespeare. But at least he's reading. Hamlet just won't turn him on. Dr. Fu Manchu will. And to a guy who never read a book in his life—any book—it's a start."

"He's a Corpsman at the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey and like most other Corpsmen, he's a school dropout. The problem: how to get these boys to start reading and writing so that their mental skills match the job skills they're learning."

Recently, IIT set up an experiment based on the work of Dr. Daniel N. Fader. "Thousands of paperbacks of all kinds were made available, and now boys who have never read a book before are reading two or more a week."

"As a boy's reading improves and he learns sentence structure and punctuation, his sophistication in books grows."

"When many of these boys come to Kilmer, they find it almost impossible to express themselves. Now when they leave, they've found an exciting new way: with words."

And some of them, like the poet of The Hilltop News, have found exciting new ideas to express.

[From the Placerville (Calif.) Mountain Democrat & Times, Sept. 7, 1967]

JOB CORPSMEN AIDING IN CONSTRUCTION OF LAKE TAHOE STREAM PROFILE CHAMBER

(By Laura Sealy)

**SLY PARK.**—The construction of a unique addition to the Eldorado national forest's Lake Tahoe Visitor center is receiving a significant boost by the participation of corpsmen from the Sly Park job corps center.

#### DIVERTING CREEK

The corpsmen, under the direction of their instructors, Earl Sealy, work leader, and Marvin Brown, carpenter, are in the process of diverting Taylor creek through the new Stream Profile Chamber and back into its natural channel.

The Profile Chamber, the only of its kind built specifically for public use, is one of three in the world. In Sweden there is a small chamber for beavers and there is also one, the Sage Hen chamber, at Truckee, both of which are designed primarily for research purposes.

The Taylor creek chamber is scheduled for completion Nov. 1, 1968 and is designed to give forest visitors a broad understanding of what goes on in a trout stream.

Exhibits and displays inside the Profile Chamber will be done by Sly Park jobs corps center exhibit specialist John Jenott, who will interpret the graphic story of the Fallen Leaf lake watershed.

The oblique architectural form of the building will afford Jenott many areas for telling the story of the Taylor creek fishery, four seasons of the year and activities in the stream bed.

#### BELOW GROUND CHAMBER

A path from the Visitor Center leads to the Profile Chamber which is entered by gradually descending ramps to six feet below ground level. Visitors will pass through the building with 33 feet of window showing a view of the pool where fish will seek cover and move out to feed. A typical spawning bed in a stream will be shown, and at certain seasons of the year visitors will actually see fish from Lake Tahoe spawn. A white water riffle area in the stream where aquatic stream insects live to provide food for the fish will also be in view.

Three types of fish to be seen will be the Kokanee, spawning season, November; Rainbow trout, spawning season, April-May; German Brown, spawning season, October.

According to Robert K. Morris, forest naturalist for the Eldorado national forest, the Visitor Center now contains an amphitheater plus the center building. It serves the interpretive needs of three national forests in the Tahoe Basin. Fl-Stream Profile Chamber. Corpsmen participating in this phase of the construction are Norman Seymore, Dave Courtney, Otis Sanders.

#### INTEREST INCREASING

Morris states 71,000 people took part in various aspects of the USFS recreation and visitor information program in 1966. The use in 1967 is up approximately 60% over last year. The center is staffed by four seasonal naturalists in the summer and two on a year around basis.

In the fall, college students and schools participate in conducted tours of the spawning streams. Taylor creek is the most important spawning tributary of Lake Tahoe and the fish story here is important to anyone interested in fish and fish research. Winter activities at the Visitor Center include ski tours throughout the area.

With the new Stream Profile Chamber added to the Visitor Center, there will be opportunities for scientific fishery research to aid and improve fishing in mountain streams and lakes and also production in hatcheries.

The California State Fish and Game department is participating in the development and future use of the chamber.

[From the Klamath Falls (Oreg.) paper, July 23, 1967]

CAMP DIRECTOR SPEAKS: TRIALS, TRIBULATIONS AND SUCCESSES OF JOB CORPS OUTLINED FOR ROTARIANS

When the Job Corps was first introduced several years ago people in some communities, including Klamath Falls—pushed the panic-button, cried in anguish and widely announced they deplored the whole, miserable idea.

Grants Pass, where Fort Vannoy Conservation Center is located, was no exception.

This was indicated Friday when the director of that camp, James H. Stoops, addressed the Rotary Club. "Eighty to 90 per cent of the people in the Grants Pass area favor the camp. But one person can make a noise you can hear all the way across the nation."

"I found out they still have a Ku Klux Klan group in Grants Pass—small but active. And we have the John Birchers."

"At the beginning 3,300 people signed a petition opposing the center; 3,300 out of a population of about 11,000. But it's all working out well now," he said. "Economically the program means \$650,000 a year to Grants Pass."

Stoops, a forestry graduate of Oregon State University in 1935 and himself a product of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, cited

some of the work the young men in the Job Corps have done since the camp was begun two years ago.

"We work basically for the Bureau of Land Management. Some of our work is with the Forest Service. Last summer, for instance, our corpsmen fought 17 fires. They did reforestation work, made stream improvements and built 16 fish screens for the State Game Commission which saved an estimated 800,-000 salmon and steelhead."

"These kids have never had a chance to do anything for anyone," he stated. When they know their efforts are appreciated, "they bust their buttons."

He noted that work was done at the Girl Scout camp at Lake of the Woods and that a unit of his group is now working on a project at Lincoln on the Green Springs Highway.

Seven teachers are on the staff at Camp Vannoy. The boys, 16-21, go to school one week and work the next. The two groups alternate, he said. Sixty-two percent of the young people who have gone through the camp have been rehabilitated successfully," he said.

Unlike the old CCC, he said, the Job Corps goes farther than being a poverty program. "These boys have been school dropouts. Some have a prison record. Most of them have never been out of a city. Thirty two of our first 80 corpsmen couldn't read or write."

Stoops praised three VISTA volunteers, average age 70, who have been invaluable in aiding the lads to learn reading and writing. "Their accomplishment has been amazing."

Stoops said that in classes, the boys are taught to read, math and learn something of the world at work. "We try to teach them to get and hold a job. Many of these kids are exceptionally good with their hands and that through testing they have found that their IQs jump 50 points over a short period of time. "IQ tests don't mean much if you're miserable," he told the Rotarians.

"Some of these kids don't make it. They can't adjust. They get homesick even if they do come from a poor environment. But they're not allowed to resign."

The Job Corps program, Stoops explained, "costs \$1,500 before he even arrives in camp." He added that it takes \$5,800 a year for each corpsman. "But a welfare recipient gets \$4,-800, I'm told. If we save 10 per cent of them, the program will have paid for itself."

He said the Job Corps creates some problems in the local community. But, generally, the program has been a success. Many of the youths, when they arrive, are in poor health besides being deficient mentally. Through work, training, school, sports and a feeling of being wanted, great progress is obvious.

In the field of athletics, incidentally, one youth, "who never had on a pair of track shoes," may be competing nationally. He finished six inches behind another youngster in a recent state AAU meet in the 100-yard dash. The winner ran it in .09.9.

JOB CORPS IN BISMARCK: A YEAR'S EVALUATION  
(By James Conmy)

On August 19 it will be Job Corps plus one—one year since Job Corps trainees have been in Bismarck.

So how do Bismarck and the Job Corps Center stand now, after almost a year of operation by the center?

"Great!" said Bismarck Mayor E. V. Lahr. "The center is a part of our community. If it weren't, it would cause a lot of problems."

What problems do exist, Lahr said, are mainly operational and administrative, like negotiating a Bismarck city fire protection contract for the Job Corps center, which is a federal reservation.

"The fact of the matter is there've been so few problems we wouldn't even know the boys were there," Lahr said.



Bismarck police commissioner Ernest Fleck agreed.

"From a police angle, we've had neither a large number of incidents nor any serious ones," Fleck said. "There's been some fighting—usually among Job Corps trainees themselves—a little vandalism and a few drinking incidents, but nothing we haven't ever experienced from local boys."

Fleck also wished to make clear that Job Corps trainees don't receive any special handling.

"We treat them like anyone else—no favoritism and no harassment."

Bismarck police handle all incidents within the city limits, but if no complaints are filed against offenders the police do little but report the incident.

One incident came to public attention last week when two Job Corps enrollees complained that they had been abused verbally and shoved around physically by a couple of Bismarck youths. The latter were charged with assault and battery and will appear in Police Magistrate David Milhollan's court for trial next Tuesday.

Police inspector Mel Felch's noted that incidents, among the trainees themselves, are normally handled by authorities at the center.

"They keep everything pretty much in the family," Felchle said.

Of the two earlier incidents involving juvenile Job Corps trainees that had come to her attention, said Mrs. Nora Meland, police juvenile officer, both had been referred back to the center.

So Bismarck police say that because of generally good behavior on the part of trainees, police contact with the center is minimal. As a matter of fact, all of Bismarck's contact seems to be limited to several basic channels.

One is the regular passes issued to the boys for trips to town.

"We give out passes Friday nights, Saturday afternoons and Saturday nights," said James Fine, Center director, "but each boy is limited to two passes a weekend."

According to some trainees, there isn't much to do once they get to town, though.

"We walk around," one trainee said. "Sometimes we take in a movie. Sometimes we do some serious drinking. But mostly we just walk around."

Another said that he and his buddies usually check out the Teen Club in Bismarck and often walk out to a local drive-in for hamburgers.

"There isn't that much to do in Bismarck," one other remarked. "But I didn't expect there would be."

Morris Thiele, manager of the Teen Club, reported that the number of Job Corpsmen in the club varies from week to week, but that the boys are always well behaved and had never caused trouble.

"They come in, look around, and if we're having a dance they usually stay awhile. Sometimes they play pool or pinball machines," Thiele continued, "but they stay pretty much to themselves, not even associating with the girls very often."

A second way Bismarckers come in contact with Corpsmen is through the trips the boys make to purchase clothing and for medical attention.

"Lewis and Clark Job Corps Conservation Center has contracts with both St. Alexius and Bismarck Hospital," said Fine. "We also have doctors on call from Capital City Clinic, and Dr. Charles Arneson makes a weekly visit to the center."

Fine said that for dental care the boys go to whichever dentist they choose and can make an appointment with, noting that for many of the youths it is their first time in a dentist's office.

After they have been here for 60 days, corpsmen receive a clothing allowance of \$40, part of a total \$75 allotment. If they drop out of the program before completing at least

three months, this money and whatever clothing they have purchased revert back to the center.

Bismarck merchant Evan Shark said he did a fairly large volume of clothing business with Job Corps trainees.

A third channel of contact between Bismarckers and corpsmen is Sunday church services and the "family welcome plan," sponsored through the Bismarck Ministerial Association.

The Rev. Arnold Spain, pastor of St. Anne's Parish, who was on the original committee to set up a family welcome plan said the visits had "sort of died." He said that when the Ministerial Association meets again this fall, the program is supposed to be "resurrected."

One problem the priest mentioned was that there wasn't always cooperation from the Job Corps end of the plan last year, which situation he felt wouldn't exist this fall. Some families have continued to receive the boys as guests throughout the summer, according to Fr. Spain.

"With all the recreational facilities and organized athletics for the boys in the summer, some of these projects don't get too much stress until winter when the boys are more cooped up," Fine said.

The dozens of projects the Job Corps had completed in the Bismarck area have made Bismarck but not Bismarckers familiar to trainees.

A Job Corps baseball team competes with local amateur teams, and the center has a softball team in the Bismarck church league. Occasionally corpsmen aid in local social events as they did when they worked as drivers for the old timers picnic July 26.

A Job Corps chorus sang at a recent Lions Club meeting and the center's drum and bugle corps has played for festivities in area towns.

But that's it. Not too much more personal contact with Bismarck.

At present the center has just under 200 enrollees with approximately 60 from the North Dakota area. Non-local youths come from the southeast region of the U.S. or from New York and Washington, D.C.

"How long the trainees remain in Bismarck depends upon the vocational training they receive. Usually they're at the center here for about six months," Fine said.

Milan Christianson, public relations director for the center, said boys have been taken on bus trips to Minot and one was planned to Minneapolis until the rioting broke out there. The boys must use their own money for the trips, Christianson added.

When plans for the Job Corps here were first announced, lack of opportunity in Bismarck for Negro corpsmen to associate socially with members of their own race was cited as an objection to a Bismarck location. There was a heated but short-lived controversy which brought national—and unpleasant—publicity to Bismarck.

Center officials said then that corpsmen would be bussed to other cities, such as Minot and the Twin Cities, in order to enjoy social contacts with people of the same race.

But the Center was established and controversy quickly died down.

Christianson also said almost every night he and several trainee volunteers spend a couple hours fixing and cleaning up the Custer amphitheater south of Mandan where he hopes the corpsmen, in cooperation with local people, can present several dramatic productions sometime in August.

Authorities at both Bismarck and St. Alexius Hospital have scotched rumors about Negro babies being born to local girls in local hospitals. According to hospital authorities, the rumors just aren't true.

Impersonal contact with the Job Corps, especially that which can be counted in dollars and cents, is more clearly defined. The corps uses local facilities, buys many of its

supplies in Bismarck, including the lumber and fixtures used in conservation projects, and its staff members add to Bismarck's economy.

Before next spring, 100 Job Corps-built picnic tables will be distributed in Bismarck parks. Trainees have planted trees in Riverside Park and pruned trees, pulled stumps and cleaned up every local park. They've salvaged lumber for the Boy Scouts, rebuilt the historical marker by the water plant and done extensive work in Ft. Lincoln State Park and Museum.

But there's not much personal contact. And perhaps that's why Job Corps center director James Fine can say, "This is the best facility with the best cooperation from local people of any facility in the nation."

[From the Lebanon (Oreg.) Express, Oct. 20, 1967]

#### JOB CORPS CREW BEGINS TRAIL, PARKS PROJECTS

(By Josephine Sommer)

"There's a long, long trail a winding"—or at least there will be when a Job Corps task force working under Bureau of Land Management guidance completes a job started last week.

In fact, there are two recreation projects in progress in the Green Peter Reservoir area presently under the alternate supervision of Bill Eastham, LeRoy MacDonald and John Friede of the Tillamook Job Corps Center. They have 19 youths working on an expansion project at the Yellowbottom park and on a foot trail which will eventually open up the peninsula area around the lake for recreation purposes.

The Job Corps task force moved into the forest service camp at the Quartzville Guard Station about three weeks ago according to Bill Eastham, a supervisor from the Tillamook Job Corps Center. The Eastham family moved to Lebanon about the same time and their sons, Terry and Michael are already deeply engrossed in studies and sports at Lebanon Union High School. Terry is fast becoming the school's top track star and Mike, a senior, is a member of the football squad.

His awareness of the recreational projects they will be constructing under BLM and Fish and Game Commission assignments in the next few years, caused Eastham to make inquiries and personal observation to determine where the family would settle at least until the boys complete high school. He had high praise for Lebanon area schools and the friendly atmosphere in both school and community.

The Job Corps supervisor also praised BLM supervisors, the forest service and local people who have made their work easier.

#### CAMPED AT QUARTZVILLE

"Among other things, the forest service has provided their camp at Quartzville for our use while we are working in this area," Eastham added. "One service station owner at Sweet Home volunteered to take telephone messages—since we don't have an on the job communication. This is the kind of help we find everywhere we turn."

Before climbing the trail to interview Eastham, we talked with BLM's supervisor, "Hank" Blessing, his assistant John Gundren and MacDonald, the Job Corps supervisor on the Yellowbottom Park job.

"These men and their Job Corps task force cleaned up Fisherman's Bend Park (after the wind storm) prior to moving onto these jobs," Blessing said. "MacDonald and his crew will build trails to new picnic areas here on the south side of the (Quartzville) highway—across from the main section of Yellowbottom Park. They will also dig pits for pit toilets and make picnic table pads."

MacDonald explained that a Tillamook Job Corps Center masonry class will do some of the construction work at the park. Thus the



job assignments provided by BLM gives the youth a chance for on the job application of vocational training being given at the center.

The work supervisors explained that the center schedules alternate weeks of classroom studies (at the center) and on the job experience such as the boys are receiving in the Green Peter area currently.

MacDonald—who started this type of work in the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)—said they are preparing locations for 11 new picnic tables on the south section of the park. Two units were in use last summer. Blessing explained that the parking area is planned for 22 cars and the roads throughout the main park will be oiled this season. The latter job will be done either by Bureau of Public Roads crews or on contract.

#### TRAIL OUTLINED

By outlining on a map BLM's trail plans, Blessing showed how the peninsula area between the Middle Santiam and the Quartzville area would open up the Green Peter Reservoir area. Seven miles of trail will probably be completed this season. The task force began its trail work at the end of the access road which heads east then south from Rocky Top bridge (ten miles east of Green Peter Dam).

"The trail will swing back to the lake's edge just beyond Fool's canyon," Blessing said, "then will follow the water line around the edge of the peninsula on the north shore. A foot bridge will span Quartzville Creek in this section. A five year agreement with the U.S. Corps of Engineers facilitates this work and will probably be extended as needed."

Enlarging on the kinds of opportunities given "our Job Corps boys" by the various agencies, Eastham said they have supplied crews for fishways, timber stand improvement jobs, parks and campground cleanup and expansion projects, access trails, road improvement, tree planting and fire fighting.

"With the completion of the dams here in this area, crews such as we train at the Tillamook Center will be in demand," Eastham added. "I understand around ten miles of horse trails are to be built along the lake area and inland from Quartzville Creek."

Blessing had said earlier that the BLM staff receives many letters from saddle clubs asking for such trails through BLM wilderness areas.

Included in the instruction being given by the Job Corps supervisors, was the care and use of such equipment as axes and chain saws. The trail work combines training and application. Some of the boys on the job were previously on fire fighting crews in Idaho, Montana and here in Oregon during the summer.

"You hear considerable criticism of the Job Corps," Eastham concluded, "but the centers of my experience are doing a terrific training job. If these boys are kept occupied, they not only like the corps but also appreciate what it is contributing toward their future independence. I'll welcome a chance to sell anyone on the corps contributions to society. Your state agencies deserve a great deal of credit for their contributions to our success."

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a year long, in-depth analysis of the Baltimore Community Action Agency by the Strategic Planning Corp. of Baltimore disclosed that the poverty program has been very effective. According to Blair Simon, president of the Strategic Planning Corp., more than 60 percent of the residents of the target area, or about 120,000 people, have been reached with services and assistance.

To quote Mr. Simon:

The poverty program has done an amazing job in many areas.

When asked about the reaction of the people to the community action agency, Mr. Simon declared that it was very favorable. He added:

We were somewhat surprised by the lack of negative comment. Almost everyone interviewed (approximately 600 families), had a favorable response to the program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit, particularly, of those who believe that poverty funds are wasted on the "undeserving" poor, I would like to quote one more statement of Mr. Simon:

Our findings indicate that the entire Baltimore community—rich and poor—have benefited at least indirectly from this effort. We have more than gotten our money's worth.

Under unanimous consent at this point I insert in the RECORD a "Question and Answer Spotlight" which recently appeared in the Baltimore News American:

#### QUESTION AND ANSWER SPOTLIGHT: REORGANIZATION NEEDED IN CITY'S POVERTY WAR

Millions of federal, state and city tax dollars are spent each year in the War on Poverty. Just how effective this fight has been has never adequately been determined.

Last year, the Baltimore Community Action Agency ordered an in-depth analysis of 10 parts of its anti-poverty program.

The study, undertaken by Strategic Planning Corporation of Baltimore has recently been completed and submitted to the agency. Its contents have not yet been released to the public.

This week for Spotlight Q and A. The News American interviewed Blair Simon, president of the Strategic Planning and staff consultant Roger M. Windsor on their findings. The study took one year and was performed at a cost of \$60,000.

NEWS AMERICAN. You have recently completed an in-depth analysis of the Poverty Program in Baltimore. Is this just going to be another one of the many, many studies that are simply filed on the shelf and nothing is ever done about it?

SIMON. I hope not. Certainly there is every indication that the findings are going to be used. The commission has actually directed the study and we have had several seminar meetings with them and they have already taken action on several of our recommendations. In addition, the Community Action Agency's full-time staff is developing plans to take full advantage of the recommendations made.

Also, many of the Third Party Contractors evaluated have asked their boards or advisory council members to study and come up with revisions and changes to take advantage of these recommendations.

NEWS AMERICAN. How effective has the Poverty Program in Baltimore been? Is it successfully solving the problems of the poor?

SIMON. There is very good evidence that it is effective. Interviews with the residents indicate that slightly more than 60 percent of the people have been reached either by receiving services of a component of the Poverty Program or having been contacted at home.

If we assume that there are approximately 200,000 residents of the Action Area, this would mean that 120,000 people have been served and reached by the Poverty Program in Baltimore.

Our findings also show that the Poverty Program has done an amazing job in many areas starting from almost ground zero two years ago and today they have a whole family of operating programs, numerous Neighborhood Centers throughout the Action Area, and indeed appear to be providing a great deal of meaningful services. At the same time, we found that there are many possibilities for improvement.

NEWS AMERICAN. What specific aspects of the Poverty Program did your study go into?

WINDSOR. We evaluated ten Third Party Contractors. These are organizations outside of the Community Action Agency who have a contract to provide services for a given program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Were you satisfied with the degree of cooperation you received from the Third Party Contractors during your evaluation?

SIMON. Yes, the cooperation we received from each of the contractors was outstanding almost without exception. Our concern here has been that there is a weakness in the amount of cooperation and coordination between contractors and the cooperation between the contractors and the parent organization, the Community Action Agency.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you mean that there is a lack of referral between the various Third Party Contractors?

WINDSOR. Yes there is, and there are opportunities for a great deal more referrals. It is not an easy problem and there are reasons for this, but we feel the point has been reached where this must be improved.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found any antipathy between the various Third Party Contractors and the CAA and the other city or state agencies?

SIMON. I think there is always some rivalry amongst the city agencies and this has been a problem that plagues the city—we can't get concerted action on behalf of the city government. Many of our departments act independently.

The result was some apprehension or antipathy when the CAA got into the picture.

Many agencies were wondering to what extent the CAA would intrude on their ground. It has been demonstrated, I think, that there is an opportunity for all to cooperate more effectively and, therefore, provide better service for the citizens.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you feel there is need for a consolidation of all the different agencies involved in the fight of poverty?

SIMON. That is a difficult question. On the one hand we find the poverty program moving toward a de-centralization that allows for a greater citizen involvement. By centralizing, we have a benefit maybe of better cooperation, but it may become bureaucratic, more arbitrary, and further removed from the people and their wants. How we can get the benefits of both is probably the greatest challenge the Poverty Program faces.

NEWS AMERICAN. What has the reaction been of the people in the Action Area to the Poverty Program?

SIMON. Very favorable. We were somewhat surprised by the lack of negative comment. Almost everyone interviewed (we interviewed approximately 600 families in the Action Area) had a favorable response to the program.



NEWS AMERICAN. What are the people in the Action Area most concerned with? What do they want to see done?

WINDSOR. We asked this question of the residents that were interviewed and among their greatest concerns were poor housing conditions and their expression of need for the landlords to correct these conditions. Also, they were very much concerned with what they felt was inadequate law enforcement in their neighborhood areas. Also, they were very concerned about the conditions related to sanitation, garbage collection, street cleaning, and a lack of adequate numbers of play areas for their children.

NEWS AMERICAN. Were you able to determine if the people in the Action Area are receiving adequate law protection?

SIMON. We can't really give you an answer on that. It is important to recognize that the local anti-poverty program does not have the resources to eliminate poverty.

Their resources amount to approximately \$35 per year for each resident of the Action Area. University of Pennsylvania economists have estimated that the CAA controls only 4 percent of Baltimore anti-poverty industry. This study was concerned with that segment only.

The really interesting thing would be to look at the other 96 percent and find out how effective that is in serving the poor citizens of Baltimore City.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you feel that the Community Action Agency has done enough as far as publicity goes for the various Poverty Programs that are available?

SIMON. There is never enough information. We pointed out earlier the amount of referrals and cooperation between the programs depends on the knowledge of other programs.

There is a lack of knowledge about many of the programs. Some people that have been served by one know about no other programs also available to them.

I suspect that a very effective public relations program and information program would be most helpful. But the residents of the poverty area have been reached best so far by personal contact.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do the people in the Action Area know where to go when they have problems such as sanitation, law enforcement, etc.?

WINDSOR. Interestingly our survey shows that more and more people are pointing to their Neighborhood CAA Centers as the place to go for all problems and there they find that someone will be interested in them and direct them to the proper source.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found race to be a problem with the Poverty Program in the Neighborhood Centers? Are the races mixing well or are they separated? Do you find the poor whites are in one area and the poor Negroes in another area? And where they live together, do they work together to make better communities?

SIMON. Perhaps we should go back to understanding the setup here in Baltimore. The Poverty Program had decided in the beginning to concentrate its resources on a certain geographical area called the Action Area. This area includes approximately one half of the so-called impoverished people in the city.

They have selected those areas with the poorest income criteria and the greatest degree of incidence of other indications of poverty. It happens that most of these areas are Negro dominated.

There are some white people that live in the Action Area and the Target Area and this might amount to 10 percent. Actually the whites and Negroes are separated usually in neighborhood groups.

There is an integration of whites and Negroes in the program and in the staffing of the Neighborhood Centers. Race doesn't appear to be a problem.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found the staff to be a major problem of the Poverty Pro-

gram? Are they getting highly qualified, competent people and is there a high terminal rate?

SIMON. Staffing is a problem. Today it is very hard to find trained social workers. There has been an emergence of many social programs and there are inadequate numbers of people formally trained for social action programs.

The Poverty Program is trying something interesting. They are deliberately trying to use indigenous people to provide professional type services. This means that there may be some sacrifice in the backgrounds and immediate capabilities of the people, especially at the beginning.

What they hope to get in turn is a sensitivity, a warmth, a responsiveness that has been missing in some of the bureaucratic problems and services that have not served the need of the poor people. In addition, there is the constant problem in Baltimore City of Civil Service classification and recruitment. The Poverty Program has claimed that inadequate Civil Service criteria, testing, and promptness of response has greatly inhibited their staffing.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that by concentrating on indigenous personnel that this works to the detriment of the Poverty Program?

WINDSOR. There is a tradeoff here. We get something if we give something. In most cases the indigenous people have been outstanding for their ability to relate to other poor people.

NEWS AMERICAN. Is there a need for a large step-up in salaries of the poverty workers? Would this attract the kind of people really needed?

SIMON. There is a need for some re-evaluation of this and there is a comprehensive study now underway in the city.

NEWS AMERICAN. In your survey, have you found that these programs which are allegedly self-help programs, have begun to drift into subsidies rather than self-help?

SIMON. There is a very difficult problem because the Poverty Program is by its very nature multiple-goal oriented. It must satisfy a number of things. Income is one form of deprivation. Most of the poor people have been judged to be deprived primarily of adequate income, but in addition to this there is the deprivation through the lack of services and amenities—housing, poor sanitation services, etc.

Generally it is felt that the poor people get less than their share of the city services due them. In addition there is the deprivation of organization or power. In order to have self help, we must have some form of organization.

We recognize that there must be a combination of all these things. We are urging, however, that CAA move more towards self-help and away from the caretaking.

NEWS AMERICAN. What sort of problems did you find in the operation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

WINDSOR. I am not quite sure that we ought to concentrate and focus on problems because there is a definite benefit gained through enrollment in the program.

As far as operation of the program itself, we feel that one of the major limitations or drawbacks in the program is the lack of an adequate followup system that determines what happens to the youth once he leaves the program. I might add that this is not just limited to our own local situation but nationally this inadequacy exists as well.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that the inner-city schools contribute in any way to the lack of education of these people so that they would drop out?

SIMON. Schooling is a problem but our evaluation really does not define the problems of the school system. The parents indicate a great interest and concern about

their children's education. The fact that the dropout rates are high is a reflection of the problem.

Among the suggestions we have made to the Community Action Commission is that they take advantage of their experience with the needs of the poor people and articulate suggestions for improvement of the inner-city schools particularly. This is appropriate because the Community Action Commission should be an advocate for the poor citizens in all facets of city decision making.

NEWS AMERICAN: Have the people who have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps gone back to school?

SIMON: No, generally they have not. This was one of the original thrusts of the NYC—to encourage the dropouts to go back to school.

\*On the average, those dropouts are below a ninth grade education. That means that he has approximately four more years to go. This is not a very attractive alternative.

Actually, our findings show that most of the youths in the NYC are going to full-time work and we have every reason to believe that they are better prepared. They have established work habits, they have references, they have worked at jobs, they have demonstrated a capability to perform.

This theory has not, however, been proven yet, for as Mr. Windsor pointed out, NYC simply doesn't have adequate follow-up on what happens afterwards. If we don't have follow-up and find out what happens over the longer term, we won't know how to revise and correct our program inadequacies.

NEWS AMERICAN: Are these jobs that are being given now merely menial type jobs?

WINDSOR: For the most part we find that they are. This is, in part, due to the fact that there are not enough adequate jobs above that task level with which to provide these youths.

We have recommended that improvement in the quality and assortment of jobs would have great benefit in making the NYC even more effective than it is today.

NEWS AMERICAN. Is there a possibility of some cooperative effort between the NYC and various segments of the business community to train these people for better jobs and get them out of the ghetto?

SIMON. Yes, but NYC may be the wrong program. One of the potential weaknesses of the NYC program is that it is limited to work habits orientation—not job training. They are not trained for any particular job.

NEWS AMERICAN. Could you tell us a little about the Small Business Development Center? What are its main aims? Is this one of the programs you studied?

SIMON. Yes, the SBDC has as its task the providing of services to residents of the Action Area in acquiring loans through the Small Business Administration. These loans are directed at establishing new businesses or allowing existing businesses to expand or continue in operation.

NEWS AMERICAN. Why is there a need for an organization such as the SBDC when this function is already performed by the Small Business Administration itself?

WINDSOR. The SBA is not equipped to relate and provide special detailed services to the poor resident. In this city the Director of the SBA has worked very effectively with those in the SBDC and together have done an excellent job in getting something like 44 firms with a loan in the first year of operation.

The real reason for why it is needed is that the banking institutions and other conventional sources are not providing capital to the poor people and especially the Negro community. Nobody can get one of these Equal Opportunity Loans unless they have been formally rejected by the conventional financial sources.

SIMON. Our findings on this program indicate that it is one of the most successful



of the anti-poverty programs in the city and the reasons are that it has taken people off welfare, it has taken people off unemployment, and has put them to work in the private enterprise sector.

It is truly a self-help program and it is interesting that it is one of three programs in which we went further than the basic evaluation requirements and performed a cost-benefit analysis.

This program stands out as an effective poverty eliminating program in that it returns a great deal more in benefits to both the poor community and to the entire state than it costs.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that these people are good risks for these loans?

WINDSOR. Yes, interestingly enough, our study shows that in the first year of operation, not one of the firms failed. This is an amazing standard in that even the best risk type business firms have a high failure rate.

NEWS AMERICAN. What are the problems with the present Day Care Program?

SIMON. The Day Care Center Program is another one that we submitted to this vigorous cost-benefit analysis and our findings are somewhat controversial. An attempt was made to probe the strategy and purpose of an anti-poverty service program. There is an unquestioned need for better child Day Care in Baltimore.

The problem that they have is one of ill-defined goals and objectives and policies and sometimes individual decisions tend to work against each other and reduce program effectiveness.

The national guidelines are sometimes fuzzy and sometimes they don't exactly fit the local need. It is up to the local agency however, to make it as effective as possible within the limits of their choice.

The question can be asked if Day Care is an effective poverty eliminating program. It does not appear to be as effective as others and theoretically it is appropriate to consider shifting the very scarce anti-poverty funds to other uses. However, under the present law, you either use these funds for the designated program or get nothing.

NEWS AMERICAN. I understand that the Street Club Worker Program of the Poverty Program works closely with the Department of Recreation. Do you feel that they work closely enough or is there some antipathy between them?

SIMON. No, we don't feel they work closely enough. Actually the Street Club Worker Program started long before Baltimore had a Community Action Agency or an anti-poverty program.

This is an example of where there are opportunities but currently failings in the Community Action Program. We mentioned earlier that the CAA has only a small portion of the total resources to provide services to the poor.

What they must do is to mobilize all the agencies in the city to do a more effective job in preventing and eliminating poverty. That is an important section in the local ordinance and in the federal law—that is to mobilize all city agencies.

NEWS AMERICAN. You haven't found then that the Department of Recreation has taken to heart what it has learned from the Street Club Worker Program?

SIMON. The lessons are not total and we must be careful about sweeping criticism of the Recreation Department.

We do find that this program is operated as a separate independent section of the Department of Recreation—they do not appear to be looking for lessons and they do not appear to be utilizing the lessons learned here in their other recreational efforts.

NEWS AMERICAN. It has been charged that the Board of Directors of the Legal Services program is composed of people who are opponents of the Legal Aid system itself. Have

you found that to be a problem and have you found that it hampers Legal Services?

WINDSOR. The Board of Directors of the Legal Services Program is not packed with opponents of the program. There are people on the Board who did oppose the program at its inception.

As far as it hampering the operation of the program, I would say no, it is not generally hampering the operation. Certainly the staff of the program, because of the difference of opinion among the Board, is not able to institute all of the programs that they would like to operate in the Action Area.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you noticed with the Legal Services that you get young, inexperienced lawyers who use Legal Services as a training ground and then leave, which necessitates the Legal Services going through another period of adjustment by bringing another new lawyer in, training him, only to see him leave later on?

WINDSOR. I think this has been one of the criticisms leveled at Legal Aid programs not only here in Baltimore but across the nation. The Legal Services Program operating under the War-on-Poverty in Baltimore has only been operating for slightly less than a year.

There is no clear indication that this situation is occurring in the Baltimore program. There are some young attorneys on the staff of the Legal Services Program, however, this is counterbalanced by some well experienced attorneys. I can't say that definitely young attorneys are using Legal Services as a training ground for their own ambitions.

What is the issue, however, is could they possibly do more. Presently the program services are directed solely to attention on individual civil cases when possibly the most relevant and the most pressing concerns are for criminal case assistance and group activities—problems that bother all the poor such as the alleged excessive licensing of liquor outlets in the poverty areas, alleged propensity towards giving a poor youth a criminal record compared to those from the more affluent areas.

We should get the Legal Aid Program out on the table and again look at it in terms of what ways can we do the most for the poor as opposed to what the lawyers want to do.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found it a problem to get Negro lawyers for Legal Aid?

WINDSOR. This has been pointed out by the operating staff of the Legal Services Program as one of their problems. They indicated that it is very difficult to attract a Negro attorney to the staff because he can fare as well, if not better economically, in private practice than he can in joining the Legal Services Program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found a lack of enthusiasm or a lack of spirit across the board of the Poverty Program among the staff members on the lower levels?

SIMON. No, on the contrary, we have found a great deal of spirit and commitment. People are in there basically not for pay but because they feel they are doing something worthwhile. This was most evident in the early times and the problem will be to keep it up—to keep the innovative, the new view, the freshness, the ability to criticize one's self as part of the Poverty Program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Millions of dollars are spent each year in the Baltimore anti-poverty effort. There has been a great deal of criticism about whether it is used correctly. Has your study found that it is being used correctly?

SIMON. Correctly is a very difficult conclusion to reach because it is very obvious that there are a number of different viewpoints as to what is correct. We have found that in Baltimore a very effective job has been done in a short period of time with limited funds.

Our findings indicate that the entire Bal-

timore community—rich and poor—have benefited at least indirectly from the effort. We have more than gotten our money's worth.

What we are suggesting at this point, however, is that it is time to shift gears. Phase one has passed. The Poverty Program has established a bridge to the poor community. They have an organization, knowledge, and program where there was little before.

There doesn't appear to be more resources available to continue to expand the program at this time. Therefore, it is time to capitalize on the lessons learned. It is time to eliminate or redirect programs, also to help mobilize all available community resources to do a more effective job for all citizens.

NEWS AMERICAN. What is it going to cost to implement your suggestions?

SIMON. Our suggestions have been basically tuned to the original guidelines given us by the Commission which are to assume a constant level of funding rather than an increase in funding.

We have found ways and suggestions to improve the efficiency, to get more effectiveness and results for each dollar, and secondly perhaps to make some program revisions.

Although each of these programs are effective and aimed at satisfying real needs, some of them seem to be more effective than others; therefore, it may be more desirable to allocate funds towards those which seem to get the most results.

What is essential now is that the Commission sharpen up its objectives and policies. A consultant cannot properly formulate the objectives. What we can do is to help define the issues and to point out how to get maximum benefit from the available resources once the objectives have been determined.

It is time to re-assess the services that this city in total is applying in eliminating poverty, in serving the poor people, in helping them to help themselves.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a staunch supporter of the war on poverty since its inception, I would like to share with my colleagues today a number of recent editorials from the Baltimore Sun in defense of the program as well as a New York Times editorial entitled "No Spin Off."

I know that these programs have enabled many people to attempt to solve their problems and improve their lives. You may be interested to know what the various OEO programs have done in my own State of Maryland: 16,323 youngsters participated in summer Headstart; 68,903 Marylanders of all ages have participated in community action programs which operate in 21 of the 23 counties in my State at a cost of \$17,004,000; 8,607 young people and their families have benefited from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs; 11,317 trainees have profited from the work experience program; and 5,604 adults have participated in the adult basic education program.

As you all remember, when the economic opportunity programs first started, some individual projects were slow in getting off the ground, but now that most of them are well organized and



beginning to show results, it is certainly not the time to cut them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we appropriated \$1,678,500,000 for OEO in fiscal 1967 and appropriated \$128,752,450,419 for the entire budget for fiscal 1967. We are spending approximately 1.3 percent of our budget to rehabilitate the poor and disadvantaged—a small amount, indeed, to raise these individuals from tax consumers—welfare and so forth—to taxpayers.

It is my firm conviction that cuts should not be made at the expense of those least able to help themselves.

At this point, I insert the editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun]

#### JUST TOO MUCH

Sargent Shriver has threatened to quit as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity if Congress doesn't give him the funds to really fight poverty. He is understandably alarmed and angry. Members of the House of Representatives are seriously thinking of cutting the Administration's anti-poverty appropriation request almost in half, from \$2.06 billion to \$1.2 billion.

It is fairly clear that not much could be done with that kind of money. As Mr. Shriver put it, "... it would be a delusion of the poor. It will be a deception to the general public, and, therefore, I don't think it would be advisable to continue a fraud." Even as he spoke, reports came in that, owing to a lack of funds, anti-poverty projects are closing down all over the country. Funds are already becoming scarce here in Baltimore and in six Maryland counties. VISTA workers will go unpaid. Job-training programs are being curtailed, community action assistance to poor rural families is being held up.

Mr. Shriver seems adamant. He is arguing that, in this case, a half a loaf is worse than none at all, that giving it would be a gesture designed only to appease the conscience of the affluent without its actually alleviating the suffering of the poor. And Defense Secretary McNamara yesterday joined the debate by questioning America's will to see the poverty program through. He rejected the thesis that national resources are insufficient to fulfill our international commitments, while at the same time meeting domestic needs.

President Johnson committed this country to a protracted war on poverty, and now Congress, through procrastination and threats to cut deep into anti-poverty funds, seems bent on avoiding that commitment. Perhaps some reduction in these funds is necessary in the interest of fiscal stability, but half the requested appropriation is just too much.

#### FIGHT FOR POVERTY FUNDS VOWED

WASHINGTON, November 6.—Defenders of the Administration's war on poverty reacted sharply today to forecasts that the program would be cut back below last year's spending levels.

Representative Perkins (D., Ky.) chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee which drafted the \$2,060,000,000 bill now before the House, said, "we should be getting more than we asked rather than being cut back. I will fight these cuts."

Perkins spoke in reply to a statement by Representative Mahon (D., Texas), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which had said the committee would not allow more than the \$1,600,000,000 spent during the 1967 fiscal year.

#### HINTS LOWER FIGURE

"In fact, there are strong indications that the figure approved by the Appropriations Committee for the entire antipoverty program may be less than \$1,600,000,000," Mahon said. He did not disclose what the new figure would be, however.

Actual debate on the bill to authorize funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity was delayed by floor debate on a number of minor bills, but Perkins released a lengthy speech, saying six community action agencies—including one in his own district in Appalachia—are without funds.

"Unless we act by November 23—just 17 days from now—35 other local community action programs will have to close down their operations," he warned. "This involves \$42,000,000 worth of community action projects and affects the lives of some 500,000 people."

These agencies are in sixteen states, including Maryland, Perkins added.

OEO, which administers the anti-poverty program, was cut off without funds October 23 when a stop-gap resolution to allow it to spend at 1967 levels was bottled up by a squabble between the House and Senate over economy.

"You can well imagine the anxiety and the frustration that this lack of funding is creating in the hearts and minds of poor people throughout this country," Perkins declared.

The delay in beginning formal debate on the bill was another in the series of blows at OEO taken by the House. It delays at least for one more day the passage of some sort of program. The Senate has already approved a \$2,200,000,000 program which will be subject to negotiations with the House version.

Earlier, Representative Ayres (R., Ohio), senior Republican member of the House Education Committee, had suggested that the House abandon the bill, and instead pass a continuing resolution that would set the spending level at \$1,200,000,000.

OEO has said Ayres' resolution would force the closing of 60 Job Corps centers serving 20,000 young people, 250 community action programs, half the VISTA programs and end job training for 120,000 adults.

Perkins described it as "completely unrealistic and completely irresponsible. Make no mistake, the impetus for a continuing resolution approach is coming from those who want to see the emergency opportunity programs severely crippled."

During a television interview today, Sargent Shriver, head of OEO, said he would resign if the agency were cut to the \$1,200,000,000 figure. It was the first time he has publicly threatened to resign although there has been speculation he would step down to run for Senator from Illinois next year.

#### NEW VERSION OFFERED

"... It would be a delusion to the poor and a deception of the public and therefore I don't think it would be advisable to continue," he was quoted as saying.

At the same time, Representatives Quile (R., Minn.) and Goodell (R., N.Y.) offered a new version of an earlier "opportunity crusade" which would be substituted for the existing anti-poverty program.

While the committee bill was amended to turn over control of funds to local officials rather than to the community action programs, themselves, in a move to get support of southern Democrats against Republican attempts to dismantle OEO, the Goodell-Quile proposal would retain present procedures.

#### VISTA FUNDS PROMISED FROM PRIVATE SOURCE

NEW YORK, November 6.—Twenty-five New York corporations were reported today to have agreed to bankroll the domestic peace corps with \$100,000 in hopes Congress eventually will restore anti-poverty funds.

The funds were cut October 23 and 230 New York corps workers, members of Volunteers in Service to America, found themselves without money for food and lodging.

Encouraging VISTA workers to stay on the job, William H. Crook, the director, said he hoped Congress will restore the funds retroactive to October 24.

The corporation heads pledged \$54,000 needed to maintain New York workers for a month. The remaining \$46,000 was made available to VISTA workers elsewhere in the nation.

#### HOUSE GOP DENIES SUPPORT TO DEEP CUT IN POVERTY AID

WASHINGTON, November 8.—House Republicans declined today to support a proposal to cut funds for the anti-poverty program to a level the Administration says would end the program's usefulness.

At a strategy meeting held in connection with the anti-poverty bill now before the House, a majority of the GOP members indicated they preferred to try to change specific programs rather than vote for an across-the-board cut in spending.

The result of the meeting is believed to have improved the chances for House passage of a bill that would leave intact most of the programs now administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

No decisions were reached at the GOP meeting, but participants said sentiment was strong against a proposal by Representative Ayres (R., Ohio), to cut OEO spending to \$1,200,000,000. It is now funded at \$1,600,000,000 and President Johnson has asked for \$2,600,000,000 for fiscal 1968.

Supporters of the bill indicate they expect to see the House put the figure at around \$1,600,000,000.

The Senate has passed a bill authorizing \$2,200,000,000 and a final compromise figure in the neighborhood of \$1,800,000,000 is considered likely.

The House is proceeding slowly on the bill because of other legislative business and the absence tomorrow of a number of members who will attend the funeral in Texas of John Nance Garner, former Vice President and Speaker of the House. Final action is not expected until next week.

#### POLITICALLY UNWISE

Democrats favoring the bill said the lack of support for Ayres' proposal indicated the Republicans feel it would be politically unwise for them to back a drastic cut.

"They're finding out this program is not as unpopular back home as they thought," Representative Carey (D., N.Y.) said. "They're hearing from their mayors and other officials who want it continued."

#### POOR, SUPPORTERS RALLY FOR FUNDS: TYDINGS, MCKELDIN JOIN ANTIPOVERTY OFFICIALS IN DECRYING LOSS OF FEDERAL MONEY

(By Stephen J. Lynton)

With scores of placards bobbing up and down, with drums and bugles resounding and cheers rising in the cold night air, a throng of Maryland's impoverished and their advocates gathered in Hopkins place last night to shout its demands that Congress rejuvenate the nation's financially ailing war on poverty.

The rally, which had been organized by city anti-poverty officials, looked like an outdoor version of an election-eve convention. But political candidates in today's election were not permitted to speak.

#### "LET LIVELY SPEAK"

As the hour-and-fifteen-minute gathering before the new Federal building drew near an end at 8.15 P.M., cries of "Let Lively speak. Let Lively speak" broke from the crowd. But Walter H. Lively, the Republican City Council candidate from the Second district, did not speak.

Crowd estimates varied widely. Anti-poverty officials claimed 3,000 to 4,500. A police estimate was 1,500 to 1,800. Some newsmen guessed even fewer.

Senator Tydings (D., Md.) drew a roar from the crowd just by naming President John F. Kennedy. "I can't believe that Congress is going to turn its back on a program which



our beloved President [Kennedy] began," he said.

Mayor McKeldin termed "horrificing" the prospect that Congress might end the national anti-poverty program.

Parren J. Mitchell, the city anti-poverty director, put the crowd—including delegations from Montgomery, Calvert, Harford and other counties—on notice that they might be called upon to demonstrate anew next weekend, apparently in Washington.

Representatives Friedel (D., 7th) and Long (D. 2d) also produced roars in the crowd by voicing support for anti-poverty programs.

The crowd displayed signs saying "Indian Givers," "No More Broken Promises" and "To C.A.A. (Community Action Agency) With Love." One placard bore a skull and crossbones and the words, "Don't Mess with Poor People."

City anti-poverty officials had organized the demonstration against what they considered to be a grim background of increasing fiscal emergencies. Money difficulties have already disrupted anti-poverty programs in Baltimore city and at least six Maryland counties.

#### PROGRAMS HURT

One Eastern Shore community action program was halted last week. A Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Baltimore ran out of money last Friday and has received emergency city funds to last out the current week. Members of the Volunteers in Service to America program face a payless payday. And programs in Montgomery, Prince Georges and Harford counties confront the possibility of imminent doom.

The difficulties are among the results of Congress's failure so far to approve new funds for the national war on poverty or to enact a continuing resolution which would permit Federal agencies to keep spending money. Federal agencies have been told not to pay for new non-defense programs unless they had already been authorized by midnight October 23.

Peter B. Davis, deputy regional director of VISTA, says that 108 VISTA workers in Maryland—94 of them assigned to health, housing, education, recreation, poverty and social work projects in Baltimore—will not receive their two-week's salaries, an average of \$95 for rent, food and personal expenses, when payday comes November 14, unless Congress takes action.

#### VOLUNTEERS UNPAID

Michael A. Toth, director of the VISTA training center in Baltimore, says that 48 new volunteers have not received their normal \$1-a-day expense allowances since they began their studies October 26.

Richard W. Bateman, an associate city anti-poverty director, said that a city Neighborhood Youth Corps program, which employs 40 staff members and provides job training for 500 high school drop-outs, discovered that its newly approved six-month grant of about \$800,000 "suddenly terminated" last week.

William F. Moran, deputy director of the metropolitan Washington area's Neighborhood Youth Corps, says that a job program for 60 high school students in Montgomery county, and two programs for 110 students and dropouts in Prince Georges county will end Saturday, unless Congress authorizes new spending.

#### SPECIAL TRANSFER

S. Edward Smith, director of the Maryland Office of Economic Opportunity, says that a community action program assisting 1,200 poor families in Kent, Queen Annes and Talbot counties halted most of its normal operations last Wednesday, Thursday and Friday when a five-month grant expired.

Mr. Smith adds, however, that a special transfer of \$3,700 to \$4,000 in regional anti-

poverty funds had been tentatively approved. That amount would be enough for a month's operations, he said.

The Eastern Shore program had returned to regular activities yesterday. But Mr. Smith notes that its nine paid employees "will miss a payday and maybe two."

A Harford county community action program, intended to assist 12,368 poor people, will also run aground between now and November 25, Mr. Smith says, unless Congress appropriates new money.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1967]

#### NO SPIN-OFF

The Republican substitute for the anti-poverty authorization bill now pending in the House of Representatives would transfer several of the more successful and less controversial programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to various regular departments. This reorganization would leave O.E.O. with nothing but the much-disputed community action program.

Under the G.O.P. plan, sponsored by Representatives Goodell of New York and Quile of Minnesota, Head Start and its follow-up program, Upward Bound, would be shifted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, which consists of two programs, in-school and out-of-school, would be split. The in-school program would be assigned to HEW and the out-of-school program to the Department of Labor. Finally, the Republicans would phase out the residential Job Corps centers and rely on the state-administered vocational education programs.

No administrative arrangement is sacrosanct. What counts is how a program functions and whether it is run in the simplest, most responsive fashion. On paper, it may sound logical to consolidate educational programs in HEW and manpower programs in the Department of Labor. But experience does not bear out so plausible a theory.

The state-run vocational education programs have not done the job of reaching Negro youths in the slums and preparing them for jobs; if the states had been succeeding, the Job Corps would never have been necessary in the first place. Local school systems are cooperating in many instances in running Head Start and the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, but in other instances they have proved to be rigid and unresponsive bureaucracies. Settlement houses and community centers are often more willing to innovate and to make flexible arrangements, and there is no reason to freeze them out of Head Start and Upward Bound.

Flexibility and experimentation are at the heart of the antipoverty effort. More experience is needed before a decision is made to spin off these new ventures to the old-line agencies. Two dissenting Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee—Representatives Reid of New York and Bell of California—gave their party sound advice when they declared in their separate minority report: "This is not a time to cut back or restructure the antipoverty program."

#### A LONELY MAN

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter from Mrs. Charles T. Jandik, Sr., of 5806 Park Avenue, West New York, N.J., in which she was kind enough to enclose a poem written by her

son, Sp4c. Charles Jandik, Jr., who is serving in Vietnam.

I think that Specialist Jandik has very eloquently put into words the feeling of the average GI fighting in Vietnam. I include his very fine poem following my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of this Nation have a great obligation to our fighting sons in Vietnam who have proven themselves the equal of any other men who have worn the uniform of the armed services in any earlier war. I hope that all Members of this House and all Americans who read this RECORD will heed the words of this gifted young New Jerseyan.

Specialist Jandik's poem follows:

#### A LONELY MAN

A GI is lonely man.

Fighting for freedom in a far away land.

Not knowing what the next day brings.

If he will live or die, or anything.

He sleeps at night with his trusty gun,

And wonders what will come when the night is done.

If Charlie will try to attack and kill,

Or if he'll have to fight on one more hill.

He eats food prepared in a can,

And imagines it is vittles straight from the pan.

He daydreams of home and the ones so dear,  
And wishes he could be there with them so near.

When the mail call comes, he waits for some,  
Only to find out that he has none.

Feeling lonely and blue, he continues to fight,

Fighting for things we know are so right.

Fighting like a man who seems obsessed,

But fighting for the things he knows are best.

We all know what these things are,

And will keep them ahead of everything far.

We are here to keep America free,

So worship and thank God for your liberty.

And don't forget to put a word in for the GI,

For he is the one who is fighting and might die.

#### NAVIGATION AND THE NATION

(Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 10, it was my privilege to join with other Members, Senators, and interested citizens who share our concern for the future of the Nation's waterways, at a joint luncheon sponsored by the National Waterways Conference and the Propeller Club of the Port of Chicago. The featured speaker for the luncheon was Senator FRED R. HARRIS, of Oklahoma, and I am confident that every Member of this great body will be interested in what he had to say:

#### NAVIGATION AND THE NATION

I am honored to be with you at this closing session of your annual meeting, the theme of which is "The Meaning of Water to Modern America." Our country is deeply indebted to this group and to each of you participating in this conference for the magnificent progress this nation has made toward the maximum conservation, development and use of its great water resources. A sense of dedication, past and present, pervades this meeting.

In Washington, too, I am reminded almost daily of the debt we all owe to past and present water resources development leaders. A stroll through the Senate reception room,



which is off the Senate floor, serves to dramatically illustrate how central to this nation's domestic policy water resource development has always been.

When the reception room was constructed about the time of the Civil War, the architect provided for five blank spaces on the walls of the room which he said were "... reserved for the portraits of distinguished Americans." Later, in 1874, a member of the Senate suggested that those spaces be used for the portraits of the five most outstanding men who had served in the Senate. With the characteristic deliberateness of the Senate, this idea was eventually adopted, upon the motion of the then Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, in 1954.

When Senator Johnson was incapacitated by a heart attack, on his suggestion, the then Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, was named as the chairman of the Senate committee to choose the five greatest senators of all time. After the polling of all living past Presidents, of all Senators and most of the distinguished historians and political scientists of the country—and a great deal of rather heated debate and discussion—the committee selected as history's five greatest senators: Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Robert M. LaFollette, and Robert A. Taft.

It should not be surprising to this group that all five of these "most honored" Senators were strong supporters, in their day, of a progressive federal waterways policy; the vast majority of congressional leaders throughout our history have been. The publication earlier this year by our sponsoring organization of the excellent book by William J. and Robert W. Hull on the origin and development of the waterways policy of the United States highlighted this strong congressional support throughout the years.

So each time I enter the Senate chamber through the reception room, and each time I talk with visitors there, I am reminded of the strong fight each of these senators made for waterways legislation in his time and how important this fight has been to the strength of our nation.

The Great Triumvirate—Webster, Clay and Calhoun—assumed positions of congressional leadership as common champions of a strong federal program for internal improvements, featuring canals and improved waterways. They had come to Congress as young war hawks in the period just before the War of 1812, but they became leaders in the period soon after the war, when the debate on internal improvements called them again to join battle for a common cause.

Daniel Webster was a senatorial leader who, throughout his lengthy congressional career, used every opportunity to voice his strong belief that improvement of the nation's waterways should come from the Federal Government or, as he said, "in the nature of things they could not come at all."

John C. Calhoun, especially in the decade following the War of 1812, before sectional issues claimed the major portion of his attention, was an equally strong proponent. In the debate on internal improvements in 1817 he said, "Let us then bind the Republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals."

But Mr. Internal Improvements himself was Henry Clay. It was primarily through his efforts that the phrase, "The American System," became so popular that it found its way—along with adjacent pictures of the Erie Canal and navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers—into most of America's history books covering the period before the Civil War. Sometimes I feel that, if the present proponents of continued national waterways development could just come up with as good a name for our program as did Henry Clay for his, our task would be immeasurably easier.

Clay said many things well worth remembering today about improved waterways. Perhaps as typical and forceful as any was the argument he used in the Senate debate in 1824, when he said, "There are some improvements emphatically national, which neither the policy, the power nor the interest of any State would induce it to accomplish, and which could only be effected by the application of the resources of the nation. The improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi would furnish a striking example."

The other "honor senators"—La Follette and Taft—were from later periods, but they were also supporters of the kind of water policy which we are, still today, trying to get implemented.

Senator Taft's long standing interest in water pollution control, for example, is well memorialized today by a major research facility, working in this field, which bears his name, the Taft Research Center in Cincinnati. And, as is well known to all, the innovative Senator from Wisconsin, Senator La Follette, fought vigorously for the full development for the public of our great public water resources.

Recalling the words and deeds of these earlier leaders in the cause of a forward-looking national water policy helps us recapture the sense of dedication which we continue to need today.

To this list each of us could add the names of additional heroes, including my distinguished predecessor in the Senate from Oklahoma, the late Robert S. Kerr. From them all—from their lives and their records—there are lessons to be learned, important lessons of this nation's past and for its future.

On November 20, in the Department of Commerce Building in Washington, a ceremony near an instrument known as "the census clock" will commemorate the fact that America has become a nation of 200 million people, a fantastic growth in our population.

And, the "clock" will not stop on that day; it will continue to run, marking the fact that each day there are 6,400 additional Americans. Even with present declining birth, all the experts agree that in just 33 short years—by the year 2000—our population in America will be in excess of 300 million.

This explosion of population means that the economy of America, our gross national product, must also continue to expand accordingly if these greatly increased numbers of additional Americans are to find private jobs. Our economy cannot expand rapidly enough except by maximum conservation development and use of our greatest natural resources—water.

Our economy cannot grow rapidly enough except by continued growth in our national transportation network, and it is obvious that automobile, air, and rail transportation cannot grow fast enough to carry the increased load.

It almost seems that each of us in America drives two cars simultaneously when you consider the fact that last year we killed 52,000 people on our highways, or the fact that the Interstate Highway Program, the most visionary public works undertaking since the days of Rome, only authorized approximately one-half the four-lane highway mileage traffic experts say is needed.

These facts are true—and, most significantly, they are true in a nation which today has 100 million automobiles, a figure which is going to increase to 200 million within the next 33 years. Expanded navigation, as well as stronger multipurpose national water policies, encompassing solutions for the problems of municipal and industrial water supply, pollution, flood control, recreation, and power, looms even larger as domestic policy requirements.

As a member of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, I am particularly concerned with the enormous and growing problems of American cities, which must be attacked head-on and immediately. But for the long pull, we cannot solve these problems unless we take steps to slow down or reverse the rural to urban shift of our population, which has magnified these problems tremendously in recent years. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, 11 million Americans moved from rural areas and small towns to larger cities. And, they are still coming at a rate of 500,000 to 600,000 each year.

I was a staunch supporter of regional economic development and multipurpose water resources development programs long before becoming a member of the President's Commission, but, now, I am an even more dedicated disciple. Through such programs as the Arkansas River Navigation Program to be completed in Oklahoma and Arkansas in 1970, these underdeveloped regions of America can become in-migration areas, help to give people a chance and a choice of living where they want to, where there is opportunity for good jobs in a developing economy.

Navigable waterways are a major contributor to regional economic development in the United States because they extend the advantages of ocean ports some 9000 miles through interior America. The promise and potential of navigable waterways offer hope and meaningful alternatives to residents of rural and smaller urban areas in river valleys across the nation. Without the resources and opportunities created by navigable waterways, the population migrations and manpower drains from the country to the city in recent decades undoubtedly would have been far larger, resulting in even more insurmountable problems than the nation's largest metropolitan areas face today. In region after region the extension and improvement of navigable waterways have led to the creation of thousands of new private jobs—good jobs—and each new project which is completed adds to the possibilities for population diffusion.

The development of navigable waterways has created highly attractive new industrial sites where such waterways converge with vital rail and highway routes—flood-free, with a plentiful water supply. Each year there are announcements of hundreds of new plants to be located on waterfront sites along the nation's navigable waterways.

The availability of transportation via these waterways has made it possible for certain types of industries to locate at great distances from their principal sources of supply or markets. Low-cost barge transportation has made it economically feasible, for example, for the chemicals and primary metals industries, the foundation building blocks of the nation's economy, to be dispersed along the waterways rather than concentrated in the largest metropolitan areas.

The impact of a navigable waterway on the economic development of a region is illustrated by the Tennessee River experience, which was reported by TVA to the President about a year ago in a booklet entitled, *Navigation and Economic Growth*. When the development of this navigable waterway was begun in 1933, the Tennessee River stretched 650 miles through three states; it was a great flexed arm without the muscle for development. The river was undisciplined, uncontrolled, and alternated between ravaging floods and low water. Nine main river dams and dams on tributaries brought the river under control—its muscle has been harnessed for development. When construction of the navigation channel was started, the Tennessee Valley and river waterfront were undeveloped industrially. The Valley was characterized by agriculture and extractive activities providing raw material for processing in



(1) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"2319. Introduction, sale, distribution, or advertisement for sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys

"(a) Whoever knowingly introduces, or manufactures for introduction, into interstate commerce or transports or distributes in interstate commerce any motor vehicle master key shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever knowingly disseminates or knowingly causes to be disseminated by means of the United States mails, or in interstate commerce by any means, any advertisement of sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) the introduction, manufacture for introduction, transportation, distribution, sale, or possession in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys for use in the ordinary course of business by any bona fide locksmith, common carrier, contract carrier, new or used car dealer, rental car agency, automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of (A) the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or (B) any political subdivision of any such entity; or

"(2) the shipment, transportation, or delivery for shipment in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys in the ordinary course of business by any common carrier or contract carrier.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'motor vehicle master key' means a key which will operate all of the ignition locks of two or more motor vehicles each of which can be operated by a key which will not operate the ignition locks of other such vehicles."

(2) by adding at the end of the chapter analysis of such chapter the following:

"2319. Introduction, sale, distribution, or advertisement for sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys."

(b) Section 1716 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after the seventh paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"All keys adapted to fit the ignition of two or more motor vehicles the ignition switches of which are designed to be operated with different keys are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried by the mails or delivered by any postmaster, letter carrier, or other person in the postal service. Such keys may be conveyed in the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe—

"(1) to any bona fide locksmith, new or used car dealer, officer or employee of a common carrier or contract carrier, or officer or employee of any rental car agency for use in their business;

"(2) to any officer or employee of any automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof for use in connection with the activities of such club or association; and

"(3) to supply or procurement personnel of (A) any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or (B) any political subdivision of any such entity, for use in connection with the activities of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

The Postmaster General may require, as a condition of conveying any such key in the mails, that any person proposing to mail such key explain in writing to the satisfaction of

the Postmaster General that the mailing of such key will not be in violation of this section."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

[News release from Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Nov. 14, 1967]

#### OTTINGER HITS CAR THEFT PROBLEM; BILL LIMITS MASTER KEY SALES

WASHINGTON.—Predicting that a car will be stolen in the United States every 30 seconds by 1970 if the current trend continues, Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, D-N.Y., introduced legislation today to eliminate one factor in the recent car theft wave—the indiscriminate advertising and sale of automobile master keys.

At the same time Mr. Ottinger made public a letter from Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., disclosing that the Justice Department is considering sending a similar bill to Capitol Hill. The November 8 letter to Congressman Ottinger stated: "The Justice Department is currently considering the submission of legislation to Congress which would outlaw the movement in interstate commerce or through the mails of so-called motor vehicle master keys. We are in complete agreement with you in objecting to the indiscriminate sale of such keys, which are definitely a factor in the severe auto theft problem now confronting the country."

In introducing his bill, Congressman Ottinger pointed out that in 1966, a car was stolen in the U. S. every 57 seconds, but that the rate has risen 20 per cent in the last two years. "If that continues," he asserted, "more than a million cars will be stolen in 1970—one every half minute."

Mail-order sale or advertising of automobile master keys would be punished by prison terms of up to five years and fines up to \$10,000 under the Ottinger bill. Locksmiths, car dealers, rental agencies and automobile clubs are exempt from the bill's provisions.

Congressman Ottinger, in a House speech today, pointed out that although nearly nine out of every ten stolen cars are eventually recovered, auto theft costs the public and the insurance industry about half a billion dollars yearly. Mail order firms in such states as Florida, Pennsylvania, Maryland and California freely advertise motor vehicle master keys and are totally indiscriminate in filling orders, he said. Only four states—Texas, Oregon, Massachusetts and Michigan—have laws limiting such sales but they are powerless to stop mail-order operations.

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(Mr. VIGORITO (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, as we debate and vote upon the Office of Economic Opportunity bill today, I would like to say a few words relating to statistics recently made public on the amount of domestic Federal aid to State and local governments.

An article in the November 9 issue of the Washington Post said that the Federal Government spent a record \$17.8

billion on grants-in-aid and related payments to State and local governments and individuals in fiscal 1966.

It was encouraging to see that due primarily to the passage of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act by the 89th Congress, we are now helping our Nation's children by contributing \$2.248 billion in aid to education programs. It is also significant that we are working toward a better life for all citizens by assisting public health programs to the tune of \$1.1 billion.

What disturbs me is that we shelled out to States and local agencies \$3.5 billion in fiscal 1966 to various public assistance programs while giving them only \$892.3 million for the war on poverty.

One of the finest features of the war on poverty is its various self-help programs. By educating and training our underprivileged children and men and women, we are giving them skills to make them productive members of our society. I feel that if we were to fund the OEO program as the administration requests, we would in the years to come be able to take a large number of persons off our public assistance rolls.

Let is not fool ourselves. There are many people now receiving public welfare payments who could be out working. If these persons were trained in certain job skills by OEO and other programs, they could help themselves by earning a living for their families and take themselves off a public welfare dole.

Let us, therefore, recognize the extreme good the war on poverty has done and give it sufficient funds to carry on its many worthwhile programs.

(Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HELSTOSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HELSTOSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### WE NEED A TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL THIS YEAR

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the rush for adjournment the dismal prospect of postponing needed and meaningful truth-in-lending legislation looms large. This ugly prospect is galling and regrettable; particularly so since we are now so close to putting a decently strong statute on the law books.

In these closing days of the first session every effort must be bent toward getting the truth-in-lending bill through the multiple hurdles still before it. I be-



lieve many of the obstacles now combining to make passage of the bill this year almost impossible, could be short circuited if the House Banking and Currency Committee quickly reports a measure framed around the compromises unanimously adopted in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it took 7 years for the U.S. Senate to pass a truth-in-lending bill. While the Senate bill leaves much to be desired, it still represents a meaningful beginning in providing the consumer with accurate comparative credit information.

Our responsibility in the House must be, in these waning days, to do all we can to insure that the work started in the Senate is completed this year. I believe we can do this if we are willing to turn our attention to strengthening the Senate-passed measure in the areas which will be most meaningful to the consumer, while at the same time facilitating the road the legislation must take through conference.

In September I introduced legislation which substantially improved the Senate bill. My measure adds a truth-in-credit advertising provision to the language of the Senate legislation, as well as tightening up the \$10 credit exemption. The strengthened sections my bill adds to the Senate version, especially the truth-in-advertising provisions, provides the consumer with the kind of useful information now not available. However, these additional provisions will not jeopardize the passage of truth-in-lending legislation this year.

There are some now giving the impression that the Senate bill, even with the improvements provided in my bill will provide the consumer with little, if any protection. This is obviously untrue. My bill—and even the Senate bill—provide for detailed disclosure of credit charges. While I believe my measure substantially improves upon the Senate version, both bills offer the consumer significant protections. In these last days of the first session the best service Congress can perform for the consumer is to put a statute on the books. We can do this, and do it meaningfully if we pay attention to the work done in the Senate, and strengthen that body's measure in a way which will be of the most use to the consumer as soon as possible.

Over the next few days I will put in the RECORD a number of representative editorials from major newspapers around the Nation which help put the truth-in-lending issue into perspective. All the editorials point to the need for legislation now, and suggest the House use the Senate-unanimously-passed measure as a basis for expeditious consideration. I commend these editorials to the Members, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 17, 1967]

#### MORE HELP FOR CONSUMERS

In spite of its catchy nickname, the "truth-in-lending" bill was stalled for seven years in the Senate. It has now passed by a remarkable 92-to-0 vote, partly because Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), who took over the bill's management after the defeat of its original sponsor, Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), was willing to make compromises Douglas was not.

The concessions by Proxmire do not, in our opinion, weaken the bill unduly. They lie in an area where understanding was foggy and enforcement uncertain in any case. Bypassing this area achieves the main purpose of the bill, which is to give the consumer better protection against the gougers on fringe of the legitimate credit business.

There has never been serious objection to this basic purpose, either in the Senate or in the responsible business community. It is merely good business to make sure that the buyer knows in advance how much interest he will pay on a loan and how much the carrying charge will add to the total bill when he buys on long-term credit.

The obstacles arose in trying to formulate a law to require that "true" interest rates be shown. This requirement, seemingly so simple, proved to be anything but that. So many different ways of figuring interest were paraded before the senators at hearings on the bill that at times it seemed arithmetic had abdicated as an exact science.

This year the Treasury Department came up with a book of standardized tables to cover most credit transactions. With the help of these tables, the interest problem may be overcome, though it is bound to be confusing for a time to clerks and customers alike if the House concurs and the bill becomes law. To cite one of the simplest examples, a standard 6 per cent bank loan paid off in 12 installments on a declining balance will have to be restated as 11 per cent "true" interest.

The Senate gave up on revolving credit accounts offered by many department stores and bank credit card plans, and exempted them from the "true interest" requirement. Also exempted were first mortgages, margin accounts with stockbrokers, and other commercial credit transactions.

In its final form, however, the bill approved by the Senate should mark a long step toward acquainting the consumer with the true cost of the product he is buying—a cost often overlooked in the attraction of an easy-monthly-payment contract.

Coupled with the credit-reform package passed this year by the Illinois Legislature, the federal measure promises better protection for the consumer than he has yet known. We hope the House joins with the Senate in putting the law on the books.

[From Newsday, July 19, 1967]

#### TRUTH IN LENDING

The "Truth in Lending" bill was first introduced in Congress seven years ago by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D-Ill.), who has since retired. At long last, under the sponsorship of Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and with the firm backing of the President, it has passed the Senate 92-0 and has been sent to the House. High time, and let's see affirmative action quickly.

Under the bill, merchants and loan agencies extending credit will, in all but a few cases, be required to disclose the total cash price of the article or service purchased, all service and financing charges, and the total amount to be paid, expressed in dollars and cents and as a simple annual interest rate percentage. Too many consumers have been gulled by inflated charges; too few have been able to figure out what they actually pay.

The bill therefore should be passed by the House and sent to the President at the earliest possible date. It is a valuable protection for the millions of Americans who rely so heavily on credit to finance their purchases or to pay their bills.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 13, 1967]

#### TRUTH IN LENDING: WELCOME VICTORY

The seven-year campaign by ex-Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., and Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., for truth-in-lending legislation has succeeded in the Senate. It is a welcome sign for consumers.

The prospect in Washington is for favorable House action late this year and a quick signature by President Johnson, who has sought this kind of legislation since 1964.

If that happens, installment lenders will be required by federal law to furnish borrowers with full, accurate statements of interest and finance charges. Only two states (not including Colorado) now require this type of disclosure.

What will it mean to the consumer? When he signs a note to buy a car or a television set he will be told how much he is being charged for credit. It will mean he has a better chance to decide intelligently where and how to borrow money.

Without a truth-in-lending law, about all the borrower knows is how much he is paying every month and how many months he must continue to pay. With a truth-in-lending law, he also will know the annual interest rate he is paying and the total amount of finance charges, stated in dollars and cents.

What will it mean to the lender? He will certainly have to be more frank with his customers and probably more competitive with his rivals. We do not believe for a moment, though, that the bill will "disrupt or destroy the system of extending credit," as one frantic lobbyist told Congress.

Senator Proxmire deserves credit for pressing on with a crusade that seemed to have little hope early this year. Some observers said then the main battle would be fought in a Senate banking subcommittee, where bills sponsored by Senator Douglas had been buried so many times before. Proxmire got his bill through that subcommittee and then the full Banking Committee last month.

The unanimous Senate vote Wednesday was still surprising. It could not have been foreseen a few weeks ago.

One major amendment seems to have eased the way considerably. The amendment, accepted by Proxmire, gives a partial exemption to ordinary, short-term, revolving credit accounts.

Department stores and other lenders extending this short-term unsecured credit will not, under the bill, have to quote to customers an annual rate of interest—which they say they can't do anyway. But they will have to tell customers their monthly interest rate (usually 1.5 percent) and their monthly finance charges in dollars and cents.

We do not think the Proxmire bill was seriously hurt by this compromise. We do not think the major abuse of credit occurs in this type of account. And, anyway, the customer will still have a pretty clear idea of his credit costs.

We do not expect the Proxmire bill to cure all the ills of the credit industry. It will not make all borrowers prudent. Many will go right ahead borrowing up to the hilt, without thinking about interest rates, so long as they think they can meet all the monthly payments.

But the bill will give thinking consumers an opportunity to bargain effectively for credit in the same way they now bargain for merchandise. We think that's fair, and in the long run, it's good for business, too.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, July 27, 1967]

#### FEDERAL TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

The Connecticut legislature earlier this year adopted a truth-in-lending bill designed to make consumers aware of what they are paying in finance charges.

Congress is now taking similar action, although the bill is somewhat weaker than the Connecticut law.

The Senate has sent to the House a bill which, among other things, provides:

1—That the annual percentage rate be made known to a customer before credit is extended.



standing has never been greater than it is today for the future of Asia and indeed for the entire world. Therefore, Mr. President, I look forward to frank discussions with you on problems between our two countries with the view to seeking an adjustment and expansion of our basic national interests.

It will not be our two countries alone, but all of Asia I am sure, who will benefit from close relations of mutual trust between Japan and the United States.

Thank you.

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### TRAINING CONFERENCES TO PREVENT AND CONTROL CIVIL DISTURBANCES

(Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has recently set into motion a far-reaching effort to reduce the chances of violence and riots recurring in our cities.

The President directed the Department of Justice to conduct a series of training conferences for city officials this winter on the prevention and control of civil disorders. Dates and locations for these conferences will be worked out at a planning session in Washington on November 17.

This endeavor has enormous potential among the presidential programs to meet this serious national problem. It affords an opportunity for the exchange of information among officials who have experienced civil strife firsthand and other experts in the field of social and community relations.

How better to reach workable solutions than to meld such knowledge, develop and refine methods of prevention and control, and finally to search for new methods?

I commend the President for taking effective action during the short, cold winter to avoid another long hot summer. I recommend to my colleagues a reading of the Attorney General's announcement of this program and include it in the RECORD at this point:

RELEASE BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
NOVEMBER 1, 1967

Attorney General Ramsey Clark announced today that the Department of Justice will hold training conferences for city officials on the prevention and control of civil disturbances.

Mr. Clark said the conferences will be held this winter at the direction of President Johnson.

Mayors, police chiefs and other municipal officials from throughout the nation will be invited to attend, the Attorney General said.

"The purpose of the conferences will be to combine knowledge on effective methods of preventing and controlling disturbances, to develop and refine these methods, and to search for new methods," said Mr. Clark.

"The melding of knowledge gained by various officials in various situations in various

cities will provide a base for the better maintenance of law and order in our great urban areas.

"It is hoped that this endeavor will decrease any chance of a recurrence of the violence and riots which seared the face of many of our cities last summer."

Among the topics to be covered, Mr. Clark said, will be techniques for controlling disorders, joint operations involving different police jurisdictions and the military, and police-community relations.

Such a series of conferences was recommended to the President by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The President directed the Attorney General to arrange the series.

"These conferences," the President said, "should make maximum use of the skills and experience gained by several agencies of the government, and of local officials who have been successful in preventing or controlling civil disorders."

"As you are well aware, this is a matter of great urgency," the President told the Attorney General. "Effective conferences and consultations with key officials at all levels of government during the winter months require careful planning now."

Mr. Clark said he has scheduled a meeting in Washington, D.C. on November 17 to work out the dates, locations, curriculum and other details of the conferences. Thirteen outstanding police and city leaders from throughout the nation have been invited to attend the planning session. They are:

Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of Minneapolis.  
Beverly Briley, Mayor of Nashville, Tennessee.

John Gold, City Manager, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Superintendent James B. Conlisk, Chicago Police Department.

Chief Thomas Reddin, Los Angeles Police Department.

Chief John Layton, Washington, D.C. Police Department.

Chief Curtis Brostrom, St. Louis Police Department.

Chief Oliver Kelly, Newark Police Department.

Chief William Hanger, Pontiac, Michigan Police Department.

Chief Herbert Jenkins, Atlanta Police Department.

Colonel Frederick E. Davids, Michigan State Police.

Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Michael N. Canlis, Sheriff of San Joaquin County, Stockton, California.

The conferences will be co-sponsored by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), which will furnish a number of the instructors. The cost of the conferences will be borne by the Department of Justice.

The Department, through its Law Enforcement Assistance program, is already funding several projects to improve law enforcement in urban areas. It has financed two conferences held by the IACP: one in June, 1966 at Indianapolis on police-community relations and another last spring in Memphis on the prevention and control of disturbances.

#### THE FARM BUREAU

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, while reading Kansas Attorney General Londerholm's report on the Kansas Farm Bureau, the Kansas Farm Bureau Insurance Companies and the Kansas Department of Insurance, I was reminded of the

not too inappropriate proverb that "we often give our enemies the means of our own destruction." What was billed as a conclusion that my charge of improprieties between these organizations was unfounded is actually a carefully documented vindication of that charge. And, what is even more ironic, it supplies new and unsolicited support for my conviction that a full-scale investigation is urgently needed.

First, I am of the old fashioned belief that a State regulatory agency—supported by taxpayer dollars—must maintain a scrupulous neutrality in dealing with all of those organizations it is supposed to regulate. Thus, my surprise and concern when I learned that football and basketball tickets paid for by the Farm Bureau Mutual and Kansas Farm Life Insurance Cos. were being used by the commissioner and staff of the Kansas Department of Insurance.

In light of the opportunities for favoritism that this can lead to, I expected nothing less than a complete refutation by the attorney general. But, to my amazement, no such refutation has been made. Instead, the attorney general makes an absurd distinction between the purchase of season tickets for the insurance commissioner and the purchase of season tickets which are offered to the commissioner on a week-to-week basis, and then concludes that the Farm Bureau companies "have offered to make available guest tickets if the commissioner or a member of the staff wished to come up to a game." He then reports that on a few occasions the insurance commissioner, and on many occasions other staff members, have represented the department at the games.

Second, in light of the new evidence he has supplied, I cannot understand how the attorney general could conclude that there is nothing improper about the relationship of the Kansas Farm Bureau and its insurance companies. For the last 5 months, I have been charging that the Farm Bureau represents the interests of the insurance industry and not the interests of the American farmer. If it weren't for his responsibilities to the people of Kansas, I would ask the attorney general to join me in documenting this charge.

For example, I was under the naive impression that Farm Bureau directors were paid for their services out of membership dues or out of other assets of the Farm Bureau. This standard method of compensation would be some assurance of that undivided loyalty which members of an organization have a right to expect of their managers. In the Kansas Farm Bureau however, the Attorney General reports that:

Board members are compensated on a per diem basis and are also reimbursed for their travel expenses. These amounts are paid by the Farm Bureau which is then reimbursed by the insurance companies in proportion to the services rendered to them by the board members. (Emphasis added.)

In other words, the salaries and expenses of the board of directors are being paid by the insurance companies and not by the farmers. Since it is the person who signs the paycheck who calls the shots, there could be no clearer evidence



that the Farm Bureau people are working for the insurance companies and not for the farmers.

The Attorney General supplies considerably more evidence of this blatant overlap of the insurance companies and the Farm Bureau. For example, if the Farm Bureau were concerned with the needs of its members, its legislative department would conduct research, provide information and perform lobbying services for the Kansas farmer—and only the Kansas farmer. Instead, I was dumbfounded to learn that in Kansas, "the Farm Bureau insurance companies do not employ separate research and lobbying services but instead contract with the legislative department of the Farm Bureau to perform these functions for them." The Farm Bureau, in short, is receiving substantial payments from its insurance companies—totalling about 40 percent of the department's budget—to lobby for insurance bills. That it, it spends at least two-fifths of its time buttonholing legislators, testifying before committees, and writing and introducing bills for projects totally unrelated to farming.

I am sure that many Kansas farmers will be surprised to learn that the Farm Bureau rents out its lobbying services to insurance companies that are making its living off the farmer. I would like to know how many other State Farm Bureaus are doing the same thing.

In this so-called exoneration of the Kansas Farm Bureau, the attorney general also reports that it carries on an extensive safety education program throughout the State. I was at a loss to explain what relationship driver education bears to the needs of farmers until I learned who finances this program. The attorney general reports that 97.4 percent of the total safety department budget is contributed by the insurance companies "on the theory that safety education reduces accidents and this keeps down insurance claims and costs." There is, of course, nothing objectionable about the insurance companies conducting such a campaign, but why is it necessary to disguise it as a Farm Bureau project? The boundaries between State Farm Bureaus and their insurance companies are much fuzzier than they should be. Why do they claim to be different organizations for some purposes and one organization for others?

This amazing report to exonerate the Farm Bureau and refute my charges accomplishes neither of these tasks. The highest legal official in the State of Kansas has shown that Farm Bureau insurance companies set aside football and basketball tickets for the Kansas insurance commissioner and that there is an overlap between the Farm Bureau and its insurance companies. I can only conclude that the report of the attorney general confirms my conviction that a full-scale investigation of these activities is urgently needed.

#### POVERTY PROGRAM A MUST

(Mr. ADAMS (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, while rejecting the nihilism of black power extremists, we should listen carefully and with respect to the voices of responsible Negro spokesmen. This is especially the case where the war on poverty is concerned, for responsible Negro leadership places the greatest importance upon the successful prosecution of this program.

A very trenchant editorial, entitled "Poverty Program Must," appeared recently in the Washington Afro-American, and because I think it worthy of my colleagues' attention, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### POVERTY PROGRAM MUST

The real tragedy in the House of Representatives' callous attitude toward the Poverty Bill is not the quibbling over dollar figures or even over amendments to the basic legislation. Rather, the tragedy is to be found in the shocking revelation of the contempt in which an alarming number of Congressmen hold the poor.

Forgotten in the attempts of the Republican reactionaries and the Dixiecrats to either kill the poverty program or so emasculate it as to make it meaningless, are the poor. If these sources had their way, the poor would forever remain exactly as they are, poor. They would continue to be locked up inside the ghetto of the cities and the slums of rural America without any hope of escape.

It is as if the poor have ceased to exist, as if there is no need to continue a program that for the first time in the history of the country, held out the prospect that the poor could be assisted out of the poverty rut through outside help.

The poverty program has never had enough money to give it adequate support, but at least, at the very least, some things of a positive nature were being accomplished.

In Washington, the United Planning Organization, set up neighborhood centers, which provided the poor with a number of services including legal aid, consumer education, employment and training assistance.

Head Start classes were begun, youngsters found employment through the Neighborhood Youth Corps., and at long last, there was a faint ray of light at the end of the long tunnel of poverty.

Now at that is threatened by a narrow-minded Congress that in part is frightened by the idea of poor people becoming articulate members of society, by assaults of the poor on institutions that have never been responsive to their needs and by the desire to punish all poor people as a lesson to those who have rioted.

Add to this the feeling on the part of some Congressmen that colored people are the chief beneficiaries of the poverty program, and an atmosphere develops in which anything is possible.

An indication of what can develop came last week when the United Planning Organization announced that it was dropping its youth work programs—including part of PRIDE—Because no funds were available.

All across the country, thousands of youths who depended on poverty programs to remain in school, are being thrown out of work because of the inaction of Congress. At least 35 Community Action Agencies have already been forced to shut down and VISTA volunteers have to rely on the charity of others to survive.

This, however, is only a prelude of what is to come if Congress does not approve a poverty bill with at least the \$2.06 billion requested by President Johnson. Anything below this amount would severely cripple poverty programs, and would be a sell-out of the poor.

Despite the horrendous consequences of Congressional cuts, in the budget, there is

no assurance that Congress really cares enough not to make the cuts. Congress in fact, seems blind to reality.

It seems to have learned nothing at all from the events of the past summer, which revealed the need for jobs, education and housing in the slums, if these events are not to be repeated.

#### HAWAII'S ROLE OF PREPARING PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR SERVICE "WEST OF EDEN" LAUDED BY JACK VAUGHN

(Mr. MATSUNAGA was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct attention to a major policy address, as excellent in its literary quality as it is inspiring in its message, which was given in Hawaii last week by the Director of the Peace Corps, Jack Hood Vaughn.

In speaking of the significant and vital elements of the Peace Corps, Mr. Vaughn noted particularly the opportunities for further service in the Pacific basin. It is here, he said, that in the decade ahead the people of the Pacific basin countries will take the kind of giant steps the Pacific demands to confront the problems of economic, social, and political development.

The Peace Corps Director also paid great tribute to Hawaii in his speech. He mentioned that 4,000 young men and women had received their training in the islands for overseas service. More than 50 different groups of them have left the island State, destined for service in 11 different countries in East Asia and the Pacific. Said Mr. Vaughn:

Hawaii has seen more volunteers and given more of itself in their preparation, than any other State in the Union.

I take considerable pride in Hawaii's contribution to the work of the Peace Corps as it enters its seventh year of service as a vibrant and effective instrument of peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to enter Mr. Vaughn's memorable speech, "West of Eden," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can be read in its entirety by my colleagues in Congress:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### WEST OF EDEN

(Address by Jack Hood Vaughn, Director of the Peace Corps)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I see that I'm billed this evening for a major policy address. I think \$5 per person entitles you to some very significant policy indeed, encased in a comfortably brief address befitting the latest fashions: short on surface, long on message.

Actually a mini-skirt, well suited to the wearer, does convey the intention of a policy statement, for the observer becomes fascinated equally with what is and what ain't and it's the blend of both, after all, that makes policy.

I am honored to be with you this evening, on such an auspicious anniversary in political history: on this date, in 1805, Messrs. Lewis and Clark sighted the Pacific Ocean, proving for the first time the contiguity of the American land mass. Congress paid \$2,500 for that trip. Some Federal outlay for Pacific exploration, development and de-











# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 16, 1967  
For actions of November 15, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 186

### CONTENTS

Air pollution.....19	Housing.....31	Reclamation.....3,33
Appropriations.....2	Imports.....27	Recreation.....24
Award.....11	Information.....15,25	Research.....5,22
Census.....28	Loans.....3,7	Social security.....8
Commodity reserves.....9	Meat inspection.....16	Spending.....13,21
Credit unions.....30	Migratory birds.....10	Tariffs.....26
Economy.....13	Military construction....2	Taxation.....23,29
Extension.....5	Opinion poll.....17	Time.....32
Fisheries.....14	Pay bill.....6	Watersheds.....7
Foreign aid.....2,18,34	Peace Corps.....4	Wheat allotments.....7
Forest lands.....7	Pesticides.....12	Wilderness.....20
Freedom of information..15	Poverty.....1	Wildlife.....10
Grants to States.....5	Public Management.....22	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed poverty bill. Senate committee voted to report pay bill.

### HOUSE

1. POVERTY. Passed, 283-129, with amendments S. 2388, the poverty bill (pp. H15287-364, H15367-8, H15375-6, H15381-4, H15397). House conferees were appointed (p. H15364). Agreed to, 221-190, a motion by Rep. Ayres to recommit the bill and have it reported back with a reduction of the authorization from \$2,060,000,000 to \$1,600,000,000 (p. H15363).

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill (p. H15400). This bill is to be debated today, Nov. 16 (p. D1035).



Conferees were appointed on H. R. 13606, the military construction appropriation bill (p. H15283). Senate conferees have been appointed.

3. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 862, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act to (1) remove certain language which is objectionable to the President on the grounds that it violates the "separation of powers" doctrine, and (2) extend the benefits of the small reclamation projects loan program to projects which include irrigation as a project purpose but which are, or may be, used primarily for domestic, municipal, or industrial water supply. p. H15400
4. PEACE CORPS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 1031, to authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps. p. H15400
5. GRANTS TO STATES. Received from GAO a report on interest savings available if program funds of Federal Extension Service and Cooperative State Research Service were advanced to States only as needed. p. H15399

#### SENATE

6. PAY BILL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 7977, to increase postal rates and salaries of Federal employees. The Daily Digest states the bill as approved by the committee would include a 6-percent pay increase to postal employees, 4½-percent increase to classified employees, provide additional insurance benefits for all Government employees, and provide effective date of Oct. 1, 1967, on salary increase provisions. p. D1034
7. AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION. The Daily Digest states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) the following bills; Without amendment H. R. 10442, to authorize the exchange of national forest lands with public school authorities; and with amendment S. 1722, to authorize increased acreage allotments for old wheat farms; and S. 2565, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act with respect to interest rates on farm loans. Committee also approved four watershed projects. pp. D1032-3
8. SOCIAL SECURITY. Began debate on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. S16492-3, S16495-538
9. COMMODITY RESERVES. Sen. McGovern urged enactment of S. 2617, the commodity reserve bill, and Sens. Mansfield, Young, N. D., Burdick, Metcalf, Cooper, Harris, Long, Mo., and Morse were added as cosponsors. p. S16445
10. MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION. Passed the following bills; without amendment S. 2447, to make the Secretary of Transportation a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission in place of the Secretary of Commerce; and as reported S. 322, to provide that no land can be transferred from the national wildlife refuge system without approval of the Migratory Bird Commission, and H. R. 480, to extend for 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated for acquisition of wetlands for migratory bird conservation. pp. S16434-6



pointments on the part of technicians because House conferees were unable to retain civil service benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will give to the Reserve components of the armed services the stability which we have tried so hard to preserve against the desires and efforts of the Department of Defense.

Notwithstanding article I, section 8, of the Constitution which gives to the Congress the power "to provide for the common defense," to raise and support armies, to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and notwithstanding the fact that the Congress has made its views plain, since 1959, each year the Committee on Appropriations has had to write language providing for a "mandatory minimum strength level of 300,000 for the Army Reserve and a mandatory minimum level of 400,000 for the Army National Guard."

Despite this action at times there has been little effort to see that these forces were fully equipped.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that even the Secretary of Defense cannot misunderstand the intent of Congress, but if he does, I trust we can take appropriate action to maintain the Reserves and Guard, which have proven so effective in time of war and at present so necessary in many areas to maintain peace and order at home.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the Nation owes the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and his dedicated subcommittee a great debt of gratitude for the final resolution of this Guard-Reserve matter. Therefore, with the exception of resolving the technician matter contained in title II of this bill, for which the gentleman from Louisiana has a solid commitment from the Senate Armed Services to take up the technician retirement program early next year, this bill puts into positive statutory language the future status of our Reserve forces.

I want to call to the attention of the House that the House of Representatives and the Congress will have control of both the ceiling and the floor as to the number of reserves contained in our Reserve elements. Each year we must—we must legislate on this matter. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and his committee for a magnificent job and they deserve the thanks of the Nation.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to join my colleagues in commending the chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services for bring-

ing this bill back to the House floor in this conference report. I think passage of the bill will mean a great deal to the Reserve components of our country. Strength controls have now been set by Congress and will be reviewed each year by Congress. The Secretary of Defense will not be able to juggle strength figures as he has done in the past.

As you know, this bill, H.R. 2, is known as the Reserve bill of rights. I would say though to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, I was disappointed that title II of this bill had to be taken out, which was the technicians part of the bill, which put technicians under the retirement system of the civil service. I hope the gentleman as chairman of this committee can reconsider this step taken by the conferees and that next year we can consider putting the technicians under the retirement system.

Again I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman and his committee. I think this is a definite step in strengthening the Reserve forces of this country.

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I would repeat what I said in my earlier statement. Nobody is more disappointed than the members of our subcommittee because we had to abandon, at this time, the legislation with reference to technicians in the Guard. But we have a positive and definite assurance that it will be taken up immediately. It was a question of getting a bill now or not getting a bill and recognizing the realities and the facts of life, we receded in that respect but we do have a commitment on that.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Does the gentleman think it is possible that we might have some relief in this field during the coming year?

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, we are pretty nearly at the beginning of the coming year. I cannot speak for the Senate, except that we do have a direct and positive commitment from Senate conferees. Keep in mind that on two occasions this body has passed the technicians section of the bill. On each occasion it has met its fate over in the Senate. I cannot speak for the other body except to say again that Senator RUSSELL and Senator STENNIS both have committed themselves to a thorough review at the earliest possible time. I cannot go beyond that. But I have great respect for the integrity of both of those gentlemen.

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. SIKES (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had been agreed that section 103 of the committee substitute ending on line 21, page 211, would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point. Are there further amendments to section 103?

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAWKINS

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAWKINS: Beginning with line 5 on page 171, strike out everything down through line 9 on page 172, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

### "COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"Sec. 210. (a) A 'community action program' is a program which—

"(1) mobilizes and utilizes in an attack on poverty resources, public or private, of any community;

"(2) provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;

"(3) is developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the group served; and

"(4) is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency (other than a political party) or a combination thereof (hereinafter referred to as a 'community action agency')."

On page 173, strike out lines 4 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) (1) The Director shall not approve or continue to fund a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.

"(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership. The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor. In communities where substantial numbers of



the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree."

Beginning with line 1 on page 174, strike out everything down through line 15 on page 176.

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAWKINS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is sponsored by Mr. REID of New York and me, simply continues without change the existing law in respect to organizing community action agencies. Nothing new is added.

The Green amendment to completely restructure community action agencies so as to require them to be the State or one of its political subdivisions seeks to redirect the war on poverty from its original objective, of creating self-sustaining and productive citizens, to one of retreating to a welfare program.

Since the war on poverty is being redirected, the American people have a right to know precisely how and in what direction we now intend to travel. Unlike the redirection of the long-debated opportunity crusade, the Green amendment redirection has never been subjected to scrutiny in open hearings, and is, therefore, more imprecise as to meaning, probable effects, and even as to what commitments have been made and to whom.

The reason for the sudden redirection is even more obscured by the findings of the committee which state on page 22 of the committee report:

The committee finds that there is no correlation between an agency's legal form and the success of its program. Effective and ineffective programs can be found under both the public and private nonprofit structures.

Strengthening the role of elected public officials is not the issue. This field of dealing with poverty has historically belonged to locally elected public officials. And I am sure all of us would be delighted to leave, if we could, the problem to them.

But we recall too vividly the 17th century welfare practices that have prevailed in many counties of the Nation, and the orphan homes, poorhouses, and snakepit instance asylums. It was such practices that gave birth to Federal concern and leadership.

The Economic Opportunity Act, however, attempts to mobilize not just public officials but the total community in an all-out attack on the root causes of poverty. If the Green amendment encouraged real honest involvement of public officials without destroying broadly based community action, it would be highly desirable.

What it seems to be saying, however, is this: the Office of Economic Opportunity is wasteful and poorly administered, and we need locally elected public officials to curb the abuses of this agency which we created and which we alone can reach legislatively.

If, as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] says, it was the Congress that gave this so-called white knight, the OEO, his armor and his mission, then it is this Congress, not local public officials, who should defrock, if it is necessary, the "white knight in shining armor." And we should not leave any implication as she did that this Federal agency might be handling funds improperly and is fiscally not accountable to its creator, this Congress. The lady from Oregon says, "let us have faith in local officials." I say, let us have faith in ourselves as the creator of the OEO.

The amendment requires not only that the umbrella community action agency be dominated by elected public officials but that even neighborhood centers, boards and committees also include one-third elected public officials or their representatives—section 211(c) of the Green amendment, page 175, S. 2388.

This double-barrel attack on existing law could easily result in creating a Tammany Hall superstructure downtown, and little neighborhood wigwams in various political precincts that would completely submerge community groups and the poor.

Not content with this, however, the amendment attacks representation of the poor in community action by repealing outright section 202(a) of the existing law. This section defines a "community action program," among other things, as one "which is developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

Take this away and you have destroyed the very essence of the program, the involvement to the "maximum feasible" extent of the poor themselves in the decisions and operation of programs that affect their lives.

Repeal this concept and you have taken away what is the Magna Carta of the rights and privileges of the poor to have first claim on the benefits and services provided under the act, and an assurance of maximum initiative and self-determination by the poor, without which they cannot hope to escape poverty.

But even the "representatives of the poor" under the Green proposal will presumably be selected by public officials and not as now "by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty," for section 202(c) (3) of existing law is also being repealed—page 89 of the report.

However, just the reverse is also being promised. In the RECORD of November 7, 1967, on page H14739, in answering the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] said this:

One-third of the board would be representatives of the poor, elected in a democratic process by the poor.

If this is the intent, I challenge the advocates of the Green amendment to write it into the law. In the one place above all, that of creating expectations among the poor, it is essential that we be precise.

I firmly believe that those who believe in States rights and home rule will not

object if we insist on a little democracy in the war on poverty which affects all Americans, rich and poor, white and black.

Now, when we are just beginning to see tangible results of the poor becoming self-sufficient and productive citizens, is not the time to turn the program into a giant welfare scheme in which the poor will have meaningless participation in decisions or operations, or a lack of feeling of doing things for themselves.

Those who advocate the Green amendment would make the poor subservient. They want them to go hat in hand to welfare offices and city hall. They want the poor to feel inferior, humble, and grateful. They demand of the poor that they surrender their independence, self-reliance, and dignity for an antipoverty program. I believe the poor are too proud to pay such a price.

And I believe that the Congress, which is the hope of free peoples everywhere, would not want to project such an image of America's integrity and leadership.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is the hope of the members of the committee that we will be able to complete the legislation today and go to conference and get the bill signed before Thanksgiving. I am hopeful that we can proceed along here today expeditiously and wind this thing up at a reasonable hour.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to walk down here in the well and oppose the distinguished gentleman from California on his amendment. He has been diligent and constructive in his efforts to bring this bill to the floor of the House. He has made outstanding contributions not only to this bill but also other significant legislative enactments originating in our committee. I can see the gentleman's point of view.

Mr. Chairman, the crucial issue before us is whether we are to repudiate the judgment of a large majority of the committee—and a bipartisan majority—that the changes in the law reflected in sections 210 and 211 of the committee bill are necessary to the proper implementation of the community action program, and should be retained. Equally at stake, I would remind the gentleman from California, is the formula which has thus far provided us with the key to success for the House bill. Should we jettison this formula, which was carefully worked out by our distinguished colleagues on the committee, we may well be passing a death sentence upon this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely vital to the success of community action that duly-elected local officials play a leading role in the local programs. Such a role will be guaranteed under the provisions of the committee bill this amendment would delete. We must reject this attempt to deny local and State officials their appropriate role in the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill will not deny the poor a role in the program, nor will it deny such a role to the private sector. Allegations to the contrary are simply untrue.



It is important that the central thrust of sections 210 and 211 be retained, and that efforts to undermine this vital part of the committee bill be turned back.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to comment upon the provisions of section (b) of the bill and if it is brought into play, that the author of the amendment feels that the poor people will not have an opportunity to participate?

Would the chairman of the committee care to comment on that question?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct under paragraph (b) of section 211 at least one-third of the board must be representatives of the people to be served—the poor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. It is very clear in its intent. It would retain the language of the existing statute with respect to community action agencies.

Mr. Chairman, my concern can be stated quite simply: I believe that the Green amendment could stifle innovation and move community efforts back to the smoke-filled rooms and to the political clubhouses and could permit city hall to take direct political control of community action.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Green amendment is an amendment involving just better coordination. In my opinion, the thrust of that amendment is very clear: It opens the way for community action programs to come under direct political control.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I would state that I believe it is very important that we not stifle innovation, that we encourage flexibility in our community action programs.

Local governments clearly differ. They have different capacities and different initiatives.

I believe it is unwise to bind into the political structure of every community the innovative spirit and capacity of community action.

Further, and this is the third point, I believe the amendment is necessary because the committee bill now pending before the House could wreak havoc with the 1,100 existing CAP groups. There is not a permissive word in the language contained in this section of the bill. It is a mandatory change for some 1,100 community action groups.

And this, in my judgment, could result in complete chaos. But above all what we are talking about is the spirit of commu-

nity action and the importance of involving the poor themselves in their own future. What we are talking about—and I believe this is most important—is the basic necessity of encouraging at the local level a spirit of initiative and a feeling in the people of the area that they have a part to play in the action in their community; that they can do something concerning the betterment of their own lives. Community action means that their skill and their dedication and their interest do indeed matter, and we insure that they will continue to matter.

To leave the language in the bill as reported by the committee in my judgment would place the dead hand—and the dead hand—of the political clubhouse on the community action program. I believe that that is not the way to spur or encourage social innovation or progress or commitment or spirit, particularly by the people most directly involved.

I believe this House should support the amendment of the gentleman from California. Let us place our faith in the people and in local innovation, and not in the political clubhouse.

Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment would be, in my judgment, a serious mistake, and I urge the support of the Members for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate my colleague from California for having presented this amendment which I heartily endorse. He and I voted against the Green amendment in committee, and I join him in urging that the Members support his amendment.

We have heard explanations that the Green amendment would make the community action process more orderly; would organize it, harmonize it, and so forth. I do not believe that for a moment. On the contrary, I believe it would give a clear and unmistakable signal to the poor that we are reneging on the promise inherent in the warp and woof of the Equal Opportunity Act to give the poor a voice in their future, the promise to give them a grasp on the lever of power to affect their lives and prospects positively, and productively, the promise to let them participate in the design of the engines of their escape from poverty.

This would simply add to the frustration, resentment, and bitterness that has already been produced by the painfully and pathetically meager level of resources which we have been willing as a nation to channel into the program thus far. Our stated national commitment to the eradication of poverty has seemed increasingly hollow and insincere to the poor, as we have dillied and dallied and delayed in investing dollars even remotely appropriate to our goals; that commitment will seem emptier than ever if we appear to be removing the poor from power and decisionmaking over programs designed to liberate them from the shackles of poverty.

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the very thoughtful statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

What the amendment proposes very simply is to retain the present statutory framework for community action programs. The issue is whether or not to continue and develop the unique concept of the "maximum feasible participation of the poor" by adopting the Hawkins amendment.

The issue is not whether or not one should have confidence in local public officials.

I believe there has been a confusion as to functions all through this debate. The function of a legislator, a public official elected to legislative office, is not to administer local programs. I have heard the argument here that legislators should serve on community action boards.

Under the present law, the local communities have been free to determine the composition of their community action boards except for the requirement, which we wrote into the law 1 year ago, that one-third be representatives of the poor, selected by the poor.

In some cities that provision has not been satisfied. But to require that local community action boards be dominated by local public officials and others selected by them through the mechanism of the Green amendment is to lock the indigenous poor out of the decisionmaking process.

The idea of involving the poor in planning and administering their own program is working. The distinguished minority leader pointed out yesterday that in his area the local mayor did not want the present structure changed.

The fact that it is working may be very upsetting to the status quo and to the local political machinery, for it has stimulated a new awareness and a new consciousness among the poor, who recognize that poverty is not only economic poverty but the poverty of power. In the past hopelessness and powerlessness has characterized the poor.

Now there has been a discovery that by involvement—by meaningful involvement in this program—there can be hope. Power can produce hope and change. If local government had been responsive to the challenge, there would have been no need for bold new programs.

The committee recommends city hall domination of the overall, umbrella agencies, as well as the subsidiary boards.

The poor will view this as an effort to destroy programs which they have worked diligently to establish. Structures, which have been laboriously put together, will have to be reorganized. It will affect community action programs all over this country.

For instance, in the city of New York the membership of the community corporation in central Harlem has been worked out over a long period of time and consists of 90 members. Now it is proposed to tell those who have worked so hard to devise a structure that of the 90,



only 17 can serve, since one-third of the maximum of 51 are to be public officials and the other one-third are to be representatives of various groups, whose selection will no doubt be influenced by the public officials. That is destroying the very promise which this program held out.

The proposed composition of the community action boards and the community action governing boards is inconsistent with the maximum feasible participation of the poor which was the concept originally written into this legislation.

Submerged in the rhetoric of "giving responsible public officials a share in the decisionmaking process" is a very basic political question. Will the poor be able to conduct necessary programs to fight poverty which may offend powerful local interests? If the Green amendment remains in the bill, the answer will be no. The so-called "responsible public officials" are those whose indifference—at best—toward the plight of the underprivileged necessitated a Federal anti-poverty program. Will the community action programs be able to operate with the same flexibility that has facilitated their success in the past? If they are completely under the control of local government, the answer will be no. By requiring that a community action agency be a political subdivision of the State or its designee, its ability even to function will depend on the attitude of the governmental unit to which it belongs, which varies from favorable to hostile.

Turning community action over to local government control creates administrative problems caused by widely varying State and local laws.

For example:

First, under many State laws employees of government agencies must be hired through civil service. This would preclude employing many of the non-professional employees—in other words, poor people—who now hold jobs through community action agencies.

Second, some States have laws prohibiting persons other than public officials from disbursing public funds. If a community action agency were a public body, the poor themselves would have no way of influencing how the funds would be spent.

Third, many community action agencies, especially in rural areas, have programs cutting across existing political boundaries. If each local city or county government exercised its option to form its own community action agency, there would be tremendous waste and duplication of effort and money. In Massachusetts, for example, if this option were exercised, the eight existing umbrella community action agencies could be broken into as many as 75.

Fourth, under the existing community action program many community agencies are able to enlist the aid of volunteer workers. If these were taken out of the hands of the community and turned over to the local government, the morale of the program would suffer, the community might cease to feel the program were "theirs," and there would be a corresponding disinclination to volunteer. The result would be a weakening in the

effectiveness of the program as well as an increased cost.

Fifth, in certain States there are actually statutes prohibiting political subdivisions from complying with Federal desegregation guidelines. In certain States political subdivisions are not permitted to operate public community action agencies at all. These States, which tend to have the most distressing conditions of economic and social privation, would not benefit from the community action program at all.

Mr. Chairman, under the existing statute community action agencies may be either private, nonprofit groups or governmental bodies. Eighty percent have chosen the private, nonprofit route. Thirty have switched from public to private. This is hardly testimony to the failure of nonprofit, community groups to perform; it is hardly testimony to the willingness of local governmental bodies to accept the responsibility for the community action program that the language of the committee bill would place upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I make this reservation for the purpose of asking the gentleman in the well if he will yield as soon as he gets his 5 minutes for the purpose of talking about the superstructure in New York?

Mr. RYAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman if the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement. Then I will yield for the balance of the time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, if the gentleman will be good enough to yield some time to discuss just exactly where he finds a difference between this legislation before us now and the existing law, as to the participation of the poor in these programs.

Mr. RYAN. I will be very happy to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I said previously that the Green amendment will affect the morale of those who have volunteered and who are working now in this program.

I believe we have to recognize that, since the inception of this program, there has been a basic difference in philosophy between those who view community action as simply an extension of local welfare programs controlled by local government and those who view community action as a new and a unique concept, one which is experimental and in which

there are going to be mistakes, but which will involve people locally for the first time.

It offers an innovative, fresh approach to a profound problem that neither local efforts nor conventional welfare programs have been able to solve.

The major element here is the participation and leadership on the part of the poor themselves, instead of leaving it to established welfare officials and agencies to mandate to the poor what they should have.

It is ironic that the greatest critics of welfare programs are now prepared to turn the one program that is taking a new approach to the root causes of poverty into little more than an embellishment on local welfare programs.

The key difference of the antipoverty program is its emphasis on participation and leadership by the poor themselves, instead of leaving them to the whim of bureaucrats. This is accomplished through private, nonprofit community agencies which are responsible to boards composed to the maximum feasible extent of the poor themselves. The committee amendment destroys both of these principles.

In addition to turning community action programs over to local governments with all of the disadvantages which I have described, the amendment stacks the composition of the boards—subsidiary boards as well as umbrella community action boards—against the poor.

Under section 211 one-third are to be public officials. One-third are to be members of business, labor, religious, and other groups. The bill is deliberately silent on how they are to be selected, but presumably the public officials would have the major voice in their selection. The remaining one-third are to be "persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representatives of the poor in the area served." The bill eliminates the existing language of section 203(c) (3) requiring that "the representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty with special emphasis in participation by the residents of the area who are poor."

Even with this reduced voice for the poor, there is serious question whether the community action boards would have any power at all in those cases where a State or local government has designated itself as the community action agency. The powers are not specified.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, by altering the character of community action agencies and the composition of community action boards, the committee would fence out the poor from meaningful leadership in the Federal program which has done most to better their condition. The result of this can only be a lapse into stale welfare remedies, dominated by many of the least imaginative units of government. And this destruction of the most unique and positive aspect of the community action program will not lead to renewed apathy; it will lead to redoubled frustration.



The community action program has been the first device to draw upon the initiative of disadvantaged Americans and give them the means to lift themselves out of their poverty. It is inconceivable that we should have extended this promise only to take it away.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. During his statement, the gentleman made reference to the administrative structure and the redtape that would be set up if the present language of the bill is maintained. I hope that the gentleman is not indicating that he is satisfied with the administrative structure of the New York City program at this juncture. Do I correctly get that impression? Is the gentleman satisfied with the administrative structure of the New York City program?

Mr. RYAN. Quite to the contrary.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If he will yield further, I should like to say I do not think he could be satisfied, nor could I be satisfied when, for instance, the New York City structure as presently organized, with all the officials appointed by the mayor and the community boards appointed by subalterns in the community, has so well organized itself that on June 30 it received a grant for narcotics addiction in the amount of \$4.7 million. I know that is a very important field in the gentleman's district and other districts where narcotics addiction is a very serious problem among the poor.

As of today not one nickel of that \$4.7 million has been expended because there is an administrative hangup on who is going to spend the money and how. Is that the kind of administrative structure the gentleman wants? I am sure he does not want to continue with the present system. I am sure he feels that it can stand some improvement. And that is the design and function of the Green amendment.

Mr. RYAN. In response to the observations of the gentleman, the Green amendment is no cure for the administrative failures in any city. The cure for the difficulties in the city of New York is effective administration by the local government of programs for which it is responsible. The Office of Economic Opportunity should require the city administration to comply with the present law, which is very clear in what it requires. New York City is not in compliance with section 202(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act. New York City's problems will not be solved by giving city hall greater control or by turning local community action programs over to local "Tammany Halls" to run. It will only stifle the program.

One answer is to provide a substantial amount of direct Federal funding to local community action programs in order to achieve a balance between the city and private nonprofit agencies. Unfortunately, the Green amendment makes independent funding almost impossible.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois in order to answer the question he asked before.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my colleague will read the committee bill, he will find that the bill merely alters the transfer of taxpayers' funds. It provides that taxpayers' funds at the Federal level shall be transferred to a local government agency. But it in no way—and if I am wrong, I want the gentleman to show me where in this bill—would alter the relationship of the participation of the poor from that prescribed in existing law.

Mr. RYAN. I will do so.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like the gentleman to comment on page 174—

Mr. RYAN. I will answer the first question. The Green amendment would eliminate from present law section 202(a)(3), which requires that a community action program be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

That is No. 1.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman read page—

Mr. RYAN. I will not yield further until I complete my answer. No. 2. The Green amendment would eliminate—and this is very important—section 202(c)(3), which requires—

The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor.

The Green amendment is silent on the question of how representatives of the poor are to be chosen. In fact, it changes the present statutory language. If the intent was to have local elections or to have the poor select their own representatives, then why is the language changed? The committee bill changes the present formula, and it stacks the boards against the poor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAWKINS

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by Mr. HAWKINS: On page 2, bottom line, strike the period and insert the following: "on which officials (duly elected or appointed) of local government, or their representatives, not to exceed one-third of the membership, are not included; *Provided, however,* That such officials or their representatives are available and willing to serve; and on which the remainder of such membership does not consist of representatives of educational, welfare, religious, business, labor, and other organizations, selected thereby".

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I do not have a copy of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am pleased to give the gentleman a copy of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] because I believe it would be a substantial improvement over the present committee bill in its handling of local community action agencies. However, I offer the amendment to the amendment in order to correct what has been an error and a mistake in the operation of the law as presently constituted.

I do concur in and completely understand and appreciate the concern of the majority members of the committee about the fact that local units of government have not been involved. The distinguished minority leader yesterday reiterated on this floor a point which I think is of vast importance, and that is it is important that community action agencies be in cooperation with local units of government, but not dominated by them.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], sponsored together with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], would return us to the present law. I think we should move one step further, however. I think we should provide for that necessary cooperation between local government and the community action agency. That is why I have proposed the amendment now before us, because it would say simply that there shall be a local, independent community action agency which shall have at least one-third representatives of the poor, selected democratically to insure the maximum feasible participation of those to be served. In addition, there shall be at least one-third representative of local government, provided they are willing and able to serve, and the balance of the board shall be representative of the community as selected by business, labor and other social and eleemosynary organizations.

I think the adoption of the amendment now under consideration, with my amendment, would provide for that direct participation, for that involvement, for that actual engagement, and for that commitment that is so absolutely necessary if we are going to give the poor a meaningful voice.

I am sure each of us has received scores of letters from constituents and others who are concerned with the committee bill in its present form. The League of Women Voters of Madison, Wis., wrote to me and said:

One of the most salutary features of the CAP was its separation from local politics. The proposed change in the structure of the CAP board not only increases control by the very leaders who have often turned a deaf ear to the problems of the poor, but decreases the opportunities for active citizen participation, another most creative feature of CAP.

If I may say, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, in a speech he gave on November 10, 1967, at the University of Colorado, said this—and while he was directing it specifically to youth protest, I think his point is valid and applies here:

Youth is persuaded—



And if I may interject here, I would say the poor and others are also persuaded—

that government, church, corporations, labor unions, political parties, universities, even the family, have come to be considered too much as ends and individuals too much as means to those ends; that as these institutions now operate they offer too little opportunity for actual, direct involvement of the individual in the conduct of his own and the community's affairs.

The adoption of my amendment to the Hawkins amendment and the adoption of the Hawkins amendment would provide for that direct involvement, for that engagement, for that meaningful participation which is not provided unless we reverse the committee bill as it now stands.

I urge the Committee to adopt my amendment to the Hawkins amendment and then the Hawkins amendment to the committee bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] to the Hawkins amendment.

The reason why the Steiger amendment to the amendment is necessary is the committee did make some important improvements; that is, that in a community action board the public officials do have an opportunity to serve if they are willing and available to do so. Public officials could not comprise more than one-third.

This language is preferable to that of the committee bill.

The amendment also would require that representatives of education and welfare organizations, of business and labor, serve on the board as well. However, the amendment would require that they select their own representatives on the board, rather than to permit the public officials to appoint them to the board as is the case in the committee bill language. Those are important improvements.

If any of the Members on the other side of the aisle want to get the Hawkins amendment passed, they need the Steiger amendment as a part of the amendment. I ask, "Where were you yesterday when Congressman GOODELL offered his amendment?" His was a far superior amendment to the Hawkins amendment. It would have done the job. It would have reversed the Green of Oregon amendment. I saw very few from the other side of the aisle walk up the aisle in support of that amendment.

I want the Members to know, I am going to walk up the aisle in favor of the Hawkins amendment, even though it is offered by a Democrat. I believe we have to reverse the Green amendment and to make certain that the poor have a voice in these programs.

In doing that, let us understand the mood of the House. The mood of the House is to want public officials at least to have a voice. There should not be an objection to that. It is important, if we

are to have their help and benefit in these programs, that they do have a voice, but they should not dominate. They should have a voice.

The same is true if we are going to solve the problems of poverty with the help of business leaders. We need them. They ought to select those who will represent them in this program. The decision ought to stay with them as to who should represent them.

We also need the help of organized labor. In many areas of the country organized labor is an important factor in the community. It may not be in some areas, but in other areas it is. It is important that we have on the board their support from the person on the board, through their choice, rather than a labor person an elected public official puts on the board. If there is any selection, each group to be selected should be permitted to select their own.

The same is true for the welfare education and other participating groups. They ought to be involved and ought to select their own representatives.

This would reverse the Green of Oregon amendment, which states that a local political subdivision can be a community action agency. My amendment would mean they cannot be a community action agency themselves. The governing board will be running every community action agency. The local political subdivision will be involved, but it could not dominate. That is the significant part of it.

If we want this program to function with the gem of the new idea—the only one I can see in the entire poverty program; that is, the involvement of the poor in a meaningful way in their own destiny—this is the amendment we need to adopt.

It is not easy to bring about involvement of the poor. It comes slowly. The poor people are not used to self-government. We have to work with them. They are going to make mistakes in some places. We are going to be upset with them. But we should give them a chance. Only if they are involved will they be able to come out of poverty. We cannot do it to them. We cannot do it for them. We can give them an opportunity, but they must have a voice themselves. Without that, I do not believe there will be success.

Therefore, I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman said to give them a voice, to let them make mistakes, to work with them. Is it not a fact that the gentleman has been a most severe critic of the mistakes which have been made?

Mr. QUIE. I have been a severe critic of the people who ought to know better, of the people who are hired professionals at high salaries. Never has anyone heard me criticize the poor person who has tried his best, never in all the criticism I have made of the program.

Any individual we pay \$15,000 or \$20,000 has no reason to make those mis-

takes of the extravagant misuse of the money.

We ought to get a dollar's benefits out of a dollar spent.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman brings up the question of high salaries and powerful professional figures. Is it not true that in many community action organizations right now under the present law, being interpreted at the local level, that high salaried professionals have gained control of the organizations with their staffs and actually manipulate the poor? And is it not true that their interpretation of maximum feasible participation is the control of the poor by them and not the control of the poor by the poor people? Is that not happening in many community action agencies?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, it is happening in many.

Mr. CAREY. Is that not a good reason for the committee revision?

Mr. QUIE. No. I do not believe that the committee revision will solve the problem without throwing the baby out with the bath water.

Mr. CAREY. Does not the gentleman feel, then, that if we do this which he is suggesting, that in many cases the poor will be controlled by the high-priced professional?

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman from New York that with the Steiger amendment there will be ample voice for the public officials.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Minnesota is still available, I would like to say that a year ago he convinced me the language we have in the Green amendment was proper, and I voted for that part of the Green amendment which he introduced last year, in which he said at least one-third of the membership of the boards and the agencies must be the poor. That is exactly what the Green amendment now says in its final version.

I might also remind the gentleman from Minnesota, that Mr. Shriver, testifying before our committee this year, when asked the question as to whether the Quie amendment had been sufficiently implemented, said that very few of the boards and agencies had been able to come up to that standard. In other words, the Quie amendment of last year, which is part of the Green amendment of this year, requiring that at least one-third of the poor be represented, has not been implemented as yet because of the fact that it is difficult for the group to get the full participation of the poor.

When we are talking about the poor no one seems interested in the amendment that I suggested many times that at least 50 percent of the representatives of the poor had to be the poor themselves—those receiving the benefits under this legislation. So, when you are talking



about the poor, remember that it is the representatives of the poor, many of whom are not poor, because of their financial condition or because of their community status. They want to serve on the board many times for the very reason that you are opposing this amendment by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] today. It is because they want to get a springboard to get into politics and a place to get some publicity and notoriety so that they can become known by the public and they can run for political office. I find in my lifetime those who complain most about city hall are the ones who know the path to city hall the best to ask for favors and consideration, and those who complain most about political participation are the ones who knock on the door of the politician the most times to get the influence of the politician so that they can get in a position to complain about it.

It is just like the old story of the Arab who was out with his camel in a sandstorm. He puts up his tent to protect himself from the sand, and the animal then coaxes him to take him inside the tent with him, just as these people who were appointed by politicians coaxed their way into political office. Once the camel got inside the tent it kicked the owner out.

Most of these people have gone to politicians to be named to the jobs that they are holding right now.

I listened to television on the eve before our election last Tuesday one of the few moments that I get for television, and I heard one of the representatives of the Pittsburgh CAP agency giving the thousands of listeners and viewers of that TV a complete misrepresentation of this committee amendment. The statement was a baldfaced lie in which he said that this committee amendment would eliminate the participation of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I think it strengthens the position of the poor, because those who are responsible to the people, recognize the need for satisfying the people. An elected official knows best what he has to do and who understands better the things that have to be done for the good of the community than an elected public official, because, at least, he has to be reelected.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the poor will get better representation and they will be the poor themselves that will be represented on these boards.

Mr. Chairman, I admire the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] as much as any man I have known for many years for his political integrity, his experience in the legislative halls. Mr. Chairman, were this a vote at this time, either by tellers or by a record vote as to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] himself, I can assure the members of the Committee that I would vote "aye."

But, Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for his amendment because it is misconceived, and the action of the committee is misinterpreted and in many cases misrepresented.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we want local officials to participate in this program.

Permit me now to say that one of the best and most beneficial benefits which we derive by having local officials to participate—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, may I say that it bothers me to find that as we get along with the debate there are those on the other side of the aisle who on the one hand seek to extend time for individual debate and on the other hand object to an extension of the debate when it comes to certain Members on this side of the aisle by later moving to limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon object or does the gentleman not object?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, one of the lasting benefits and one of the corrective measures that will come because of the adoption of this type of amendment will be that we will be in a position of having an elected official, either in person or his designee, to sit on the board in its proportionate membership composition, so that they can determine the expenditures of the board, and so that they can determine the salary schedules.

Mr. Chairman, for instance, we have in Westmoreland County, a county which is located in the heart of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, three commissioners who are paid the sum of \$12,500 a year, commissioners who look after the welfare and look after the interest of over 400,000 people, commissioners who have the responsibility for miles and miles of roads, who have the responsibility for millions and millions of dollars worth of public institutions, as well as the responsibility for hundreds of employees. Yet they only receive the sum of \$12,500 a year for their efforts.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the head of an agency with 3,500 or 3,600 employees who participate in the program can receive a salary of \$16,000, \$15,000, or even more a year. There comes a time when we must face the reality of the problem of comparability of salaries. In other words, we have to pay salaries that measure up to the salaries paid in a community. When they hire a man to work and pay him \$40,000 a year, that action certainly establishes a base rate of pay for people similarly employed all over the country. And, when you do that, you get into this question of disproportionate spending, you get into the question of disproportionate spending for overhead as compared to the welfare benefits that will accrue.

Mr. Chairman, we have conditions that

have come to our attention where there have been as much as 80 percent of the funds involved spent for overhead in the operation of this program. That could not happen with participation by the people who are elected to public offices.

Why, then, Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] say in his remarks, with respect to the amendment, that would bring in Tammany Hall? Mr. Chairman, Tammany Hall is a red herring and belongs to the pages of yesterday. Let us talk about the realities of today.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Does not the point which the gentleman is making really put to the fallacy test this notion that under the present situation the poor have a real voice in determining their own affairs?

Mr. DENT. Absolutely.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that a very small percentage of the poor actually get into contact with the program?

Mr. DENT. Absolutely.

Mr. CAREY. In some cases the members of the staff and the staff director manipulate this small group of the poor according to their own design to approve their own salaries and budget, and so on.

Mr. DENT. I agree with everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that the committee bill, however, will provide for definite representation of the poor on a one-third basis, or even on a two-thirds basis?

Mr. DENT. I was coming to that. We say at least one-third, and it can be more than one-third.

Mr. CAREY. That is right.

Mr. DENT. But another important facet of this that seems to have been ignored by those critical of the so-called committee amendment, they seem to fail to realize that many times the poor are the kind of people who are the meek ones of the world; they are backward, they are not forward, they do not have the push to make their way in. And you will find that when they bring in a director or a high-priced agency head what happens is the poor do not even go into the office, the door is closed. But find me the door of an elected official that is closed to the poor, and I will find you an elected official that will be defeated at the next election just as sure as you are alive.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania yielding to me.

May I say to the gentleman in the well that it seems to me that in fact what we can learn from independent CAP agencies is that that characterization is not accurate. I can take the gentleman to Fond du Lac, Wis., and I can show you people who, even presuming they are the ones who are "the meek" of the world, when they had an opportunity to really mold their future through independent CAP agencies, not domi-



nated by politicians, they found their voice, and it is now being heard.

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that even though I have not much time left, I just want to say that I am happy to hear the gentleman refute the statements of his colleagues who have said that the OEO program has not done any good, and because the gentleman is telling me that actually in Fond du Lac, Wis., there are people who have been rehabilitated and are now in the productive stream of America as ordinary human beings, like the rest of them. That is a great, great story to tell.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. What my good friend has just said does not accurately reflect what many of us have said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in insuring that there is some way to keep the local elected officials out of the poverty program if that should be in the best interest of the program.

I have been somewhat confused in believing that the Hawkins amendment would do this, and realizing that an amendment to mandate politicians out has no chance of passage, so I would like to seek some information from a member of the committee concerning the present operation of the poverty program and the bill that is before us, and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] for offering to give me that information.

In the present bill on page 174, beginning on line 18, it states: "One-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third of the membership of the board."

Could that one-third, which might be available, or less than one-third, possibly go down to zero?

Mr. CAREY. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Yes; that is entirely possible. The key words are the words "reasonably available" to serve. If someone has stated and announced his opposition to the poverty program, in fact, has led the force to oppose the poverty program, it would be interpreted that he would not be an official reasonably available to serve. That takes care of it.

Mr. HOWARD. So this one-third could go down to zero?

Mr. CAREY. That is the possibility if there is no one who can fit the description. However, I believe there has been too much talk here about elected officials and politicians. We are aiming at getting into poverty community contact on the board such people as your elected school board members, and your other officials

of the county in health and housing, who have to do with the carrying out of such functions in the community.

Because we think they should be on those boards immediately accessible to those who need their aid the most.

There is no other way to get on those boards unless it is provided by statute as we are doing here because the gentleman, I think, has before him the guidelines under the present law and the guidelines if they were written into the bill, they would be the Green amendment. Unfortunately, the guidelines do not have the force of law and the local officials have chosen, at the OEO, as long as they got the money to refuse to follow the guidelines.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask him another question.

According to the guidelines to the present law on page 17, it says "there shall be representation from private or public agencies and it shall include at least one representative of the chief elected official for officials."

Is there any provision that this may be negated—that either the chief elected official or his representatives be on the board?

Mr. CAREY. No; not in the present law. However, there have been instances where elected officials have sought to be removed from the program, and end their responsibility for the program. Where this has happened, the Director of the OEO has made arrangements that other agencies may serve.

A specific case in point is in the Suffolk County, N.Y., Board of Supervisors. They decided not to operate the CAP program and they so notified the OEO. Through the participation of a nonprofit organization, with their tolerance and support—the Suffolk County—a private group became the CAP agency. It has happened before and it can happen again.

Mr. HOWARD. I am concerned by the fact that these different elected officials may be on the board or have a representative on the board.

I am aware of instances where these elected officials in connection with their county CAP, have said, "I am going to do my part to handle this money but do not blame me if the program is no good. It is a Democratic program."

I do not think that is the kind of official who should be in charge of a community action program.

Would the gentleman then finally agree with me that if we want an opportunity to have the local officials out of the program, it can be better done by the bill that is before us rather than the Hawkins amendment or the present situation. Therefore, those who want the chance to get the local officials out should oppose the amendment and support the committee bill.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman is entirely correct because in the committee bill we can even have cooperative efforts with public officials and those who are sympathetic to the program.

But under the present law, as I read the guidelines, actually there may be more mischief under the present law than under the Hawkins amendment and the committee bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask the gentleman from California, who is the author of the amendment, a couple of questions relative to his amendment.

Has the district, sir, which you so ably represent, had actual experience in the process of having the poor elect their representatives for the CAP board?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, at the present time in Los Angeles the EYOA agency, which is the local community action agency, has obtained its representation from the poor through elections.

Seven individuals now serve as those persons elected in those elections.

Mr. KYL. Then I would ask the gentleman, about how many of the poor people actually participated in the election compared with the total number who could be eligible?

Mr. HAWKINS. A very small percentage as I recall—about 1 percent. It was very disappointing, but may I say in connection with that, that I, among others, opposed the election, not on the basis of the theory involved, but in the way that the election was being conducted. The election was being conducted by local public officials who had gerrymandered the districts—so that one person is representing at the present time, for example, a district stretching from my district next to the Vernon area to the area represented by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Can you imagine a district 15 miles long in which a person who was supposed to be poor was attempting to campaign among poor people and trying to locate even his constituents? So we anticipated the election would be a failure. The districts were gerrymandered. They were asking seven individuals to represent 15 poverty areas. They were asking each person who was to vote in the election to swear or affirm that he was a poor person before he could vote in the election.

Mr. KYL. What qualifications are listed, and how does an individual actually prove that he fits the qualification as an eligible voter in these elections?

Mr. HAWKINS. They use the poverty standards as a qualification for both candidates and those who would be entitled to vote. We objected to that requirement on the basis that people who live in poverty areas certainly should not be required to say that they are poor. We feel that an individual who lives in a poverty area has as much right to represent the poor as any other individual.

I live in a poverty area myself, but I could not be a candidate in the election, even though I represent about 300,000 poor people. We feel that an individual who is a resident of a poverty area has as much right to vote as anyone else.

Mr. KYL. In other words, the representation that the law allows only the poor to participate in the election is really a misrepresentation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.



Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding. I think the point the gentleman has made is very important in this debate. I really cannot understand why my dear friend and colleague from California is supporting so enthusiastically a system which he at the same time condemns as not having worked.

The gentleman from Iowa has asked what percentage of the voters in the Watts district voted in the election to select poor people to serve on the board. The facts are in that election there were 400,000 people who were eligible, and six-tenths of 1 percent turned out to vote; 2,659 cast their votes.

In addition, we have examples in other places in the United States where in the selection or the election of the poor we have had 14-year-olds voting. We have had a recent case brought to our attention where in an election in a community action agency they bused in people from outside the target area. They were the ones who were really the balancing power to select the people who were to represent that area, even though they did not live in it.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for drawing attention to this part of it. When we argue about the election of the poor, when we have elections where six-tenths of 1 percent of the people turn out, when we have elections in two cases—in Philadelphia where 2.7 percent of the eligible voters turned out and in another election where 3.2 percent turned out—the need for change is evident.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], and our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], for offering this very important amendment.

I was one of the minority on the Education and Labor Committee that opposed the provision in the proposed legislation because I felt that it invited city hall and statehouse control of the community action programs.

The essence of the potential—if not the genius—of the war on poverty, in my view, is the involvement of the poor, giving them the authority and the responsibility to help shape their own destiny in their own communities. The democratic process, though painful, is, in my view, in the long run the most productive method by which peoples resolve their own problems and reach their own solutions.

This is a question about which there is serious disagreement. It is my very strong view that the proposed virtual city hall and statehouse control of the community action agencies will rob the CAP program of the one new factor that distinguishes the war on poverty from existing public agency efforts to meet the problems of the poor of this land.

The war on poverty has been reduced to a skirmish in this legislation. The proposal before us is, at best, most inadequate to meet the challenge confronting the rural and urban poor of our land.

The adoption of the Hawkins amendment would, at least, preserve that which is most unique in the war on poverty.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statement the gentleman made. I wonder if the gentleman will comment on the colloquy that occurred a few minutes ago, in which the contention was made that the committee bill actually would involve fewer politicians in the program than the Hawkins amendment or the present law would. The comments were directed primarily to the technical section, saying that if a number of officials reasonably available for such services is less than the one-third of the board, we may have zero members of local officials on the board.

As a practical matter, is it not the case here that the local community action agency under the so-called Green amendment is local government, and that any board created under this technical language is a creature of that local government? Would the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. BURTON of California. First, I would not want to rewrite the history that the proponents of the so-called Green amendment are writing on the floor. However, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and I have been in agreement on this aspect of the poverty program since the inception of the program. The CAP agency, under the committee proposal, in most instances is going to be the public agency. It is going to be city hall.

I have difficulty in following the logic that says that city hall shall be the father and mother, and yet the child, CAP, shall be free of city hall domination under the program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is one of the most responsible members of our committee. I wonder if he would comment on this language in the committee bill: "at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served."

Would the gentleman also comment on this provision:

The Director shall . . . provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad community involvement in programs under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting these programs.

Would the gentleman comment on these two provisions and show us how

they would deny the poor people in the community the right—not the privilege, but the right—to participate in the development of these programs? Will the gentleman please comment on that?

Mr. BURTON of California. Of course, I did not make the statement that the proposed amendment to the OEO legislation would deny the right of the poor to participate. I did not say that. What I did say was that this would increase the likelihood of city hall or statehouse domination of the program. I stand on that statement.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CAREY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I have no wish to foreclose the right of my colleague from California to be heard, but I believe he has already spoken on the floor for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Since the time the gentleman from California addressed the Committee with regard to the Hawkins amendment, another amendment has been offered, which is an amendment to the Hawkins amendment, and the gentleman from California has not yet spoken on that.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly to address my remarks to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] but, before I do that, I would like to clarify one point with respect to elections in the city of Los Angeles, with which I am as well acquainted as any Member of this House.

We considered this to have been an election called by a group of public officials, an election which was poorly conducted, in districts which were gerrymandered, and we considered its requirements for voting to have been un-American. These elections really did not reflect the interest of the poor people of this country, but assuming they did, I think it indicates the tremendous job we have to arouse the poor people to an interest in their own affairs. That is the reason why we have presented these amendments, in order to give to them that meaningful participation, to arouse them.

I believe that if this election had been successful those who now refer to it as being a great example of why we should not have elections would be more fearful that the poor are being aroused by the poverty program. In my opinion, that goes to the essence of the opposition of those who are afraid of the poor people becoming organized. They are very much afraid that they will perhaps wonder why they have dirty streets, wonder why they are unemployed, wonder why they are being neglected.

I believe that is also the reason why those individuals who now talk about democratic elections are so afraid that some of this money might be used to register voters. That is why there is a restrictive provision in this bill against registering and voting. They do not in-



tend to have elections. They have indicated, when they talk about selection in the Green of Oregon amendment, they do not in any way intend for those democratic processes ever to include elections.

As to the Goodell amendment, offered last night, it seems to me those who today are talking about public officials and have been crying that we do not have faith in public officials had a golden opportunity in the Goodell amendment last night to involve more public officials, because that would have involved the State officials as well as the local officials. They were opposed to that also.

Now there is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] before us, which seeks only to put in the law the present OEO guidelines, which require one-third of the members of these agencies to be public officials. Again we see them opposing this, an amendment which would require one-third of the Board to be public officials. They say they do not want this to be put into the law because the OEO guidelines do not have the effect of statutory law.

It seems to me they do not want public officials. This is only their excuse. What they want to do is to strike out of the existing law those references to the maximum feasible participation of the poor, to representation from the poor being elected or selected by the poor themselves. That is really all they are after, but they are not saying that.

I submit, they have no greater faith in public officials than the rest of us, because if they did they would not have written into their proposal all of the restrictions against public officials. They would not be writing new penalties into the administration of the program by local public officials. They certainly would not be requiring from local public officials \$1 for every \$9 they get of Federal money. So they have little faith in public officials. Otherwise they would give to the public officials the Federal money and say, "You do with it as you see fit, because we have faith in you." Apparently they do not have such love.

They use this as a guise under which they are really attacking the poor in a poverty program which is designed certainly to aid the victims of poverty.

I believe that is the intent of the Green of Oregon amendment. I submit that the Steiger of Wisconsin amendment would do no more than what is already in the OEO guidelines. It should be approved by this committee. It will improve the amendment we have offered to this bill. Therefore, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment proposed by my colleague from California.

I support the committee's position—and I do so with a clear conscience and without misgivings.

The secret to the success of our national strategy against poverty, Mr.

Chairman, is the total involvement of all our people and the total employment of all our resources in an assault on the problems of the poor.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that this total involvement—this total use of all resources—can best be achieved under the community action structure as proposed by the Committee on Education and Labor.

We are saying, in this bill, that local governments—local elected public officials—must take a greater role in this community effort to reduce and eliminate poverty where it exists.

This greater involvement of local governments offers many advantages.

It obviously will bring into play greater governmental resources.

It will assure greater responsibility in the handling of public funds—responsibility exercised by people with experience in handling taxpayers' money.

It will assure greater administrative expertise in the operation of programs—expertise that already exists at the local level.

It will assure greater accountability at the local level for local programs—by administrators accountable to the people who elect them.

And, as a result, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we will see a greater participation in this important effort by all segments of our society if for only one reason.

That reason is trust.

This is a good program, Mr. Chairman, and many good people are already involved in the effort.

But there are still too many of our citizens standing on the sidelines. Some will always be on the sidelines—that is the nature of a few members of our society.

But some are on the sidelines, Mr. Chairman, because they are still not sure about the program—they still have reservations—they are apprehensive about who is involved, what it is supposed to do, and how it is to be done.

By tying this important program more closely to local governments, we can inspire confidence in what is being done. We can assure that the responsibility for a sound operation—for the proper use of taxpayers' funds—is in the hands of people they have elected.

With this confidence developed, our strategy against poverty will attract more warriors—more citizens ready to get involved in the business of helping poor people work their way out of poverty.

Beyond this, Mr. Chairman, and more important certainly, is the clear evidence that public antipoverty agencies—as we have in Detroit, New York, Chicago, and other places—are having greater and faster success than private agencies in bringing about institutional changes to the advantage of the poor.

This should not surprise anyone here.

With mayors and the local governments involved in the local antipoverty program, institutional change can be effected more rapidly than if the impetus came from outside.

The employment service, our schools, our welfare departments—all of these

local agencies—are responding to the new call of the antipoverty program.

That call, of course, is not just to care for the poor but to provide them with ways out of poverty.

Evaluations show that public antipoverty agencies are responding to the call at least as rapidly as private agencies and offering solid support for the committee's position.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated and that the committee be supported in its definition of a community action agency as one that will include all segments of society—public officials as well as the poor, labor as well as business, and civic organizations as well as churches.

This is the way we must go forward.

The big issue is, Who shall be responsible for expenditure of public funds, the elected officials of a community who are responsible to their electorate or those who never have to account to anyone but the auditors of the OEO? That is the issue here.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his statement. It seems to me the preservation of this so-called Green amendment is important to public acceptance and greater public support of the program. I appreciate what our distinguished and very sincere friend from California has said about his amendment, but in my opinion acceptance of the bill as reported will mean much to the success of the program among those for whom it was intended, that is, the poor themselves, and it will add to the support of the program in the country and in the House itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the majority leader.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Is it not true that one of the greatest criticisms of the Poverty Act in the community action area is its looseness or lack of tight control? It is criticized because of the fact that the funds are frequently badly administered at the local level and a direct line of responsibility is not clear. Is that not the basis of the whole problem? Is it not also true that if the responsibility for these programs, and for the administering of the money, were laid more heavily at the feet of elected officials would it not tend to make the program more responsibly handled?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes; that is the basis of the whole problem. In cities where local officials have been tied closely into the program you have good programs and no criticisms or scandal. It has been in those communities of the country where public officials have been excluded that you had the greatest criticism and scandals. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. So that what you are really trying to do here is to tighten up the program to what both the public and to what the Congress basically wants.



Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes; I hope that the Committee of the Whole will stand with the committee bill, which is a carefully thought out bill. We sincerely and honestly believe by staying with the committee bill you will move the poverty program forward so in 2 or 3 years from now this will not be controversial legislation if you put it in the hands of the responsible elected officials of the community.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does he recognize that the Conference of Mayors, in a letter to the committee members, indicated that they were disturbed by reports that the committee might act to limit the ability of the community to determine the structure and nature of the community action agencies and ask that we put more flexibility at the local level and not less?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman will also note that the Conference of Mayors did not come out against the committee bill.

Mr. CONYERS. They did not support the Green amendment, either.

Mr. PUCINSKI. They supported the whole bill and the whole program, so it would be incorrect for us to say here that the Conference of Mayors somehow is opposed to this particular principle proposed by the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I really believe that a great deal is being read into this amendment and into the intent of the sponsors of the amendment.

It is my opinion that all of us recognize that if a community action program is going to be truly successful, the community's public officials must be involved and must cooperate with the community action program.

We are not going to make any real progress toward the objectives of this legislation, if the community action agency and the duly elected representatives of the people of that community are at loggerheads. Poverty is not a problem that anyone can solve without complete community cooperation. The entire idea behind the language of the committee bill is community action working in cooperation with all similar programs to achieve our objective, of eliminating the causes of poverty and alleviating conditions created by poverty.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to kill anything through the adoption of this provision of the committee bill. The Green amendment as contained in the committee bill simply provides for an orderly way of achieving our objectives. It says that the community action agency shall be one established by or designated by the local governing body, and approved by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I cannot see anything wrong with that. Do we really believe that a community action agency will do better if it is one that the local governing body does not want, if it is one that the elected representatives of the people in that community are opposed to? Is that what we want?

Mr. Chairman, the Green amendment assures us that this will not be the case, that we will have a community action agency so constituted that it will be able to work in concert with the other official bodies of the community concerned with the problems of poverty.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the ability and the integrity of the distinguished gentleman in the well. I know that the gentleman speaks very fervently to the question of ending poverty. I agree with what the gentleman has said, up to this point at least, anyway.

But, may I ask the gentleman whether or not that is the issue, since all of us agree that the locally elected public officials should certainly constitute at least one-third of the representation on these boards? It is my opinion that that was the original intent when we discussed the bill, and when the gentleman was present, in 1964. We discussed the idea of having the board composed of one-third elected officials and two-thirds community groups.

Is it not true that this is today the Office of Economic Opportunity guideline, and that if this were to be followed, perhaps, there would be no necessity for us to debate the issue. And, further, this same opportunity is offered in the amendment. What we really want to do is what you express as being the ideal and that is that we have this opportunity. But, is it not also true that under the Green amendment, it goes beyond that and repeals section 202(a) and section 202(c) of the existing law with reference to representation on the board?

Now, why is it necessary to repeal these sections in order to have public officials serve on the board?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I do not believe it was necessary to repeal those sections. If I had had any idea that doing so would create all of the doubts that seem to exist in the minds of some of the Members of this House, I would have favored leaving them in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I believe the gentleman from California will agree that, during our discussion of this provision in committee, there was no intention expressed to change the selection process, or to somehow or other rearrange things so that the poor did not have an opportunity to choose their own representa-

tives. That is not one of the intentions of the committee bill, and I know the gentleman from California agrees that certainly no such intention was ever expressed.

I would like to make it clear now, as one of those who supported this committee provision when it was before the committee, and support it now, that I had no intention nor can I construe any intention on the part of the committee, to eliminate or change or bypass the democratic selection of representatives of the poor by the poor themselves. That would still be a part of this operation under the committee bill.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Is it not a fact that, under the committee bill and the Green amendment, section 202(c) (3) of the present statute is eliminated, which requires that "representatives of the poor shall be selected by residents in areas of concentration of poverty" and which expressly emphasizes "participation by the residents of the area who are poor"? That language has been stricken by the committee.

That is the language of the present law. It is stricken. There must have been a purpose in removing that language, and eliminating the requirement that the representatives of the poor be selected by the poor.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] to respond to that.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As far as the language referred to, and the language of the new bill, if there is any difference between those two I fail to see it.

The gentleman has read the language of the present law. The committee bill recommends this language that at least one-third of the members of the representatives of the poor shall be chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representatives of the area of the poor served.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

(On request of Mr. RYAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I might say in response to the gentlewoman from Oregon that the language of the committee bill, which the gentlewoman just read, does not say, as the present law does, that the representatives of the poor shall be selected by the poor. That is quite a difference.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about a distinction without any difference. The plain fact of the matter is it is not the intention of the committee, or of this Committee of the Whole, to change this selection process, and that is that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] to the



amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

I would like to explain at this time, very briefly, my objection to any provision that elected officials will have up to one-third of the places of leadership in the community action programs. It seems that under the present law—and that is all that the Hawkins amendment attempts to do—is revert back to the present legislation which would permit, even under that law, to have elected officials if we so desired.

Contrary to some of the statements that have been made here about the amendments under debate, they are very crucial. These are not distinctions without a difference. I think a number of the Members here are becoming aware as this debate proceeds, just how important this discussion is.

As one who comes from a city where the disruptions in July and thereafter which started in my district, I want to say to the membership here that we have been having struggles in Detroit about the involvement of the poor in the community action program for a number of years. It is a serious problem and we are not going to solve it by putting more elected officials on the program of the community action program, and if things are not any different than they are in Detroit, we will find that there is already a great deal of city hall involvement. All of the heads of the community action program in Detroit have come out of the city administration. Many employed in the program are persons who have worked for the city. A number of the key positions are manned and operated by former local government employees. So for us to gather here and argue about whether we want to make this program more responsible by adding more elected officials would be a grievous mistake.

I am not speaking against city hall. I happen to consider myself a very good and close friend of the mayor of the city of Detroit and of the entire administration including the common council. But they do not need a greater role in determining who is going to make the decisions in the community action programs. There is already plenty of city hall representation. What we want to do is to try to get some more poor people involved.

I think it shameful that we sit here and point to the small number in the election as some evidence of the disinterest of the poor.

We are trying to arouse them to this kind of program, and the only way we can do it is to follow the suggestion made not by national legislators but by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Mr. Chairman, who have written a letter to every member of this Committee.

They have said that it would be a mistake at this point to move further into the area of requiring all of the local community action programs to be either units of government or private nonprofit corporations.

On behalf of the Conference of Mayors, we urge that we be permitted to move ahead in the communities with our programs as we have developed them.

We cannot afford at this time to stop for total reorganization.

We need more flexibility at the local level—not less.

Mr. Chairman, this injunction is from an organization of mayors. This is from the very people that we seem to think need more of a hand and control in these programs.

I hope that both of these amendments will be voted up and that a very crucial part of this program will be maintained.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

I think this amendment goes to the very heart of the program. It is not just something that is peripheral.

My friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] indicated that this really was not anything important; but that the Green amendment is the same as existing law plus the guidelines presently in existence. Mr. Chairman, that is not so.

Section 210, the Green amendment, says that community action agencies shall be a State or political division of a State or a private agency appointed by the State. This is entirely different from existing law under which a community action agency is a creature of the community.

It seems to me that the Green amendment denies the whole concept of community action.

This program came to us in a large measure from the experience we had in the Peace Corps. Sargent Shriver, who is now director of the OEO, was the head of the Peace Corps, as you all know. Community action very largely came from our Peace Corps experience with community development.

Overseas in the underdeveloped countries poverty is measured, not by the thousands of dollars income per family each year as it is here, but by the hundreds of dollars per family per year. In the foreign aid programs we have been spending literally billions of dollars on improving the lot of the poor in the underdeveloped countries. Much good has been done. Additional hospital and educational facilities have been built for the communities. Food has been provided some of the needy.

But, all this foreign aid money comes from outside of the community—it represents things being done for, not by, the community.

These foreign aid projects for the most part have not changed the hopelessness, the despair, the way of life in the communities of the poor one iota.

Only when we got Peace Corps volunteers moved right into the community, when the community itself thought that it had some ability to change its own way of life, when it had the feeling that it could make the officialdom react to its needs, we began to see changes in those communities.

This is the essence of community action—that the program is controlled by the community. Therefore, I think the Hawkins-Reid amendment is very fundamental. I do not buy the logic of

my respected friends on the committee that this provision is needed to pass the bill. If community action does not emanate from the community itself, it is meaningless. If this amendment is not adopted, I think the most important fundamentals of the program would be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Reid and the Hawkins amendment and the Steiger amendment as well.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think it is very clear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] is in the public interest. I think it does involve the poor. I think this is the core of what we are trying to do. It makes very clear that the existing law will remain the law, as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] which provides that the number of public officials is not to exceed one-third. I believe that the amendment as amended should be supported.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman and commend my colleague from Westchester for the very salutary leadership that he has provided with respect to this bill generally and with respect to this amendment.

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. QUIE. Reserving the right to object, judging from the number of Members who are standing, could you make that 2:25?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Reserving the right to object, can we get a line on how many Members wish to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. I think if the gentleman will turn around, he can make as good a guess as can the Chair.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, as I asked my question, I noticed that at least four or five Members who were standing sat down. For that reason I asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?



Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, if there are that many Members who would like to speak, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first, may I again say that the committee bill comes to the House with bipartisan support. There were about as many Republicans on the committee in favor of it as there were opposed. The same is true on the Democratic side.

Mr. Chairman, there have been three arguments, if I understand the debate of the last hour, against the committee bill:

First, it would prevent maximum feasible participation of the poor;

Second, it would prevent broadly based community action;

Third, it would destroy the morale of the people who are working in the program.

Mr. Chairman, may I say as emphatically as I know how that it is not the intention of any of the members of the committee who support this committee bill to prevent maximum feasible participation of the poor. We want that participation. But what the committee bill does is prevent the maximum control of the programs by a minimum participation.

A few moments ago I gave the percentage of voter turnout in recent elections and the gentleman from California explained why there was only six-tenths of 1 percent voter turnout in that election. But the gentleman did not explain that this is a familiar pattern across the country—that when there have been elections of the “poor” or representatives of the poor to serve on these boards, there has been a 2- or 3-percent voter turnout. Twelve percent turnout is the highest I have heard about in any such election.

I would suggest that when the people in the poverty areas, in the target areas, are represented by the people who have been elected at an election where we have had 85-percent turnout of all people, they might well be better represented than when they are represented by a person who is chosen by a six-tenths of 1 percent vote.

Second, this bill does not destroy, on the contrary it assures, broadly based community action. This bill provides that one-third are going to be the public elected officials; that one-third are going to be broadly representative of community business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, and any other major group; and that at least one-third shall be representatives of the poor.

As one of the authors of this amendment, I completely agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] that we do not change in the least the selection by the poor and the election of their one-third representatives by the people in these areas.

The committee bill, Mr. Chairman, does not destroy the morale of the people who are working on the program. I submit that it does just exactly the opposite. It improves the morale of the countless thousands of people across the country who, as a measure of devotion and concern and dedication, want to work in these programs to help as many people as possible out of this “airtight cage of poverty.” But they become very discouraged and their morale is indeed ruined when they go to a meeting attended by two or three hundred people and they have dilatory action, disruption, and an effort by a very small minority to take over the meeting. These few dissidents are able to stay until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and all the other people who have already had their morale ruined have left. The result is, we have the control of the community action agency by a very small number who represent no one as much as themselves and their own special interests.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee's bill is a vast improvement on present legislation. I think it will accomplish what this Congress is determined to accomplish, and it shows that we are concerned and we mean further to do something about the poor of this country, so they become a part of the mainstream of American life.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan talked about the mayors as being opposed to this.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill is sponsored by the National League of Cities, which is composed of official delegates representing 14,300 cities. In the telegram it says they recommend that “the institutional structure for the development and administration of local antipoverty programs must, among other things, strengthen general local government.”

The committee amendment to title II is also supported by the National Association of Counties, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders, as well as other groups. Their telegrams read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Reference committee debate on OEO bill section 2.402 of national municipal policy 1968 adopted by official delegates representing 14,300 cities recommends that institutional structure for development and administration of local antipoverty programs must, among other things, “strengthen general local government” and specifically states “to the extent practical, appropriate local governmental units should be designated as the lead agency or should otherwise play a major role in the channeling or approval of projects.”

PATRICK HEALY,  
Executive Director,  
National League of Cities.

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 17, 1967.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the National Association of Counties I should like to express our strong support of Rep. Edith Green's amendment to strengthen the role of elected officials and of State and local governments in the com-

munity action programs of the war on poverty. We feel that such actions would have the maximum effect in accomplishing the programs objective.

BERNARD F. HILLENBRAND,  
Executive Director.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
October 17, 1967.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,  
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors enthusiastically and unanimously support Representative Green's amendment to poverty bill stating Community Action agencies should be States or political subdivision of States with elected governing officials overseeing local poverty agencies. All board members have in the past endorsed desirability of utilizing already established public agencies and institutions to administer poverty funds. Board further believes this would result in more effective and economical use of each tax dollar allocated to poverty program.

FRANK G. BONELLI,  
First District, Chairman.  
KENNETH HAHN,  
Second District.  
ERNEST E. DEBS,  
Third District.  
BURTON W. CHACE,  
Fourth District.  
WARREN M. DORN,  
Fifth District.

TRENTON, N.J.,  
October 17, 1967.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,  
Chairman, House Labor and Education Committee, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

The New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders wishes to express its support of your efforts to expand a decision making role of elected public officials in the operations and financing of programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

JACK LAMPING,  
Secretary, New Jersey Association of  
Chosen Freeholders.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting here patiently, not being a member of the committee, to get some time to speak on this matter. I believe this is the most critical issue before us so far as this legislation is concerned. It is a shame, on a matter of this importance, that we cannot have adequate time to debate.

We have heard many comments made here today about the participation of the poor and about turning these programs over to Tammany Hall and the like. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the issue of Tammany Hall is just a “red herring” brought into the Chamber.

The single most important thing we should be considering is this: we all want to help the poor. We want to get greater participation by the poor. Also, we want to get more of the money in these programs down to the action level. Our complaint for a long time has been with the community action programs because they have not been effective.

Contrary to what some people in this Chamber would have us believe, the Green amendment would make the CAP more effective. It would insure that there would be people serving on the boards of CAP's who are accountable to the voters,



who must produce or suffer the consequences.

If we are ever to make a meaningful dent in the poverty cycle, Mr. Chairman, we must stop treating existing agencies and programs as sacred cows. We must not fear to reevaluate existing programs for to do so would be to abandon our responsibility to the very people we are supposed to be helping. It is for this reason that I support the committee legislation. Without it the CAP's will continue along as they have; with it, there is a great possibility that more of the money will get where it should go, down to the action programs.

Therefore, I suggest that we should support the committee legislation and vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, under the strict limitation of time it is going to be a little difficult to make a point in a minute. Possibly others will ask for an opportunity to yield.

I believe we all know what is in the committee bill. The gentlewoman from Oregon makes a very persuasive case in support of the committee's position to this Member.

I am pretty much in the same position I was in yesterday. I can be had, so to speak, depending upon the weight of the argument. I have listened here intently all afternoon, but I am still confused.

I should like to give the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] or the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] an opportunity now, in succinct and simple form, to state what is the difference between what they are proposing and what is in this committee bill, because if they do not have anything good and substantial to tie to, I am persuaded that what is in the committee bill is good enough for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman who was just in the well, this is now down to whether we are more interested in control or in participation, in control by local elected officials or in participation by the poor.

I am in favor of keeping the language of the original bill. That is what the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] intend to do—to give the poor a real opportunity and not to get so many local elected officials doing some extra-curricular work on the poverty program, assuming they have time and assuming they are favorably disposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER]. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. I believe this would be far better than the committee language in the bill.

I want to make it clear that I believe we should have adopted the language proposed last night. In that proposal we could have reversed the Green amendment in the committee bill if we had any help at all from the Democratic side of the aisle. We had no help from that side. Many of the proponents of this amendment spoke against and voted against the one amendment, offered by me yesterday, that had a chance to pass. That amendment would have preserved the involvement of the poor and the independence of community action boards.

I do feel, at this stage, our last faint hope of reversing the regressive action taken by the committee, which in my opinion would destroy community action, is the Hawkins-Steiger of Wisconsin amendments. Many of us on both sides of the aisle have spoken in favor of this concept. It is a concept that has bipartisan support and is the key to success ultimately in conquering poverty in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I take this time first to clearly indicate that my amendment to the Hawkins amendment is to provide for participation, not to exceed one-third, on local community action boards which would be independent, of local public officials provided they are willing and able to serve.

Let me, if I may, in response to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] simply say this. It seems to me that what we will do if we adopt the Steiger amendment to the Hawkins amendment and the Hawkins amendment is to provide for a partnership between local government and community action as compared to the committee approach, which provides for domination by local government and not a partnership or co-operation. That, in my judgment, would be what would happen if we stay with the committee bill. We will not give the poor and we will not give local government the kind of cooperative effort that is necessary in order to truly get at the root causes of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given

en permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hawkins amendment as amended by the Steiger amendment.

I think there is still a good question that has not been answered as to the effect of the committee bill in requiring that a community action agency, whether it be a State or local community have the power under local law and under the constitution of the State to receive Federal funds and give them to private nonprofit agencies as grantees. I think many State constitutions would prohibit this. I think many characters of municipalities would prohibit this. I do not think this Committee knows how many State or local communities could comply with this requirement of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental question is whether there will be meaningful involvement of the poor in making their own decisions and developing their own programs or whether there will simply be tokenism. The present law, section 202(a), defines a community action program as one "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation" of the poor. The Green amendment incorporated in the committee, the bill strikes out that definitive language and defines a community action agency in section 210 as a State or political subdivision. That is the basic difference: Whether the poor will be involved and participate to the maximum feasible event or whether the program will be dominated and controlled by the local political subdivision.

Community action has obviously disturbed the status quo to such an extent that the big city machines and the southern sheriffs have found common cause. It is a sad spectacle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I had intended, if there were more time, to engage in a colloquy with someone on the committee relative to another point of section 211 which has not been faced. This is the question of the difference between an administrative board and a governing board. If you look carefully at the language in section 211(a), you will see that if a State or a political subdivision is involved it will only administer its program through each board while it remains the policymaker. If you look further in the same subparagraph, you find something else. If a private or public nonprofit agency is designated by a State or political subdivision, then there is in fact a governing board. I submit to this committee that only in the second event of a designated agency are you dealing with a board with real effective power. In the first instance of the State or political subdivision it will be a board charged with administrative responsibility.



ities, but not policymaking authority. I urge adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment to the committee bill in this instance. I think it is very necessary for us to bring in local officials to help to run these programs. If we cannot have trust in the local officials who are responsible to the people in that area through the ballot, then certainly we cannot turn these programs over to groups who have no responsibility at all to the electorate.

I would urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK].

(Mr. SLACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California and in support of the committee position.

The success of the community action program is predominant in the areas of this country where the program has been in the hands of responsible elected public officials. On the other hand, the program has been criticized, and rightfully so, in those areas where an accounting is only made to the OEO auditors.

The language in the committee bill brings responsibility into this program, I therefore urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct one statement that the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon made when the gentlewoman stated that as many Republicans on the Committee on Education and Labor voted for the amendment as did members of the Democrat Party.

Mr. Chairman, only four members of the Republican Party voted for her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the main difference between the committee bill and the Hawkins amendment as amended by the Steiger amendment is this: that in the committee bill the political subdivision can choose to be the community action agency. On the other hand, they can designate a public or private nonprofit agency as the community action agency if they do not wish to be the community action agency themselves. But in so doing, they not only appoint their own officials, but they can appoint the representatives of education, representatives of labor, representatives of welfare and representatives of business or other groups to serve thereon.

Also, public officials can appoint, as I read the committee bill, representatives of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, in the Hawkins amendment, and in the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER], the community action agencies would be governed in all cases by a board made up of three groups—that is, made up of public officials, and they would appoint their own members made up of representatives of education, business, labor, religious, welfare, and other groups, as well as the third group representatives of the poor, at least one-third to be chosen by the members of the neighborhood involved; that is, chosen by the poor. The second group, the representatives of the private interested groups, would also select their own representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this is the real basic difference between the language of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and the language as contained in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee language.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon is correct because about as many Republicans voted for her amendment as voted against her amendment. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the vote was 5 to 4. So, there were just about as many on one side voting for as there were voting against.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is a bipartisan issue.

The issue is whether or not we are going to bring responsibility into the operation of this program. If we adopt the Hawkins amendment—and I do not care about the Steiger amendment since it is just like adding an eyedropper of water to a gallon of soup, which does not mean anything in this stew because the proposed amendment throws responsibility out the window.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, those of us who are for responsible administration of the program, no matter on which side of the aisle one sits, will vote against the Hawkins amendment and vote for the committee bill and the language as proposed by the Green amendment which is now in the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of the Committee to vote against the Hawkins amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I plead for the language as contained in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who rises to be parsimonious one day toward the poor and to be paternalistic toward the poor the next day. I have been in the vanguard of the program since its infancy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this program and in support of the committee language.

Mr. Chairman, language represents the intent of the Congress when this bill was originally passed. I was for this bill then and now. I speak for and in support of the fact that when this concept was brought to this committee, it was under the auspices of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. Chairman, let it be remembered that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] was the author of this provision and he never intended that there be such a construction as the proponents of this amendment place upon it.

Mr. Chairman, in the manner in which this program has been operated, the greater part of the money involved has not been going to the poor. That is why we seek to give and entrust to responsible officials, and leads in the communities, and the eligible poor the duty to see that the primary portion of this money goes to the poor and does not go into the cost of high-level administration in a disproportionate fashion. This new language in the committee bill should truly be called the full community involvement amendment. Instead of a system where a small percentage of the poor gain control of all the Federal resources for the poor, we provide that all the strength and leadership of the region and the poor themselves will plan and work together for maximum effect. The present arrangement has permitted chaos which has caused fractionation in great cities. In New York, Negroes have been pitted against Puerto Ricans and vice versa. This must end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the Steiger amendment, and to the Hawkins amendment. We are strengthening the effectiveness of community action agencies, we are strengthening the hand of the poor, and we are going to bring about better, bona fide representation on the part of the poor through the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members of this body to support the committee bill, and I will do my best in conference along with the conferees to see that we hold this amendment in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 34, noes 142.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAWKINS) there were—ayes 57, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.



AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF  
NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 196, line 19, after "services" strike out "except that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution shall be in cash" and insert a period after "services".

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple in character. It would eliminate the requirement in the committee bill that one-half of the non-Federal contribution to community action funding—amounting to 10 percent of the total funding—be made in cash rather than in kind.

Under the present law the local share may be "in cash, or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

The amendment I offer along with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] would retain the present language of the statute.

I need not, I think, belabor here on the floor today the reason for this amendment. To put it bluntly, the imposition of a 10-percent cash requirement will work a very serious—and in some cases a fatal—hardship on many community action agencies throughout the country.

As I indicated during the debate yesterday, many communities do not have the cash resources, and sadly, some do not have public officials willing to obligate new tax funds for these purposes.

The community action concept has breathed new life into many urban, suburban, and rural areas which were stagnating in despair and hopelessness.

Let us not underestimate the value of contributions made in kind to the community action program. Donated buses, classrooms, materials, food, and perhaps most important, countless hours of work by volunteers dedicated to the service of humanity have enriched the effectiveness of community action throughout the Nation. The volunteers have, in many cases, made possible the existence of community action programs, and have contributed much toward improving the lot of the destitute and the disadvantaged and toward brightening their future.

Voluntary support of the community action program is basic to the spirit of innovation. The cash requirement would seriously cripple this effort as the work of volunteers is credited as an in-kind contribution. It would curtail much of the effective work of the YMCA's, the church groups, religious organizations and other groups. I feel very strongly that we should remove this cash requirement and make it possible for the community action programs to continue and with full voluntary participation.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I heartily support the amendment offered by the gentleman. The amendment would eliminate severe injustices which strike hardest the community action programs that can least afford it.

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. I believe we ought not to take too much time on this particular amendment, but I think we ought to know one thing. Under present law there is a provision for a 10-percent contribution in kind. The committee felt that we ought to keep the 10 percent in kind and add a provision for 10 percent in cash. However, the waiverability clause is in the Act, and if a community or a sponsoring agency, a nonprofit organization such as a YMCA, or any of the well-known service groups that would sponsor a project would act under the waiverability clause, that agency would not have to contribute anything toward the program either in kind or in cash.

Mr. REID of New York. I would say to the gentleman that I have discussed this very point with the Office of Economic Opportunity. They tell me that there is not a clear waiver in the present language, and that the waiver provision which some may think is there would not be effective.

I would say, in addition, that even if there were a waiver provision in the statute, it would mean that in each case a judgment must be made. We still have something called the Bureau of the Budget in Washington.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] for yielding. I support his amendment to repeal the Gibbons amendment requiring that 50 percent of the local contribution of 20 percent be cash. That requirement would jeopardize many fine programs in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I have offered an amendment which is somewhat similar to the one offered by the gentleman from New York, but which went even beyond this amendment. Many cities, counties, and other political subdivisions throughout the country cannot afford even the 10 percent, whether in cash or kind. So I would have made it 20 percent that could be contributed in kind.

I certainly wish to concur in the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID]. I would like to point out that in those cities or those school districts that actually encompass the poorest areas of our country that they would be the ones who could least afford even the 10 percent.

It is to these that I think we direct this amendment. I would not hesitate to ask the city of Los Angeles, for example, to put up 10 percent. I think it would be an excellent thing. But I believe by requiring them to do it, I would severely handicap some small hamlet or some

small village in some other area that cannot afford this but which has poor people in it. For example, may I say the school district of Los Angeles, the second largest throughout the world, could, I believe, afford this 10 percent, but just a few miles away, if I may use another example, is the Willowbrooks district, which has 90 percent poor people in it, and they cannot afford this 10 percent. So we are crippling those who are the neediest.

In addition to that I would point out even if municipalities or counties can afford this, the effect of this amendment in the committee bill goes beyond these and to those private nonprofit organizations that have volunteered their services, such as the YMCA and the YWCA, and church groups operating Headstart projects, and others. In my area, for example, there is a group now acting as foster grandparents to the mentally retarded. To ask them to put up 10 percent in cash, I think, is certainly a rather ridiculous situation.

It may be true that the Director can waive this provision. This is the Director that many of us have already tried to indict as not being competent in many instances already, and now we want to pass on to him this additional administrative responsibility. I think he can do a good job, but I think he would find certainly it is a hopeless situation to try to judge which areas are entitled to this waiver and which are not.

I believe this House should not abdicate this responsibility to an official in the executive branch. I believe the amendment, therefore, is an excellent one. I think it removes what I believe to be an almost unbearable barrier to the operation of community action agencies and particularly those that are indigenous, those that are offering volunteer services, but which cannot possibly put up the cash.

Also, I would like to point out the legal services program which today is using cut-rate figures in employing many lawyers throughout the country, would have to put up 10 percent, so we are crippling, in my opinion this and many other fine organizations which have volunteered their services in the war on poverty. Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the gentleman from California and support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID]. There is no question as has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York, that it would cripple and handicap to a great extent the voluntary agencies that have been and desire to be involved in the program—YWCA.

As many Members know, these voluntary agencies operate on a tight budget. Much of their funds come from Givers and United Funds. These agencies like the YMCA's, YWCA's and many similar groups have difficulty with their budgets. This section of this bill providing for a 10-percent cash contribution would impair the activity of agencies that can



offer and have offered much to the poverty programs. I support Mr. REID's amendment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. I support this amendment and hope it is passed.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 196, line 20, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, however, That the Director may waive all or part of such cash requirement in situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship."

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I feel the Reid of New York amendment goes too far in eliminating the 10-percent-cash requirement. There are many instances in which the community ought to put up 10 percent cash. Anybody who can ought to do it. It is good for them to exert some effort in raising money for programs they believe in.

One has only to look at the successful programs—like Dr. Leon Sullivan's OIC in Philadelphia and the bootstrap project in Los Angeles—to know that people can raise money locally and ought to.

There are some ongoing programs where the 10-percent-cash requirement would be an unnecessary hardship—would probably eliminate a program—if there were hard and fast use of this requirement. My amendment would prevent that from happening.

There is a provision in the law for the Director not to exact the full 20 percent in cash or in kind, but that comes before the requirement for one-half non-Federal contribution in cash.

I feel that my amendment would give the latitude to the Director to permit any programs to continue if they could not raise the cash. There should be pressure on the local communities, where possible, to raise 10 percent of the money.

If programs are as good as all the letters flooding in the past week and a half say they are, they ought to be able to shell out some money of their own.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I am the author, as the gentleman knows, of this requirement that there be at least 10 percent cash in the law. As the author of that provision, I intended for it to read so that it would be waivable.

I have discussed the matter with the Office of Economic Opportunity. They

said they were opposed to my amendment but they thought it was waivable. They just did not want to do it, anyway.

I have no objection, speaking as an individual, to the substitute offered by the gentleman. As the author of the original language in the bill, I would accept the gentleman's substitute as a better statement of what I intended to do at that time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, rather than take more time, I yield back the remainder of my time so that we can get on to a vote.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

I congratulate the gentleman from New York on his amendment. I believe it is much more persuasive and clear than the substitute.

Just as we have poor people, we have poor cities. It would be just as ridiculous to ask a poor city to pay for an anti-poverty program as it would be to ask the parents of a child in the Headstart program to pay his share of the expense.

Tax rates are high in cities. If we saddle this type of additional cost on them they will get higher. People are running to the suburbs now. It is ironic that the worse conditions are in a community, the higher taxes rise. Suburban communities which do not have crushing health problems, crime problems and welfare problems also have the attraction of lower taxes.

I do not believe this Congress should do anything to encourage the flight to the suburbs by imposing additional taxes on the people of the municipalities because the exodus to suburbia compounds and aggravates the problems of our teeming cities.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], although laudable in its intent, is so vague that the term "unnecessary hardship" would just be impossible to define. I urge support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful comments in support of the amendment.

I assume that the State of New Jersey is similar to the State of New York. The New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers has indicated that retaining a cash requirement "will make it almost impossible for new programs to get started because many low-income communities, where the need is greatest, were only able to afford these programs because of the 10-percent contribution in 'kind.'"

The point the gentleman makes is correct. I do not believe that a waiver provision will meet the problem.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr.

Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. I rise in support of the entire bill, and at this point to express my approval of the Reid amendment. There are so many communities with effective programs which cannot afford to provide cash, and I believe the present requirement of contributions in kind is very effective. I hope that the Reid amendment will prevail, and that we may overwhelmingly approve this bill. This program has been very beneficial to the people of West Virginia and the Nation.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman.

I should just like to emphasize in cities where there are many poor there are higher tax rates because there are health problems, crime problems, and housing problems.

In addition to this, we do not want to impose the burden of the cost of an anti-poverty program.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself also with the remarks made by the gentleman in the well in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. Chairman, I rise today representing the people of my district in general support of the antipoverty bill, even though the committee substitute does not meet with my approval in all things.

Mr. Chairman, had I been a member of the Labor and Education Committee which heard this bill, I would not have changed some of the provisions which were contained in the Senate bill. I am referring particularly to the increase to 20-percent involvement by local units, out of which 10-percent participation must be in cash. This provision contained in the committee substitute will discriminate against communities and areas not as economically blessed as some others but who wish to fight the battle against poverty. And certainly, these are the areas to be especially recognized.

My remarks, Mr. Chairman, are in response to pleas from my district. I am sure that I am not the only one who has received a large volume of mail on this subject.

But, Mr. Chairman, the large majority of the mail I have received this past week—pleading with the Congress to pass an effective antipoverty bill—is from persons I know to be responsible citizens of their communities.

In several recent trips back to my district, I have talked to many constituents who echo these sentiments and ask that local communities continue to be allowed to provide "in kind" shares for their participation in the war on poverty.

These are persons from all walks of life—churchmen, community action workers, elected officials, and those living in the neighborhoods—where we have firm hopes that the Office of Economic Opportunity will be able to provide a ray



of light into the damp darkness of a now futureless life.

I am constantly reminded by school and public officials, as well as interested private citizens, of their continuing efforts to provide more services to the disadvantaged in their communities and of the increasing drain on city and county funds for worthwhile programs.

One after the other, they tell me that inclusion of the provision doubling the original contribution rate and requiring that one-half be in cash—contained in subsection (d) of section 223 under title II—would simply mean that many worthwhile programs funded principally by OEO would have to shut down.

Many such projects—including Headstart, Upward Bound, and Neighborhood Youth Corps—are among the most valuable that OEO and the communities themselves have produced.

Discontinuance of such programs would in many cases be a tragedy and I would be remiss in my duties if I did not make known the wishes of my constituents at this time.

It is for this reason that I rise in support of this amendment which does away with the requirement that one-half of the local contribution be in cash.

Mr. Chairman, with all my heart I wish the people of my district were less in need of this program. But the facts, which I cannot ignore, show that in my hometown alone, the jobless ratio to the total labor force stands at 8.4 percent, which is double the national average.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the shiftless and lazy or the disinterested—these are men and women who are not only willing to work but who have asked for employment—human beings asking for a chance.

I cannot turn my back on them and I cannot conceive that any of the Members of the House can ignore them or the needs of other disadvantaged people throughout the Nation.

While the provisions of the present act have, in many respects which I have mentioned, brought many victories in the battle against poverty, the war has not yet been won.

Even though there has been much progress made, much is left to be desired and to be achieved in the future.

We are pointedly reminded by the Office of Economic Opportunity that many American cities with effective community action programs have escaped destructive riots; that the number of poor in our country has decreased in the last year; that the poor are becoming more aware each day of how the American system works, of how they can equip themselves to rise above the poverty level.

If we fail to do our own part by failing to pass a constructive antipoverty bill, not only the poor will suffer. All of us will have to live in a country worsened by the lack of positive contribution by a large segment of our population, who unless given the tools which will enable them to help themselves, will continue to be denied active participation in the economic and social structure of our country.

(Mr. KAZEN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. JOELSON asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and cannot too strongly urge its adoption. I have a similar amendment at the desk. I have placed in the RECORD for the information of the committee a number of letters on this question. I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the following letters I have received which clearly point to the damage which will result unless we adopt the Reid amendment.

Sister M. Bernetta of the School Sisters of Notre Dame in Mequon, Wis., wrote in part as follows:

SCHOOL SISTERS OF NOTRE DAME,  
Mequon, Wis., November 11, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: Since the beginning of the Head Start program, the School Sisters of Notre Dame have been involved as directors, teachers, volunteers, and in Milwaukee as the sponsoring agency of Head Start which has helped over 700 disadvantaged young children and their families. We are a teaching congregation and have been thrilled by the wonderful things Head Start has done for the children educationally, socially, and emotionally. We teach in the Inner City schools and know already what this program has meant to the further education of these children.

The Amendments to S. 2388 cause us particular concern, especially the *local Agency Amendment*. If the Amendment passes, we, as a sponsoring agency of Head Start would have to furnish 10% in cash toward the Head Start program which we operate. Currently, this would mean \$15,000.00. We who are struggling already to stay within the Inner City so that the ghetto children will have quality education, could never contribute such an amount, and the parishes which donate rooms and facilities could never do so either. This demand for 10% from the sponsoring agency would kill the Head Start program run by the Sisters, and deny hundreds of children the rich educational and cultural experiences they are entitled to.

We are counting on you, Mr. Steiger, to do all in your power to help these poor minority groups who have no one to speak for them.

Very sincerely yours,

Sister M. BERNETTA, SSND.

Sister Marie LeClerc, director of Notre Dame Headstart in Milwaukee, sent a telegram from which I quote the following:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
November 14, 1967.

Representative WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Notre Dame Headstart has cared for over 700 children. Vote against amendments. Especially 10 percent cash contribution.

Sister MARIE LECLEERC,  
Director, Notre Dame Headstart.

Carol Edwards also wrote to me and said in part:

WAUWATOSA, WIS.,  
November 12, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I wish to urge your strong support for the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs.

As a teacher for Head Start in the inner core of Milwaukee, I have become more and more aware of the need for Head Start and other poverty programs, and have begun to realize that only if these programs are expanded and intensified with follow-through provided, can we begin to dissolve the crisis which exists in most of our urban areas and to unify our country and build its strength. As a poverty worker, I believe that I, along with other poverty workers, am helping the poor to help themselves and that these people cannot escape their problems without this kind of help. Only when one comes in direct contact with the impoverished can one begin to understand the hopelessness of the problems which poverty generates and the inability to escape without help and active encouragement.

The reaction from parents as well as volunteers and workers outside the core that I have received in regard to Head Start has been one of recognition of the benefits of the program for all concerned, and of the need for this program to continue, be expanded, and followed through. Therefore I am particularly concerned that the measure which provides that at least one-half of the 20% nonfederal share of Head Start funds be in cash be *defeated*. While the poor are more than willing usually to contribute time and energy, it is logical to assume that they have not the money to contribute to the program.

Sincerely,

CAROL EDWARDS.

There can be little question that the letters I have received reflect the deep concern that many have about the 10 percent cash requirement. I do feel that many worthwhile projects would be crippled.

There are two further letters which I would call to the attention of the Committee which speaks directly to this matter in words which deserve consideration.

In part they say:

NOVEMBER 12, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: The crisis that the city of Milwaukee is facing right now is very much of my concern. I urge your support for the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs. I am particularly concerned with the provision that at least one-half of the 20% non-federal share must be in cash. This is an Anti-Poverty Program, you have the money, but we don't have that 10% cash. I urge you to eliminate this 10% cash of local funding.

Please use your vote and influence to defeat this provision and other similar to these, that will destroy our War on Poverty.

Mrs. LUZ JONES.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., November 12, 1967.  
Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The most important one is the provision that at least one-half of the 20% non-federal share must be in cash. My husband and I feel this is grossly unfair, because of it being a anti-poverty we the poor people need it. Please us your vote and influence to defeat these provisions.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD PACKARD.



While the adoption of the Quie substitute amendment would be an improvement over the present committee bill I hope it is not adopted so that the Reid amendment can be adopted.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Reid of New York amendment and in opposition to the Quie substitute. The problem of financing by the cities is critical. Certainly the Reid of New York amendment will assist the cities in areas where they need it. The requirements of the Quie amendment may be invoked in cities where it should not be and can cause a loss of programs in these cities.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at a quarter to 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped we could dispose of this matter long before this. As I stated in my colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], I proposed this proposal that there be a 10-percent cash contribution on these programs. I am surprised so much opposition has developed toward it, because there was so little controversy in the committee, but I realize how things change. I do not use that as an argument as to the worth or the lack of worth of it. Let me say there are many of us in the Congress who have been trying to bring to all of the programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity a greater degree of responsibility and of participation. There are some of us who have a strategy to win the war on poverty. It is not just to win a bill or to help a particular community out of a tight spot that they are in. Our strategy is to get involvement not only of the poor and of the welfare agencies public and private around the Nation but to involve all of the people in this. I have found from long experience one of the ways to get involvement of all the people is to ask them to put some of their hard-earned cash on the line. I am as aware as everyone else is of the problems of our cities. I do not want to impose any more problems on them, but in every Federal aid program we have we require as much as 66⅔ percent matching. We require as much as 50-percent matching in others. Even on the

Federal Interstate System we require 10-percent matching by the States. This has to be in cash because you have to acquire rights-of-way and things of that sort. So this is in keeping with the great tradition of this country to have participation by the communities in the programs and bring responsibility into the program. That is the purpose of my proposal and that is the purpose of the language that the committee supported here.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I think the gentleman has already responded to the comment I wanted to make. Is it not true, generally speaking, that the best way to get active and interested and efficient operation is to have participation in money on the part of the people you seek to bring into a program?

And, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Florida has already answered that question in the affirmative. I agree with the gentleman that this would be calculated on the basis that if the local people have a financial stake, they would desire to bring about more responsibility.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I discussed my proposed amendment with representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity before I presented it. I told them what I intended to do. I did not receive any direct rebuff from them as to my proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we can bring more responsibility into this program by supporting the committee bill. It is my opinion that the Quie amendment does exactly what I intended to do, and that is to allow the citizens and the people who are involved in this program in cases of hardship to get out of it.

That was my intention when I discussed this matter with the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have not received any rebuff from them and, therefore, I am surprised that the representatives of that Office told the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] what they told him.

However, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the language in the bill which I presented is to bring more responsibility into the operations of this program and not to place a heavy burden upon those who do not have the wherewithal with which to cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, the language does not come into conflict with the great tradition which we have established in this Congress to the effect that Federal funding of 100 percent of the cost of programs is a very dangerous thing, because it really establishes a group of Federal enclaves around the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Reid amendment which would eliminate the 10-percent cash requirement under section 223(c).

Mr. Chairman, the present law increases the local contribution from 10 to 20 percent after fiscal year 1967. Now the committee bill requires that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution be in cash. This is known as the Gibbons amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this provision will work an undue hardship not only upon various communities throughout the country, but upon private nonprofit community action agencies. This cash requirement would cause these agencies to depend upon local public funds, which might generate legal complications, or cause the poor to try to raise the funds. How ironic to ask the Nation's poor to foot 10 percent of the bill in cash. If the money were available through the poor, we might not need an antipoverty program.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has pointed out to me the probable results of the 10-percent cash requirement. OEO has said, in fact, that it would result in closing down many worthwhile programs. They suggest that in the South, 101 local community action agencies might not be able to operate; in New England, 61 agencies might not be able to operate; in Pennsylvania, 16 agencies might not be able to operate.

St. Louis, which has one of the most effective community action programs, would have to raise nearly \$1 million from the community of poor people, or drastically cut back its operations—to the extent of \$10 for every \$1 that could not be raised locally.

In Kansas, where a State law prohibits spending public money for private programs, the poor would have to raise the money themselves, or shut down the program altogether. In Minnesota, State law prohibits citizens of one county from spending the tax revenues of citizens of other counties. Multicounty programs would therefore, be jeopardized by this requirement.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is that the 10-percent cash requirement would be even more detrimental to the rural communities than to the big cities, because those communities are often not able to raise the money.

This requirement will create hardship and confusion. The community action program needs incentives—not obstacles—if it is to succeed.

The defeat of the Hawkins amendment earlier this afternoon carried a message to the Nation's poor, in effect saying, "City hall will be in charge of these programs." At the same time let us not impose an additional burden on the poor by telling them that they have to put up 10 percent of the cash.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. RYAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would merely add that in many cases this requirement would involve new tax money, and some communities could not or might not wish to raise new tax money. We are dealing with community action, working with the poor and destitute, much of it through voluntary help, and if we retain the cash requirement there is no question but this would cripple the efforts of the YMCA, the church groups, and all other volunteer agencies that are making community action a reality.

Again I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] and against the substitute of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. The reasons I advance are substantially different from those heretofore given. The concern up to now has been the effect of the provision in the committee bill that one-half of the non-Federal contribution must be in cash will have upon urban areas. I submit we must look to the effect a cash non-Federal contribution will have upon the rural areas.

There is no way I know under this title of the bill a multicounty arrangement can be avoided. That means three or four or perhaps five or six counties in the rural areas must band together. With this number of counties it is quite possible one of them may have already reached its constitutional limitation against the levy of any larger county tax. If this situation is true, it means this particular county has no way to produce its cash contribution.

If the stipulation which was written into the bill by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is not taken out, I think it is a fair statement to say there will not merely be some impairment or reduction of community action programs in the rural areas but it may well mean the complete elimination of our rural programs. To put the matter in stronger language the requirement that at least one-half of non-Federal contribution be in cash will mean the death of the community action programs outside the urban areas.

In larger counties or in larger cities, there is perhaps no problem to raise a large cash contribution. There is a danger that even in the metropolitan and suburban areas this large cash contribution could mean the elimination of activity by such nonprofit organizations as the YMCA and YWCA. But it is an altogether different story in the rural areas. It simply means the end of the program.

I have seriously considered support of this bill this year if the amount authorized is not increased over last year's figures. But I must say in all candor I cannot support a bill which sets up stipu-

lations and provisions that further increases the already existing imbalance between the urban and rural programs.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about efforts to arrest the trend of migration of population from the rural areas to the cities. Various solutions have been proposed. Many different approaches have been suggested.

One has been to offer tax incentives for industry to locate in rural areas. Several different plans have been advanced. But may I say to my friends from the big cities that there may not be enough money in the world to solve the problems of the big cities through the model cities program and the rent subsidies plan and all the other proposals advanced to help our cities, because even if some of the slums are rebuilt and some people re-located the vacuum will be refilled by those thousands coming all the time from the rural areas to the cities. About the only way we can make true progress to solve this problem is to make it desirable for the rural population to stay in the rural areas.

Rural community action programs if they are not starved can very likely be of some help.

But if we do not knock out the requirement for one-half of the non-Federal contribution to be in cash we can look for the early death of the program in the rural areas.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would say that I believe he is exactly right.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if the Reid amendment is adopted you are saying to every community that they do not have to put up any cash, only participate in kind, not cash.

Mr. Chairman, there are some communities who are capable of putting up cash, so then why should they not put it up? There are some counties who, if they wanted to dig down with a little effort they could come up with the cash, so why should they not put up the cash? The Federal Government is \$29 billion in the red for this year, and it is going further into the red all the time. Many communities are not as hard-pressed as the Federal Government. My amendment says that if it is impossible for the community to provide any of the cash, however, then the Secretary can waive part of the local cash requirement, or all of it. This is the opportunity for him to permit all the existing programs to continue, even if they cannot find the money locally. But if they can find the money locally, then why should they not put it up? This will make this program go further, this will permit the Director to be able to include some additional

programs that he would not otherwise be able to fund.

I would suggest to the Members to stop and think a little bit, these programs are supposed to be extremely worthwhile for each of the communities. Since they are so worthwhile, then why should they not pay something for the programs? If they are really interested in their programs they will put in the money if they can find it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Let me ask the gentleman this: Based on the eloquence of the gentleman's comments, there may be support for this amendment, but what happens in the budgetary process, if the Office of Economic Opportunity has waived this requirement in certain localities, the 10-percent requirement, and as the gentleman knows each community action agency program comes up for rebudgeting and refinancing over a period of time, and if we adopt your amendment, the communities that come up first may have their 10-percent requirement waived, but the ones that come up later in the year may be in trouble when the budgetary situation is tight and the Bureau of the Budget may not let the OEO waive the 10-percent cash requirement—they may have as much need as the first ones that were waived. How are we going to handle this under your amendment?

Mr. QUIE. It has always been the case, as I have observed in the operation of OEO, that they budget their money as they go along. In fact, they do not use up all their money at the end of the year. Last year, as you know, we appropriated about \$1,687,000,000, and at the end of the fiscal year this total amount was not used up. If I recall correctly, that figure was something a little less than \$1,600,000,000. So there is latitude there for the OEO to operate. Section 616 gives the Director flexibility in the use of the money between titles of this act. The decision to waive the cash requirement comes at the time a contract is written for each community action agency. This would be no different than the problems which face the Director when he waives the in-kind requirement.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Can the gentleman tell me how in the world the OEO is going to administer or define such a vague term as "unnecessary hardship"?

Mr. QUIE. I used that term because the bill already carries this same language in another subsection of the section to be amended, and so if he can define "unnecessary hardship" in another subsection of the bill, I figure he has the competence to define it in this subsection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. If communities can afford to make a cash participation of 10 percent, they certainly should do so. However, if communities cannot make a



cash participation without undue hardship, they should not be excluded from the program.

In the event the Quie substitute fails, then I urge passage of the Reid amendment which is vitally important for many, many communities that would find it impossible to participate, for they would have no means whatever to fund the required 10 percent in cash. In my own State of Alaska, the Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut village communities could not possibly find the means necessary to fund the 10-percent cash requirement for the community action program. The net result is that the extremely poor communities are too poverty stricken to participate in this portion of the poverty program. Why require cash from the extremely disadvantaged before they can be helped? It is indeed a sad commentary when the poor are too poor to be aided. Communities can be just as destitute as individuals, for the communities are but collections of individuals.

There are many ways to kill a program without voting against it, and the proposal of the committee to compel a cash participation is one way to kill it for the poorest, most needy communities in the Nation.

I most strongly urge my colleagues to support the Quie substitute for the Reid amendment, and in the event of its failure, then I most strongly urge that my colleagues overwhelmingly support adoption of the Reid amendment. This is a vitally important vote in support of the poorest of all the communities that need help under the poverty program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think we are ready to vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 66, noes 89.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REID of New York and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. PERKINS. For a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to section 103 close at 4 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that all debate on all amendments to section 103 close at 4 o'clock?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee. I was on my feet. The Chair recognized me, and I did not yield for a unanimous-consent request on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked the gentleman for what purpose he rose.

Mr. GURNEY. And I said to offer an amendment, and I was recognized for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not recognized the gentleman from Florida at that point.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GURNEY: On page 188, after line 18, insert:

"No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this part) shall be utilized (A) to organize or assist in organizing any unlawful demonstration, or civil disturbance, or (B) for the defense of any person charged with participating therein or with the commission of a crime committed in the course thereof, if such person organized or assisted in organizing any such demonstration, or civil disturbance."

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 20 minutes after 3; that is, in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] is recognized.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do is to prohibit the too eager legal beavers in the OEO program from defending people charged with participating in disturbances if they are leaders in these disturbances, and also in helping organize civil disturbances.

Last summer we observed specific instances where this occurred. Actually, there were several in the city of Newark, the lawyers of the Newark legal service

project financed by OEO actually requested complaints be filed against two police officers. They also participated in a suit which was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union in which it was requested that the Federal courts take over and operate the Newark Police Department.

I do not know anything about the Newark Police Department, but I do not believe that the Legal Services Department of the OEO was intended by Congress to participate in this kind of business. My amendment would prevent this.

Then there was an example in New York that I should like to point out. The scene here was the great Cathedral of St. Patrick in New York City. Earlier this year a group of 23 demonstrators at a Sunday morning mass arose in the church and attacked the foreign policy of this country in Vietnam, the third largest war in our history. Twenty-three of these people were arrested, and 10 of them later were defended by the legal services project of OEO on the lower East Side.

As a matter of fact, most of these 10 people were college graduates, and only one was unemployed. They were hardly the kind of poor people intended to be defended by this legislation, even if what they did had not been as reprehensible as it was.

In testimony and from newspaper reports this year, Sargent Shriver and Earl Johnson, the director of the legal services program, have admitted that OEO financed legal services have been involved and used by people arrested in demonstrations. It seems to me that this was not what Congress intended when we passed this legal services section of the act.

We did want to help the poor and needy who were not able to secure legal counsel, but not in riots and demonstrations.

There is another thing I want to point out, because I believe it is very important. The amendment is worded carefully. It is not intended to strike out against all the poor people who may get caught up in a riot and demonstration. I am giving them the benefit of the doubt, that they could be innocent, or misguided, might not be able to employ counsel, and it is possible that this Legal Services Division ought to be used in that respect. I am leaning over backwards to protect the poor.

What I am aiming at are the leaders involved in these kinds of things, who organize the riots and demonstrations, to cover both the lawyers employed in the Legal Services project and those whom they are defending through Legal Services project.

It seems to me Congress never intended this be done, and that the House could well amend the act by adopting my amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Does not the gentleman believe that anyone charged with the commission of a crime is entitled to legal representation and counsel and entitled



to present his defense, and not to be judged before a trial? This amendment would deny basic constitutional guarantees.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not yield further, but I will answer the gentleman's question.

It is not a question of prejudging a defendant. What we are talking about here is what Congress intended to be done through this legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very noteworthy what the gentleman from Florida said. He said the purpose of this amendment was not to strike down the rights of all the poor. I might add it was just meant to strike down the rights of the poor people who make mistakes. I would like to ask him what he defines as a civil disturbance. We have many crimes which are civil disturbances, which are not riots or demonstrations, and which do not come under these categories. This amendment would automatically take the right to counsel or to legal services counsel from those people who might be tried for civil disturbance.

I say further, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment goes much too far in some instances, and it might even deprive the right to counsel or to legal services counsel to those people who try to stop a riot or civil disturbance or a demonstration because in there he says "or anyone involved in such a civil disturbance or riot." I suggest this amendment is very mischievous, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that everyone will vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLNBORN].

(Mr. ERLNBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very mysterious one. It is very difficult to comprehend its exact meaning. As I read it, it is unconstitutional, because it does not afford equal protection of the law. I do not have the time to expand on that argument. I hope the amendment will be voted down, because I believe you are treating the poor quite differently than you are treating the rich. The person who might be rich and who would head or organize this demonstration would have the means to retain counsel, but the poor and indigent individual, if he heads up this organization or heads this procession is without the right to counsel because he does not have the means to hire one. In that sense you have a differentiation

made between the rich and the poor. Thus a right is accorded one but denied another. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is unconstitutional. Furthermore, we have a statute already which accords to the indigent the right in criminal cases to have counsel assigned by the court. It is difficult to apprehend the effect of this amendment upon the statute which we passed some months ago. Which prevails? I do not know. I do not suppose the author of the amendment knows.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out all of these constitutional arguments made here on the floor of the House are very fine, but what we are doing is simply putting some guidelines in the bill so that when the lawyers in a legal services project in the communities in which we live have come before them one of these indigent people who may be participating or may have been participating in organizing a riot, actually what they are doing to do is sit down and ask the facts and circumstances about what happened and use these guidelines to decide whether they should defend them or not. That is all we are doing here. It seems to me a very sound and practical thing to do. We do not have to get involved in a lot of legal rigmarole about constitutional law here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to close debate.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GURNEY) there were—ayes 75, noes 59.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GURNEY and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request, but before doing so I would like to find out how many amendments to section 103 are at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there are 19 amendments at the desk.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on amendments to section 103 and all amendments thereto close at 5 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to section 103 and all amendments thereto close at 5 p.m.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand there are 19 amendments at the desk with reference to section 103?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all amendments to section 103 and all amendments thereto close at 5:15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. QUIE.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 87.

So the motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANDALL

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: On page 202, line 11, delete the period and insert a comma, and add the following: "(7) persons receiving minimum social security benefits or special benefits for the uninsured."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would hope there would be no controversy concerning this amendment. It simply adds a seventh criteria to the six that are enumerated on page 202 of the bill under section 241. Six guidelines are enumerated to help the Director set up rural programs—such as low-income families, incidence of unemployment, welfare recipients, school dropouts, and military rejects. My seventh guideline would consider the aging—that is those who receive only minimum social security benefits or those over 72 who receive special benefits for the uninsured.

It is my judgment that this bill, S. 2388, can be improved by the adoption of this added criteria, which should help thousands and perhaps millions of elderly men and women in our rural areas from coast to coast who live at or below the poverty level in the midst of our unprecedented affluence.

I am sure we all agree that the Headstart project has been accepted. Also some of the Job Corps programs. But for some unexplained reason OEO programs to date seem to reflect a curious bias against the elderly. We have had prosperity in this country, and economic progress. Our standards of living have been raised to unprecedented heights for the majority of Americans, but this has worked in reverse for the elderly.

One of the classes of Americans that are actually worse off now than they were when this unprecedented and uninterrupted prosperity began back in 1961 are the elderly. Secretary Gardner of HEW estimates that there are in this country nearly nine million men and women 65 years of age or over who meet the established criteria for being poor or in poverty. One of the tragic things about



our country is that old age too often means financial hardship. There is a slowing of the physiological responses that comes with aging. There are other things that go on in the minds and physiology of elderly people. Along with this slowing of their physiology comes the shock of transition from productive work to retirement, and this is often accompanied by the feeling of having no place in our youth-oriented society.

To the praise of our committee, the bill that is reported does aim to help in this tragic and even pitiful predicament by providing job training and employment opportunities for these able-bodied elderly who want gainful employment.

This is done under section 126 for the elderly in general, but please note it is without regard to the imbalance between urban and rural. My amendment by adding a new criteria to section 241 would place emphasis on the elderly who live in rural districts. There are various social agencies that keep check and a sort of surveillance over some of the elderly in the urban areas. There are even some job training and employment opportunities for those able-bodied elderly who want employment in the urban areas. But in my judgment the truly forgotten are those elderly who live in the rural areas. It is for this reason that I offer the amendment to this section 241, especially pertaining to the rural areas.

I have supported this amendment for the reason we should remember there are many old people in rural areas who have never had any social security coverage. This is true because being self-employed there was no compulsory coverage, and in addition, only in recent years has coverage been optional or voluntary.

Those 72 years of age and over with no coverage receive only \$35 a month under the current law. Under the new House version they will receive \$40 a month, and under the new Senate version, \$50 a month.

I do not know what is an acceptable or adequate definition of poverty. OEO says that any single person receiving under \$1,450 per annum is below the poverty line. Certainly in this group all of them are below \$600 per year, and I submit no one can do very well on \$35 per month.

Then there are thousands and perhaps millions who receive the minimum under social security. Part of this is because of their residence in the rural areas, and because their low income failed to build up coverage for higher benefits. This group is nearly as bad off as those over 72 who had no previous coverage. Minimum social security payments for this group, and there are many of them in the rural areas, are: current law, \$44 a month; new House version, \$50 a month; new Senate version, \$70 a month.

Mr. Chairman, this seventh criteria should be added to section 241 pertaining to rural areas. There is no reason this should be opposed by anyone on either side of the aisle.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] for his fine amendment which recognizes the urgent economic problem of many aged Americans today. I think it has much more pertinency than several of the other criteria, and the gentleman has offered a very worthwhile amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSENTHAL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. ROSENTHAL: On page 193, line 14, after "Welfare", add a new section:

"(10) A 'comprehensive consumer action program' to develop and support projects to aid poor consumers of goods, services and credit. The program shall emphasize the broadening of existing institutions and the creation of new institutions to provide the poor consumer with means for proper economic judgments and consumer self-sufficiency.

"Projects shall (a) provide the opportunity for the poor consumer to assemble buying information, and compile comparative shopping data through the creation of voluntary consumer institutions and associations designed to meet these needs; and (b) develop the capability for capital accumulation by the poor and promote its use in voluntary self-help enterprises which will develop leadership while meeting consumer needs."

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I am a totally frustrated member of this Committee. I spent about 2 months working on this amendment, and I have been in constant touch with people and groups all over the country, with legislative counsel, and with members of my staff. I went to the trouble of sending a written communication to all Members of this body. I sat on this floor for every minute that this debate has been had, with the exception of taking a phone call or a sandwich in the back room. Now I am given the liberal opportunity of talking about something I spent dozens of hours on, working on, and I am totally inadequate to do that task in 2 minutes.

The only comment I have—and I must restrain myself—is that the Committee does a disservice to the legislative process in doing this kind of thing.

I need no support from the other side. I do not even welcome it.

I have not the slightest intention of talking about this amendment. I could not do a service to the people that worked so hard for this amendment and the people who need the programs and the philosophy that would emanate from the enactment of this amendment. This is a very despairing moment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to discuss the amendment?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman if he could explain to me why, with 19 amendments pending, we should divide the time 2 minutes each.

Mr. PERKINS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, the gentleman proposes to offer another national em-

phasis program, under the community action section, for consumer education. I personally cannot see any need for the gentleman's amendment, since he can accomplish exactly what he is seeking to do under existing law and under the committee bill. There is ample authority to fund programs for consumer education in the bill reported by the committee. I would state, too, that many such programs have been funded and will continue to be funded under existing authority.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Apparently, Mr. Chairman—and I say this with great respect and deference—you could not see the need for adequate debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the frustration of the gentleman from New York. He has offered a very constructive amendment. I believe we ought to understand what it is.

The purpose is, very simply, to add to the category of special emphasis programs under section 222, consumer action programs which would be concerned with the commercial exploitation of the poor. This is a major source of unrest and discontentment.

The President's Advisers on Consumer Affairs said recently that gouging of consumers was one of the causes of the civil disorders of last summer.

We ought to vote overwhelmingly for this amendment, because it is addressed to a very serious problem.

There have been consumer education programs, comparison shopping projects, and cooperative purchasing services undertaken under the present OEO program, but, I say to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, they have been demonstration projects. Now that their effectiveness has been proven, it is important to include them as part of the ongoing antipoverty program. If the program is going to really help the poor and help them to help themselves, why should there not be programs which offer protection from those who would overcharge them, from those who would sell them inferior merchandise, from those who would gouge them?

In low-income areas in New York City buying clubs and consumer groups have been a significant source of consumer education for consumer protection. One such group, MEND, or massive economic neighborhood development, in East Harlem undertakes comparative shopping to inform consumers of where they are overcharged. Another such group, which operates in my district, the La Mia buying club, is presently assisted by an OEO grant to undertake a program of consumer education. The club also provides a cooperative purchasing service.

Another group which is successfully operating in New York is the Harlem Consumer Education Council, of which Florence Rice is the director and which lists as its goals: "educating Harlem



residents to be intelligent consumers"; "bringing fraudulent merchandising practices to the attention of the community and the proper authorities"; "providing advice and assistance to consumers who are victimized and whose wages are garnisheed"; "promoting an awareness of the best aspects of family life"; "teaching Harlem mothers how to prepare well-balanced meals using foods familiar to them and their families"; and "showing housewives how to make their apartments more attractive without spending lots of money."

These are surely goals in the best tradition of self-help, and worthy of encouragement.

These activities are extremely beneficial to the welfare of low-income consumers, and need to be encouraged further.

In slum areas, where consumers can afford least, studies have shown that they tend to be overcharged most.

Fraudulent practices include the advertising at low prices of products which sale, the sale of identical items at higher prices in low-income areas, the sale at a widely advertised price of inferior merchandise in slum neighborhoods, the sale of goods on the installment plan at outrageous rates of effective interest. Unscrupulous merchants in low income areas, where consumers may be more gullible, less aware or unable to shop elsewhere, are tempted to pursue unethical practices. Frequently these practices are illegal as well; but enforcement is difficult, and the lack of a vigilant public makes it almost impossible.

The poorly educated, low-income consumer faces his own brand of inflation in the form of bloated rentals, false bargains, and higher consumer prices in general. This constitutes one more aspect of de facto discrimination against the poor and one more cause of unrest.

Consumer action programs are a necessary and logical extension of the war on poverty. Where they have been undertaken, they have been an effective instrument of self-improvement and self protection.

I urge support for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERLNBORN. If I sought recognition to support the pending amendment and used my 2 minutes, would that preclude me from explaining later an amendment I have at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would have used his 2 minutes.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARDNER: On page 211, line 6, after the word "partisan" insert the words "or nonpartisan".

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a most important amendment. We have seen time and time again this year OEO participation in political activities in many, many nonpartisan elections. We had this happen in my own State of North Carolina in Durham.

When I brought this to the attention of Sargent Shriver, the head of OEO, and also of the Civil Service Commission, I was told that the reason they were allowed to participate in heavy voter registration drives, in the carrying of people to the polling places on election day and furnishing them with marked ballots, was simply because this was a nonpartisan election.

I say it is far past the time for this House to set down some stringent requirements for the OEO. One of them will be that they will have no political activity whatsoever, in a partisan or nonpartisan election. This will happen not only in the city of Durham, N.C., but in cities like Houston, Tex.; Portland, Oreg.; and Charlotte, N.C.; as well as numerous other cities throughout the United States.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I feel very strongly that the OEO has no place in political activities, and I hope that the members of this committee will feel likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER]. There is no activity in which the community action programs have engaged which has been more damaging from a public relations point of view and from a public opinion point of view than participation in political activity whether it be partisan or nonpartisan.

I think all of us are realists enough to know that a voter registration drive immediately before any partisan election—and indeed there is always a partisan election coming up in the future—is bound to be viewed as being to the advantage or the disadvantage of one candidate or another. Thus, when you are voting on this issue, you should consider the addition of the word "nonpartisan" so the present language of the bill will have the effect of taking politics out of the community action program and of engaging further support for a community action program from the community in general.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the intent of the amendment expressed by the two preceding speakers. It seems to me that the bill already does this. We made it abundantly clear that we do not want any of the OEO money to be used in either partisan or nonpartisan activities or in voter registration drives.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GARDNER. I agree with the gentlewoman that with the exception of section 246 and the following section 1, any partisan political activity is removed, however the word "nonpartisan" has been omitted from this section and I believe it should be included.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When we amended section 603, which covers the entire bill, we put in the word "nonpartisan." So it covers every single title and even those where "nonpartisan" was not in it before.

I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's objective and with his other colleague from North Carolina [Mr. GALIFIANAKIS], that they do not want to see these funds used for any political purposes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, would you have any objection to inserting the word in order that it also pertains to section 246?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have no objection to it. I just believe it is redundant.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER) there were—ayes 69, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 211, after line 21, insert the following new parts F and G:

"PART F—HEADSTART AND EARLY YEARS PROGRAMS

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 251. (a) From the funds made available under section 260 to carry out this part for each fiscal year, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall reserve (1) such amount, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs under this part, (2) such amount as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 253(b) and 256, and (3) not more than 15 per centum during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for the purpose of adjusting State allocations to assure the continuation during such fiscal year of programs which could not otherwise be funded out of a State's allocation for such year. From the remainder of such sums the Secretary shall make allotments among the States as follows:

"(1) he shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of children aged three to eight, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

"(2) he shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in the State bears to the number of such families in all the States. For



the purpose of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The number of children aged three to eight, inclusive, and the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in a State, and in all the States, shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(c) The amount allotted for any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Secretary may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally allotted among those States under subsection (a) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection from funds made available pursuant to section 260 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount allotted to it under subsection (a) for that year.

#### "USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 252. Grants under this part may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 254, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development for preschool and early elementary school programs for economically deprived children, as described in paragraph (b), including training of personnel and pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

"(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and for supplies, designed to provide a total preschool child development program for economically deprived children and followup programs for such children in kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school, including activities and services such as—

"(1) comprehensive physical and mental health services for children needing such assistance in order to profit fully from their educational opportunities;

"(2) food and nutritional services, including family consultations to improve nutrition in the home environment;

"(3) specialized social services designed to improve the home environments of such children and to involve parents in the child's development;

"(4) a program of daily activities designed to develop fully each child's potential;

"(5) the provision of special teachers, counseling personnel, and other remedial and noncurricular services and programs for economically deprived children in kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school to maintain the advances realized in preschool programs and to assist such children to overcome educational handicaps;

"(6) other specially designed health, social, and educational programs for economically deprived children both in school and out of school (including summer, weekend, and vacation programs); which meet the purposes of this part; and

"(7) direct participation in development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level by parents of the children benefited by programs assisted under this part.

#### "STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

"SEC. 253. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part shall designate (or create) for that purpose a

State agency (hereinafter referred to in this title as the 'State commission') which shall be broadly representative of public and private education (including the State educational agency), community action agencies qualified under title II of this Act (hereinafter referred to as community action agencies or agency, as the case may be) and public and private child welfare and health agencies in the State: *Provided*, That any State community action commission designated or established by the State for the purposes of title II of this Act shall be deemed the State commission for the purposes of this part; and submit to the Secretary through the State commission a State plan for such participation. The Secretary shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) sets forth objective standards and methods for determining the school attendance areas in the State having the highest concentrations of economically deprived children, and a method for determining the highest priorities for preschool and early elementary school programs among such areas;

"(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible programs submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part, and (B) for approving and recommending to the Secretary, in order of such priority, applications covering such eligible programs;

"(4) provides for affording to every applicant which has submitted a program to the State commission an opportunity for a hearing as to any determination of the State commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his functions under this part.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend not exceeding \$10,000,000 during each of the fiscal years of this program under this part in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

#### "APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

"SEC. 254. (a) Applications for grants under this part may be submitted by any (1) community action agency, (2) local educational agency or other nonprofit agency, with the approval of a community action agency, or (3) local educational agency or other nonprofit agency in an area where there is no community action agency. Any such application shall be made at such time or times and in such manner as may be required by or pursuant to regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary for the purpose of enabling him to make the determinations required of him under this part.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve an application which—

"(1) has been approved and recommended by the State commission;

"(2) has been assigned, in accordance with the State plan, a priority that is higher than that of all other applications within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(3) provides that the funds under this part will be administered by the applicant

agency and that at least 20 per centum of the cost of the program (which may be in the form of goods, services, or the reasonable rental value of facilities) shall be met from non-Federal funds in administering this subsection, except that, in exceptional cases, the Secretary may reduce or waive the non-Federal share requirement. The value of buildings, facilities, equipment, and other in-kind contributions from non-Federal sources shall be assessed and appropriately credited as part of the non-Federal contribution required herein;

"(4) sets forth a program for carrying out the uses and purposes described in section 253 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(5) provides assurances that in the planning of such program there has been, and in the carrying out of such program there will be, active participation of parents of economically deprived children in the areas to be served;

"(6) provides satisfactory assurances that the educational and developmental programs will be carried out by public or nonprofit private agencies possessing the capabilities necessary to the success of the program;

"(7) provides, with respect to any program carried out by a local educational agency, that adequate methods are employed to involve eligible children in the area served by such program who attend nonpublic schools, and that in no case shall economically deprived children in such area be denied the benefits of the program because of their attendance in nonpublic schools;

"(8) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part; and

"(9) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part and to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting the purposes of the part, and for keeping such records and affording such access to as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the verification of such reports.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"(d) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the Secretary may approve applications of eligible agencies in those states for which there is no approved State plan, providing that the application meets all the requirements of this part except those relating to a State plan, and for any fiscal year thereafter the Secretary may in like manner approve applications in any State which has failed to designate or create a State commission, or to submit a satisfactory State plan;

"(e) If, in the opinion of the Secretary, a State plan or implementation thereof fails, or will fail, to carry out the purposes of this part because (1) State constitutional, legislative, or administrative restrictions prevent full participation of qualified private agencies or organizations in the operation of Headstart or Early Years programs under this part, or (2) it does not meet the needs of eligible children without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin, the Secretary shall withhold the allocation provided for such State until he has assurances satisfactory to him that the State plan or implementation thereof has been corrected, and in the absence of a satisfactory plan or implementation the Secretary is authorized to make grants from such State allocation directly to eligible applicants within such State for the provision of Headstart and Early Years programs.



**"PAYMENTS**

"SEC. 255. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 251 the Secretary shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this part an amount (subject to the requirements of section 254 (b)(3)) equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

"(b) Payments under this part may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(c) The Secretary shall immediately cut off funds to any applicant agency when he determines that such agency is not complying with the conditions for grant approval in section 254(b).

"(d) Payments made under this part are to be considered and treated by the State commission and by each grantee as Federal funds and shall be kept entirely separate from any other public or private funds.

"SEC. 256. The Secretary is authorized to reserve an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds made available pursuant to section 260 in any fiscal year to provide, either directly or through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education or other public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations, for research, demonstration, evaluation activities, and technical assistance designed to support the programs authorized by this part.

**"ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

"SEC. 257. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Advisory Committee on preschool and early elementary programs, consisting of a Chairman, and not more than fourteen members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Secretary may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

**"BONUS GRANTS**

"SEC. 258. (a) In addition to the sums authorized to be made available for part A of this title by section 260, there is hereby directed to be made available to the Secretary the sum of \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$100,000,000 for the succeeding fiscal year, for increasing the amount available to States making an additional effort consistent with the purposes of this section.

"(b) A State's allotment under section 251 for a fiscal year, shall be increased, through the use of funds appropriated under this section, by an amount equal to 50 per centum of the aggregate amount by which [attributable costs] during the fiscal year by applicants in the State for carrying out programs described in their applications exceed 100 per centum of the State's allotment (including any reallocation) for such year: *Provided*, That the State shall provide a matching 50 per centum of such amount to such programs.

"(c) In the event the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section are less than the amount necessary to make all the increases in allotments required by subsection (b), the amount of each increase under subsection (b) shall be reduced pro rata.

**"DEFINITIONS**

"SEC. 259. As used in this part—

"(1) 'economically deprived children' means children of families having an annual income (as determined by the State commission pursuant to criteria established by the Secretary) insufficient to provide a home environment conducive to learning, or who are recipients of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, except that in no case shall a local educational agency or a private nonprofit school be required to apply an income test to establish the eligibility of elementary school children in need of the in-school services provided under this title;

"(2) 'the first three grades of elementary school' may in addition include kindergarten school in those areas in which kindergarten is provided as a part of a program of free, public education.

**"PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION; ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

"SEC. 260. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants pursuant to the provisions of part A of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, for the purpose of assisting State commissions to arrange for the conduct of preschool and early elementary school programs for economically deprived children and for the funding of such programs.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there is hereby directed to be transferred to the Secretary from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act the sum of \$375,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969: *Provided, however*, That such amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall include any sums expended by or under the authority of the Director after June 30, 1967, for such programs.

"(c) The Secretary and the Director shall develop procedures for the orderly transfer of existing programs, including jointly-developed regulations, which shall assure that policies affecting existing grants shall remain in effect until changed by the Secretary.

**"PART G—UPWARD BOUND****"TRANSFER OF PROGRAM**

"SEC. 261. (a) The program known as 'Upward Bound' and conducted under the authority of section 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, shall be carried out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary'), as provided by this part.

"(b) The Secretary shall assume administrative responsibilities with respect to all grants, contracts, or other arrangements made by or on behalf of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the conduct of Upward Bound programs to be carried out in whole or in part after June 30, 1967.

**"ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

"SEC. 262. There is hereby directed to be transferred to the Secretary from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, the sum of \$15,000,000 to enable the Secretary to enter into arrangements pursuant to the provisions of this part: *Provided, however*, That such amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall include any sums expended by or under the authority of the Director after June 30, 1967, for such program.

**"DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM**

"SEC. 263. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a program to be known as "Upward Bound" designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school and among young people from low-income backgrounds who have inadequate secondary school preparation for continuing their education beyond high school.

"(b) The program shall be conducted by means of grants to or contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions which shall include:

"(1) arrangements for cooperative efforts among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools;

"(2) assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the project will include a curriculum designed to develop the intellectual processes, skills, and attitudes needed for success in postsecondary education; and

"(3) necessary health services and such recreational and cultural activities as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

**"COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 264. The Secretary shall take such action as he deems necessary to coordinate the operation of Upward Bound with the program of educational opportunity grants authorized by title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and he shall take necessary steps to consult with State and private agencies and institutions with a view to developing a coordinated effort to achieve the purposes of this part.

**"ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

"SEC. 265. Of the funds appropriated or allocated for the purpose of carrying out this part, the Secretary shall first reserve not in excess of 3 per centum thereof for allotment among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs, and he shall allot the remainder among the States, in accordance with the latest available satisfactory data, so that (1) 50 per centum is distributed on the basis of the relative number of children enrolled in grades 9 through 12 (both inclusive) in each State, and (2) 50 per centum is distributed on the basis of the relative number of school-age children in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 in each State. That part of any State's allotment which the Secretary determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Secretary may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the Committee has ordered debate limited to the hour of 5:15 p.m.



This amendment is lengthy.

My query to the Chair is this: From whose time comes the reading of this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Chair can assure the gentleman that somebody is going to lose some time, because all debate ends at 5:15 p.m.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ERLBORN

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ERLBORN: On page 184, line 19, strike out the words "without limitation".

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, section 221 on page 184 provides for the programs that can be funded through OEO in the area of community action. The words that are the subject of this amendment appear on line 19, and the phrase there in full is as follows:

These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities—

and so forth. And then lists successively thereafter six very broad purposes.

It seems to me that any program we might want to fund, which has not yet been funded in the area of community action, is described in those six broad areas following the words "without limitation."

The words "without limitation" open up new additional projects that could be funded. I believe that if there are any projects that are not included in this very broad description that OEO should want to fund in the area of community action, they should come to this Congress to get the authority. Certainly the authority provided in this section is sufficiently broad so that additional projects that they might want can be funded unless it might be something like the negative income tax they are trying out on an experimental basis in the State of Wisconsin.

But, in any event, if they want to go beyond the very broad area of authority now contained in the bill they should come back to this Congress for that authority, rather than to leave OEO without any limitation on the type of project they can fund. Therefore this amendment would remove the words "without limitation."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that seeks to strike the words "without limitation."

Mr. Chairman, if we strike those words we are stating that no program other than those specified in the section can be funded. This amendment would com-

pletely rob local communities of the local initiative now given them to devise programs to meet their own special needs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

The amendment was rejected.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the desk, and I would like to have them considered en bloc in order that I might speak upon all of them at one time.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do we have copies of these amendments anywhere?

Mr. QUIE. I can give the gentleman copies, I have some in my hand. I can give them to the gentleman right now.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that these amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are they related amendments, or are they on different subjects?

Mr. QUIE. You could say they are related; they are all related to this title, they affect the same section of the title.

Mr. HAYS. Do they do different things?

Mr. QUIE. They are related in this way, that they require that the board representatives—that is, the business and labor leaderships, or their representatives on subsidiary boards—do not need the full subsection (b) membership requirement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman just tell us briefly the effect of these three amendments?

Mr. QUIE. I would be glad to tell you what the effect is of the amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. What are you proposing to do, that is the question.

Mr. QUIE. The three amendments do this.

The first amendment is to section 211 (b) so that, where representatives of the poor are concerned, they shall select their own representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that the amendments be considered en bloc?

The time consumed under a reservation of objection will deprive other Members of time to speak.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we do not want to be dilatory, but we are really trying to figure out what this is, and under a reservation of objection, or before objecting, would the Chair be a little more lenient with us on this, since the point is, we are trying to protect the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized to explain his amendments after they are reported.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that the amendments be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 174, line 23, after the word "chosen" insert "by residents of the area to be served"; line 24, after the word "procedures", insert "in which the poor are given opportunity to participate to the maximum feasible extent, and which are".

On page 175, line 2, immediately after the word "of" insert the following: "and chosen by".

On page 175, line 18, immediately after the word "of" insert the following: "clause (2) of".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, these three amendments will provide that the political subdivision will not be able to appoint the representatives of the community action board other than their own.

The first amendment uses language that is presently in the act, that where the representatives of the poor are concerned, the poor shall select their own representatives.

The second one affects the Green amendment including on each board officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, educational, or other major groups and interests in the community. My amendment that these representatives shall be chosen by those groups, not by the public officials.

The third amendment goes to subsection (c) of section 211 which applies to subsidiary boards, councils or similar agencies like the neighborhood councils or any other subsidiary group where the umbrella agency permits them to conduct business in a specific neighborhood. All the requirements of subsection (b) would not prevail in my amendments. The only requirement would be that the subsidiary board must consist of at least one-third representative of the poor.

As to subsidiary groups now where some of them have only representatives of the area, and are all in effect representatives of the poor, it will permit that to continue. It does not change the Green amendment in any way as it applies to the umbrella community action agencies with the exception, of course, that it could not be contrived if my amendment is adopted, so that the mayor could appoint all of the representatives on the board.

These are changes that I think are necessary to clear up the language.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has used his time.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it too late to raise a point of order that this amendment does the same thing that the House has already rejected?



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman that such a point of order comes too late.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Withdrawal of a point of order does not require unanimous consent; so the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 35, noes 84.

So the amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT: On page 175, line 9, after the period, insert: "However, when a community action board which has been designated by the Director and is presently acting in a community is composed of more than 51 members, and the Director finds that a reduction would impair the operation of the program, it may continue with its existing composition provided that the same conforms to standards provided in this section other than the numerical limitation; or, with the approval of the Director, the board may qualify without being required to lessen its total number of members if it shall conform its composition to such standards."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, time is relatively short, but I believe I can explain this amendment. It is an extremely noncontroversial amendment. The only thing the amendment would do would be this: It states that if a community action board which now exists has more than 51 members and it is determined that it would impair its operation to decrease its number to 51, it may retain the additional members.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I sympathize with the gentleman's peculiar problem in the district that he is privileged to represent, but the committee in its judgment decided that we should place a limitation on the number.

In fact, I personally felt that the limitation we wrote in the bill was high. We have to keep this at a level where the local community action boards will not become unwieldy. I regret I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would prefer rather small boards, but my

amendment does not give any blanket authority permitting large boards. It merely permits the Director to determine whether or not a reduction would impair the operation of the program. If it would, then the Director may permit an existing board not to be disturbed, if it complies, or is made to comply, with the provisions of the act providing that one-third of the members of the board be from the poverty areas, one-third from local governmental personnel, and one-third from interest groups in the community.

There are 55 CAP's in Texas; 16 of them have boards with more than 51 members—Abilene 90, Beaumont 108, Dallas 150, Fort Worth 93, Houston 150.

Public officials and/or representatives of public agencies comprise one-third of the board membership of 85 percent of all CAP's in Texas.

Every Texas CAP is sponsored—that is, designated as the only antipoverty agency in the area—by a politically responsible body—city or county government or both.

Sixteen CAP's are multicounty organizations which would be adversely affected by the Green amendment. They would probably have to cut representation.

I think the situation in Texas is more representative than unique.

If this amendment is not adopted then under section 210(a), the CAP agency is the political subdivision. The local political authority, say the city and county politicians, must cut a board of some 150 members back to 51 or less, under the mandate of section 211(b).

In Harris County, 50 members of the board have been elected in the poverty areas. The act, if not amended in this way, would require the politicians to cut this number back to about 17 and to remove at least 99 members of the board. Thus the committee's bill, as now constituted would require city hall and the county court house to reconstitute the board whether they want to or not.

My amendment would simply permit a good, balanced board which is presently operating to be left alone.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and and hoped the committee would do likewise.

I understand, of course, the reasoning behind the committee's decisions to limit the number of members on boards of the community action programs to 51. I can understand that perhaps, on the average, this is more realistic and workable. On the other hand, I have a situation in my town of Abilene, Tex., similar to that described by my colleague from Houston, Tex.

Our community action program has just been reorganized after some difficulty, and for them to now be forced to drop back from 90 to 51, is going to be awkward and will not do the program any good. It is entirely possible that, with time, this might be done, but to

force it so soon after its reorganization would appear to be unwise.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ECKHARDT) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which dealt with the same general subject as that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT]. A parliamentary inquiry: Are we precluded now from making any amendment in this regard? It is an amendment to the same section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon certainly could not offer the same amendment.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, it deals with the same section.

At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we can see what a disgraceful operation is going on in the House now. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] said, Members have spent long hours in trying to draft amendments to improve this legislation. Now, because of a motion to cut off debate on this entire section—not just on each amendment to which I had agreed with the chairman of the committee to limit debate, but on the entire section—we are going to come to the end of this time with amendments to be offered by Members who will have little time or no time to explain their amendments. This House will not be able to give adequate consideration to the amendments when they are offered.

Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be a great deliberative body. I question whether it can be after the sham of this afternoon.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 199, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 8 on page 200.

On page 201, after the word "programs" on line 9, strike all that follows through the word "activities" on line 12.

On page 201, line 16, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)" in lieu thereof; line 21, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)" in lieu thereof.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], have said, you have now succeeded in making a shambles of this legislation by the arbitrary act of cutting off debate on some 19 amendments.

The amendment I have offered deals with research and pilot programs. It would strike out the language beginning



on page 199, line 3, on through to line 8 on page 200, with two technical amendments to correct the language which would be affected on page 201 of the bill.

There have already been far too many costly research and pilot programs in this business. I am surprised this section was not stricken in committee in order to get rid of one of the provisions in current legislation that has given as much trouble as any other.

This section provides that 10 percent of the \$1 billion devoted to this title of the act, can be used for research and pilot programs.

It is beyond comprehension that after 2½ years of the poverty program as much as \$100 million can be spent on research and experimentation.

If that money is to be spent let it be for serving the poor of this country rather than expend it on a bunch of broken-down political hacks high-priced so-called experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 36, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS OF  
NEW MEXICO

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico: On page 188, at the end of line 18, insert the following: "In carrying out this paragraph, the Director shall encourage, foster, and stimulate the adoption of legal services programs which (1) permit each user of the program to choose his attorney from among those participating in the program, and (2) provide that the fees of participating attorneys will conform to criteria prescribed by the Director."

(Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member believes his amendment is very important. I want to join all the others who believe their amendments are important.

Mr. Chairman, equal justice for every American is one of the great ideals of our society. It is for this reason that I offer this amendment. My amendment would direct the Office of Economic Opportunity to foster and stimulate the adoption of those legal services programs which permit an indigent to freely choose his own attorney from those participating in the program. My amendment would not make the client's choice program mandatory across the entire Nation, but rather it would encourage this type of programs whenever the local communities involved preferred such a method in contrast to the present OEO setup which provides that a salaried Government lawyer handle the indigent's case. My amendment provides that the fees of the attorneys would conform to criteria based upon the regional fee schedules prescribed by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Essentially the program I propose would permit each eligible person to choose his own attorney from among those participating in the program. The attorney would provide the services requested and would then be reimbursed from Federal funds provided by an OEO grant according to a prescribed fee schedule. Although the method of financing my client's choice proposal would be different from that of the medicare program, the operation of the two programs would be similar. They will both be based upon the principle that each eligible individual should have the right to services, whether medical or legal, and to the right of choice.

A major reason why I favor this approach to the provision of legal services to the poor is that I feel, without question, it is more consistent with our free enterprise system than the alternative of hiring "Government-salaried" lawyers to serve one segment of our population. In our system we believe that each American should have the right to shop at any store, to avail himself of any service and not be restricted to certain facilities and services just because he is poor. Rich or poor, each is entitled to some freedom of choice.

I point out that my amendment would encourage clients choice programs whenever the local community preferred such a system instead of the type now eligible under the Economic Opportunity Act. It may be that the existing program of neighborhood legal services is more suited to certain populations and locations. In such event, my amendment would make no change. On the other hand, clients choice may well be a unique and preferable program in small communities and rural areas where a full-time attorney for the poor is not needed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me say I am entirely in sympathy with what the gentleman is stating. However, we do not have the funds in the bill to take care of this situation. It would take three times as much money if the gentleman's amendment were adopted before it would serve as many as are being served. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I regret to oppose the amendment.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of the committee that my amendment does not make it mandatory that this type of program be carried out but it permits it in areas where it would be advisable. The language in your bill and in the committee report seems to be consistent with it, because on page 188 you say that the program must be consistent with a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards in the legal profession.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, before we decide to alter the thrust of an already successful legal services program, we should have empirical data, not just abstract arguments, on the actual advantages and disadvantages of the judicare and staff-type programs. Only in this way can we make a reasoned comparison and informed de-

cision. No business firm would make such a change, involving millions of dollars, without preliminary objective research and study.

I wish to point out that the Office of Economic Opportunity is already doing this work for us. OEO does not have an ax to grind on this or that method; its only interest is in achieving the basic goals of the poverty program in the best way possible. It has itself carefully considered the possible merits of a judicare program and, unwilling to make a hasty and perhaps unfortunate decision without adequate information, is already funding several judicare-type experimental programs in different types of areas and with different features. It has recognized that only by doing so can it answer intelligently the question of whether judicare would indeed be desirable and to what extent. For instance, it is possible that under certain types of local or regional conditions judicare might function well. In order to see if this is true, and to what extent, it is necessary to compare the successes and failures of the judicare-type program in a particular area with the comparable successes and failures of a staff-type program in the same area. This is exactly what has been done and is still being done with two major OEO-funded judicare demonstration projects. One has been operating in a number of rural counties in northern Wisconsin, one in a township in California. In addition, there are a number of minor judicare-type projects being funded and examined.

In order to insure that its conclusions about these demonstration projects are sound, OEO is not simply drawing upon its own evaluations. It is having in-depth evaluations performed by objective third parties such as the University of New Mexico. Plans are underway for a comprehensive 12-month evaluation of the Wisconsin and other judicare programs by a sociologist at the University of Wisconsin. These evaluations are comparing quality, cost, impact, and other factors of judicare programs with one or more staff programs in closely similar and usually adjoining areas. In addition, important evaluations of the overall legal services program done by the American Bar Foundation and the Georgetown University Law Center will supply OEO with valuable material to assist it in appraising the relative merits of judicare programs.

I submit that the approach to the problem already being taken by OEO is the only sound one—experimenting and assessing to learn in which, if any, situation judicare is appropriate, rather than jumping blindly into this very expensive and perhaps less effective method of providing meaningful legal services to our poor. We cannot afford to make in haste such a significant and costly decision on the basis of unproven facts and unexamined assertions.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Constitution assures certain fundamental rights to all Americans. None of these rights is more basic nor more important than the right to equal protection of the laws. Yet, the fact is that our legal system is such that justice frequently carries a price tag. And when



the poor cannot afford to retain counsel or are otherwise ignorant of their legal rights, they are often victimized by callous and unscrupulous people.

Attorneys for slumlords, unethical creditors and others who prey on the poor and defenseless have been able to use the courts to frighten, overwhelm and defeat the poor. Our impoverished citizens, entrapped by the unscrupulous, are bewildered by the complexity of the law; they cannot afford to pay anyone to explain it to them, or defend them from it. Nor have they been able to make the law work for them.

Mr. Chairman, the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has addressed itself to this most serious problem. The program enjoys the full support of the American Bar Association, and now publications as otherwise diverse as the Wall Street Journal and the New Republic have just recently paid it tribute.

The New Republic has said that the legal services program "has potential as a steam valve in the slums, an outlet for pent-up anger in the courts." Equally important, as the article points out, the program has already had positive and far-reaching effects on legal education and the law itself.

The Wall Street Journal has observed that, until recently, "leading lawyers tended to share Supreme Court Justice William Brennan's observation that 'built-in bias' against the poor frequently infects the courtroom." Now, notes the Journal, some 1,400 war on poverty attorneys are working hard to erode that bias.

Each of these respected journals has devoted special attention to one highly successful component of the antipoverty legal services program—California rural legal assistance—CRLA.

Operating in poverty areas of California, CRLA has enforced the law to prevent Governor Reagan from slashing several million dollars from California's system of medical assistance to the needy and has gotten the U.S. Department of Labor to enforce its own regulations with respect to the importation of fieldworkers.

Involved in these suits was the relatively novel issue of federally financed attorneys instituting suit against a political subdivision or Government agency. But as the Wall Street Journal so correctly points out, these CRLA cases are "no different in principle from, for example, Justice Department lawyers filing suit against the Federal Communication Commission's approval of the ITT-ABC merger." The Journal cites an even more important fact:

And there's a larger issue at stake which ought to make conservative-minded lawmakers pause before voting to immunize governments against legal attack from within. It has always been a tenet of the conservative creed that government unchecked erodes liberty.

Mr. Chairman, the two articles which follow are but a small portion of the evidence that the OEO legal services program has achieved tremendous success.

Part of that evidence is the fact that in the last year, 1,200 attorneys in this young program handled some 300,000 individual cases for the poor.

Part of that evidence are the innovations at our Nation's law schools, now equipping our lawyers to serve the poor as in the past they have been groomed for corporate and creditor service.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, I fully support this program. It has already earned the admiration of the bar, the approval of legal scholars, and the gratitude of the poor.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the New Republic, Nov. 11, 1967]

#### LAWYERS FOR THE POOR

Those who oppose the poor having anything to do with the way federal antipoverty funds are disbursed are especially eager to do in the legal services program which has offered the poor an opportunity to contest arbitrary acts of government in the courts.

LSP has 1,800 lawyers operating out of 850 slum neighborhood offices around the country to represent poor people. They handle divorces, grievances with landlords and creditors, and so forth, but their most significant cases have been against government agencies. CRLA, the California Rural Legal Assistance program, is the largest and most controversial of the 300 such OEO-funded programs in the country. It provoked the animosity of Governor Reagan by staving off through court suits cuts in the state's Medical program, and by contesting the continued importation of Mexican labor and unjustified denials of welfare benefits in California's Sutter County. Reagan is expected to veto refunding of CRLA when it comes up in December. Whether Sargent Shriver, under pressure from the California congressional delegation, will override the veto remains to be seen. In the meantime another attack on the legal assistance program is being made which could effectively destroy it nationally.

At issue is the novel concept of the government paying lawyers to represent clients suing the government. California's Senator George Murphy is one of many politicians who has questioned the "propriety and the enormous expense to the taxpayer of a legal service program bringing suit against an agency of the federal, state, county or local government. In such instance, the taxpayer is paying the legal fees of both the plaintiff and the defendant—which does not seem quite right to me." Murphy introduced an amendment to the poverty bill when it was in the Senate that would prohibit all such suits by legal services attorneys. It failed.

Earl Johnson, who heads the legal services program at OEO has articulated another view, that the right to equal justice requires that people without money have the same access to an attorney and the same opportunity to sue the government as the better-off. Without, it he says, the poor are at the mercy of the bureaucrats and can't defend themselves against arbitrary, unconstitutional treatment. Moreover, he maintains, the legal services program has "brought disputes into the courtroom which might otherwise have generated picketing, demonstrations and violence." This riot prevention "benefit" is probably exaggerated, but it is politically productive at the moment and is being exploited by news releases from OEO ("Washington, D. C. Legal Services Program Helps to Avert Riots" was the title of one such story; "Cleveland LSP Helps Avert Violence" another). Nevertheless, the program has potential as a steam valve in the slums, an outlet for pent-up anger through the courts. In addition to providing relief to a few litigants and alleviating somewhat the feeling of powerlessness among the poor, the legal services

program has begun to have important effects on the law itself. For example, a recent Connecticut court ruling, rendering unconstitutional the state's one-year residency requirement for welfare benefits, is expected to affect practices in other states and benefits thousands of poor people who may never have heard of LSP.

The program is now in trouble, the OEO maintains, not because it has been inadequate but because it has done so well. LSP officials has fears of what will happen when the poverty authorization bill for fiscal 1968 reaches the House floor within the next few days. Attacks are expected on three fronts.

First, the Murphy amendment to forbid suits against government agencies at all levels may be introduced under another name in the House. It stands a better chance of success than in the Senate. Between seven and 10 percent of the 320,000 cases handled by legal services lawyers last year were against welfare, social security, workmen's compensation, Veterans Administration, education and other government agencies. Among them were the most important law reform cases handled by LSP. "The Murphy amendment," says an OEO spokesman, "would eliminate those cases aimed directly at the causes of poverty. . . . The effect would be to deny equal justice to the poor in a year when the nation's urban ghettos have erupted in rioting."

The second attack feared by LSP is an amendment to operate legal services as a "judicare" program. Under such a setup, persons who had first been certified indigent would be eligible to go to the private attorney of their choice and he would be reimbursed, as in Medicare, by the federal government. The poor would be no longer have easy access to law offices set up in their own neighborhoods and staffed by specialists in poverty law zealous for law reform as well as for serving the interests of their individual clients.

The third amendment expected by LSP is one that would require OEO to gain the approval of local bar associations if neighborhood legal services offices are to be funded in a community. Although the American Bar Association has praised the program, local bar associations, particularly in the South, have been critical and OEO officials predict that were the amendment to become law, LSP would be effectively killed.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### LEGAL AID SKIRMISH IN POVERTY WAR

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—The scene last summer in Judge Alexander Holtzoff's Federal District courtroom here put a blush on believers in tidy government.

Here were attorneys paid by Sargent Shriver's poverty warriors determinedly pressing a lawsuit not against some Scrooge-like finance company but against another Government agency. "It is a strange thing," Judge Holtzoff remarked, and as the months rolled by other judges in other communities were similarly moved to wonder how the Government could possibly justify financing legal actions against itself.

Now this apparent anomaly is engaging Congress' angry attention for the first time. When voting starts today on amendments to recast the entire antipoverty crusade, members of the House may petulantly put an end to what many consider plain foolishness—the provision of free legal aid to the poor in courtroom jousts against local, state and Federal agencies.

Indeed, Congress quite probably would stop this program if President Earl F. Morris and other leaders of the American Bar Association weren't busily lobbying to uphold Mr. Shriver's hand. Far from being another hap-



hazard wastefulness, these ABA leaders believe, such suits are necessary to restrain Big Government's arbitrary tendencies.

#### "FIRE BRIGADES"

Behind the scenes, it's understood, ABA President-elect William T. Gossett has been working with some success to neutralize and perhaps even convert House Republican Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan; Mr. Gossett is a former Ford Motor Co. vice president and general counsel. "We've lobbied for this program, we've sponsored meetings and we've had fire brigades out to beat down the opposition," a bar association spokesman confides.

Until recently the poverty war's legal aid services seemed to be its least vulnerable flank.

For one thing, it seemed quite proper to provide free representation for poor people seeking to assert contractual rights, once it had become routine for states and localities to grant free counsel to indigent defendants in criminal cases as required by the Supreme Court. Then, too, leading lawyers tended to share Supreme Court Justice William Brennan's observation that "built-in bias" against the poor frequently infects the courtroom. In Congress, finally, detractors of the poverty war as an unconscionable waste often agree that the ignorant poor in a complex society need protection against grabby landlords, shabby sales tactics and loan sharks masquerading as legitimate finance companies.

Finding this fertile reception, Mr. Shriver's legal aiders moved to placate the bar lest it come to regard Government-paid lawyers litigating civil suits as one step toward socialized law. Among other safeguards, neighborhood law offices financed by the poverty program but operating under local control aren't supposed to accept cases from which a private lawyer might earn a fee; these "fee-generating" cases are referred instead to private practitioners.

As a practical matter, many state and local bar associations came to realize that Federal money carefully spent could be a boon to the profession. Besides opening job slots on the Federal payroll (1,400 so far), to stimulate recognition by the poor of their legal rights might ultimately tap a vast reservoir of new legal business. Earl Johnson Jr., Chief Shriver's director for legal services, cites an American Bar Foundation survey that suggests that not more than a few thousand of 14 million "legal problems" rising among the poor each year receive professional treatment.

Having won general support from the bar (state associations in Tennessee and North Carolina, among others, swung from opposition to neutrality or support), the legal aiders quickly established a national network of 200 neighborhood offices, mostly in slum areas, supplemented by much-advertised "circuit riders" traveling in trailers to rural places. Federal dollars also began flowing to law schools in the hope that courses in "poverty law" would join tax law, real estate law and corporate law as traditional components of the curriculum.

Mostly the Government-paid lawyers (on the average they earn \$9,500 a year) handle juvenile misdemeanors, divorces, paternity problems, landlord-tenant disputes and creditor-debtor controversies. When the poverty lawyers undertook to defend several dozen defendants accused of participation in race protests or riots, there were grumbles but remarkably few loud squawks. Nor did the first suits against local government agencies awaken Congressional concern—suits in Ohio on behalf of Mexican-American migrant workers requiring motor vehicle bureaus to give license tests in languages other than English; suits in New York prohibiting pub-

lic housing projects from barring unwed mothers; suits in several states challenging eligibility requirements for relief recipients.

It was a welfare suit brought by the District of Columbia legal services agency that prompted Judge Holtzoff to note with surprise in dismissing it that "here are lawyers being paid by the Government to sue another Government department." But another such suit in Hartford could reshape the welfare laws of 40 states that impose a one-year residency requirement upon relief applicants, the maximum permitted by Federal law.

#### UNCONSTITUTIONAL INCURSION

The first round in the Hartford suit was won by legal services lawyers, who persuaded a three-judge Federal panel that Connecticut couldn't deny public assistance to a needy mother moving from Massachusetts to be near her family. Denial of aid under such circumstances is an unconstitutional incursion on the right to travel, the judges held, and they went on to declare that Connecticut can't withhold relief from newcomers even if their "sole or principal purpose in entry is to seek aid."

If upheld, this language may knock out residence requirements in every state with a consequent strain in tax revenues. Yet in part because newspapers scarcely noted the role of Federally financed legal aiders, the suit generated surprisingly little flak against the "professional law advocates of the poor," to use Director Johnson's description. What touched off the Congressional tempest was a rapid series of suits in Gov. Ronald Reagan's state by California Rural Legal Assistance, a statewide service to migrant workers.

The CRLA received its first Federal infusion of \$1,756,000 (more than enough to last a year) on May 24, 1966, and \$756,000 more on Dec. 31—less than a week before Gov. Reagan's inauguration. Thus the legal aiders craftily sidestepped the certainty of a gubernatorial veto, and Poverty Chief Shriver avoided the sensitive necessity of overriding it.

Amply financed, the CRLA went to work. Starting last September it enraged Gov. Reagan by thwarting his proposed cutback of several million dollars in the state's Medical system of medical assistance to the needy, then blocked a proposal by a local school district to shut down classes for a week so students could help bring in the late grape harvest. Next the organization went after bigger game, the U.S. Department of Labor.

Acting on an application by California growers, Labor Secretary Wirtz had certified the need to bring in thousands of Mexican braceros to pick tomatoes and other crops, and the CRLA threatened suit to block the importation. The Labor Department responded not by fighting but by assigning the aggressive poverty lawyers a role in changing certification procedures.

#### EMBARRASSMENT A FACTOR

One factor in the settlement, no doubt, was the Labor Department's embarrassment at the prospect of lining up publicly with the powerful growers. "Instead of fighting the suit, as advised by the Department of Justice, the Labor Department rolled over and played dead," Democratic Rep. B. F. Sisk complained, while in the Senate Republican George Murphy denounced the "ludicrous spectacle" of both sides in a threatened lawsuit being financed by Federal taxpayers.

Yet whatever the merits of the California legal scrambling, the spectacle attracting Sen. Murphy's ire is no different in principle from, for example, Justice Department lawyers filing suit against the Federal Communication Commission's approval of the ITT-ABC merger. And there's a larger issue at stake which ought to make conservative-

minded lawmakers pause before voting to immunize governments against legal attack from within. It has always been a tenet of the conservative creed that government unchecked erodes liberty. As legal aider Johnson puts it:

"In this age of Big Government, ever increasing in size, it's refreshing to know that some bureaucratic mistakes won't go unchallenged."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: On page 201, line 7, after the period insert: "The Director shall ascertain the percentage of impoverished residents of rural areas to the impoverished residents of the nation and shall take appropriate action to assure that the percentage of funds expended in rural areas under this title is proportionate to the incidence of poverty in such areas as compared with the incidence of poverty in the nation as a whole."

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does nothing more than ask that the rural poor be granted the same consideration as those living in the urban areas. As many of you know, a great migration from the rural areas of America has taken place in the last 6 years. Farm income has been down \$2 billion since last year. What is the difference between a deprived farm child and a deprived urban child? I have never noticed any difference. Under the present poverty program, 30 percent of the funds are going to the urban areas while 45 percent of the poor in America today are rural. Now, is this amendment asking too much when it asks that the rural poor in America be granted the same opportunities in education and retraining and rehabilitation? I do not think so, and I do not think that this House does, either.

Mr. Chairman, would anyone in this House be willing to take a 10-percent cut? Would they take a 10-percent cut? This has taken place in farm income in America today. All this amendment does is to say, "Give us an equal chance to educate, retrain, and rehabilitate the poor of rural America."

Mr. Chairman, witness after witness appearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor and earlier hearings in the Senate have testified that nearly half of this Nation's poor live in rural areas, from 44 to 50 percent. In rural America, 26.9 percent of the people are poor, while the figure for the urban area is 14.4 percent.

The rural American poor are not receiving their fair share of the Government's antipoverty effort. In fiscal 1966, only 15 percent of the poverty expenditures were devoted to the eradication of rural poverty.

In fiscal 1967 this figure was 33 percent. Many close observers of the rural



American scene dispute the contention that 33 percent of the antipoverty funds were spent in rural areas. Others point out, as did the Des Moines Register, that while money may be spent in rural areas, it is not necessarily being put in the hands of those who qualify under the Government's standards of poverty. In either event, we are not giving proper attention to this segment of the Nation's poor. It has been argued that in the initial stages of the war on poverty the rural areas were not equipped to handle the funds and that this accounted for their having been ignored.

Mr. Chairman, it has also been stated that the reason the rural poor have been ignored is because an administrator of national programs is under the gun to get the biggest bang for the buck, so he does not operate in areas where he encounters the highest cost per unit of program output.

Whatever the facts may have been in the past, the Office of Economic Opportunity should now be capable of administering effective programs to eliminate rural poverty. Our committee received testimony to the effect that with the contemplated expansion of the community action program in fiscal 1968, all rural counties which fall into the "contemplated poverty bracket" will be covered by a community action agency.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman has urged that more war on poverty funds be devoted toward rural poverty and he insists that the Department of Agriculture now has the capability and the legal authority to see that these funds are properly spent. It is unfortunate that he does not follow through.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the indications that we are now prepared to fully handle the attack on rural poverty, the Office of Economic Opportunity proposes, for fiscal 1968 to allocate only 36 percent of its total expenditures to efforts on behalf of the rural poor. Why should almost 50 percent of the Nation's poor be relegated to this disproportionate share of the antipoverty effort?

Members of Congress representing urban areas may assume that my amendment would be against the best interests of the metropolitan areas. However, the facts are plain for all to see that the rural poor of today will be the urban poor of tomorrow unless we take immediate steps to see that they are provided with meaningful education and job opportunities. While there are probably many ways to achieve this result I believe that an earmarking proposal is the best approach. The reason was well stated by Mr. Lowell H. Watts, of Colorado's extension committee on organization and policy, when he said:

Rural communities do not have a professional talent to enable them to compete effectively with metropolitan regions for Federal assistance. Specific earmarking of funds to be used in rural areas would protect the interests of rural Americans and equalize Federal assistance.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include a statistical breakdown of OEO expenditures for fiscal 1967 and proposed fiscal 1968 expenditures at this point:

## OEO EXPENDITURES AND PROPOSED EXPENDITURES, BY PROGRAM, WITH RURAL PERCENTAGES

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	Fiscal year 1967—Expenditures			Fiscal year 1968—Proposed expenditures		
	Total	Rural	Percent rural	Total	Rural	Percent rural
Job Corps.....	\$211.0	\$84.4	40	\$295	\$118.0	40
Neighborhood Youth Corps.....	372.0	104.16	28	321	102.72	32
Work experience.....	100.0	27.0	27	70	18.9	27
Adult work training and special impact.....	98.0	19.6	20	258	36.12	14
Community action program.....	807.5	250.325	31	1,022	367.92	36
Migrants.....	33.0	33.0	100	27	27.0	100
Rural loans.....	24.0	24.0	100	20	20.0	100
VISTA.....	26.0	13.52	52	31	16.12	52
General direction and administration.....	15.0	5.1	34	16	5.28	33
Total.....	1,686.5	556.545	33	2,060	721.0	35

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHERLE) there were—ayes 48, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISK

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISK: On page 200, after line 8, insert a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) No pilot or demonstration project under this section shall be commenced in any city, county, or other major political subdivision except with the approval of the local community action agency or, in the absence of a community action agency, the local governing body for that subdivision."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I shall be glad to yield briefly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor on this side of the aisle have had an opportunity to observe the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California and we do not have any objections to it insofar as the chairman knows.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANDALL

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: On page 202, line 18, after the period, strike out the remainder of line 18 and all of lines 19, 20, and 21, and substitute the following: "To encourage equitable distribution of assistance, the director shall reduce or waive requirements relating to matching non-Federal assistance when there is a 10 per centum or

greater imbalance between urban and rural areas with respect to any part or all of subsection (b) (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6). When this condition exists in any rural area, the director shall utilize the community action agency and public or private non-profit agencies, or any combination thereof, to promptly achieve equitable distribution of assistance."

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, under limitation of time it will not be possible to fully debate my amendment which commences at line 18 of page 202, being a part of subsection (c) of section 241, which concerns community action programs in the rural areas.

My amendment calls for a seventh guideline to be added to subsection (b) of section 241 by providing that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall in addition to the other six criteria or guidelines take into account the number of aging in a rural area who receive only minimum social security benefits and/or the number of those over 72 years of age who receive special benefits and who have had no previous coverage.

My amendment allows the Director to reduce or waive the requirements as to matching non-Federal assistance where there is a 10 per centum or greater imbalance between urban and rural areas in respect to anyone of the six criteria listed in the original bill.

Mr. Chairman, there should be better assurances written into the bill that the rural areas will get an equitable share of the community action programs. The rural areas may have received a fair and reasonable share of the youth and adult work programs, but the community action programs in the rural areas have been woefully shortchanged. This is true of the rural areas it is my privilege to represent.

I am offering this amendment to try to make it assured that the rural areas will indeed receive the equitable treatment that the law now provides. Section 241(b) with its six guidelines was added to the old law in 1965. But frankly, unless there are stronger directives the rural areas will have to continue to go along as recipients with much less than one-fourth of the program. Without meaningful directives, the situation cannot be corrected.

My amendment is an effort to require an equitable distribution. There is no



strict demand that the distribution be 100 percent equitable all of the time, but when the proper ratio on the basis of need in the rural areas lags 10 percent or more behind urban areas then something should and must be done.

My amendment simply requires that the Director of OEO may reduce or waive requirements for matching non-Federal assistance when there is a 10 percent or more imbalance.

The progress has been slow on these programs in our rural areas—painfully slow—as compared with the swift action developed in the big cities, but the committee bill has some changes which will help the rural areas. It also contains some steps backward. One such step is the Gibbons amendment, now a part of the committee print, which would put a number of community action agencies in our district out of business. Perhaps an urban area will have no trouble making up the 20-percent contribution with half of it in cash. But it is quite another story for four or five or more counties in the rural areas, plus a number of small towns to negotiate an agreement to commingle their tax moneys into a non-profit community action board. Not only is the process of negotiation difficult and the details of pooling the money hard to work out, but it is equally difficult for the counties to raise the cash because their tax levies are now at their legal maximum. But these counties can contribute something. Each county and each small town can contribute facilities, transportation, and personnel services, and a real joint effort is the result.

In practice no separate community action agency is needed or desirable for each county or each town. The multicounty community action agency is an effective way to combat the problems in rural areas, since the problems are about the same in each county. Rather than destroy this multicounty effort by these cash contributions, we should encourage and strengthen it and make it more effective. In our State and in our congressional district, without our present amendment perhaps as many as half of the rural community action agencies would be closed down or so restricted that they would be ineffective.

We all know about the continuing migration of population from the rural areas to the big cities. This movement is continuing and will continue to overtax schools, transportation, and housing facilities of our big cities. It will make more complex and increase the problems of race relations and crime control. The practical direction to take in attacking this migration to the cities is to attack it where it starts. In other words, provide options for rural citizens to remain in rural areas if they desire.

It has been charged by several that there is an antirural bias in OEO. On the other hand, there is a strong effort going on in the Department of Agriculture under a program known as RAD or rural areas development. It is most significant that its advisory committee in a recent policy statement to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman urged a push toward a national policy of better rural/urban balance, for greater application of

Federal aid outside of metropolitan areas to ease population problems in large cities and to restore job opportunities in the countryside. The President recognized this problem in a recent message. The Senate has given recognition to this in its reports. Even the House report mentioned greater equity for rural areas. My amendment would eliminate some loose language which the agency could ignore, and provide more specific direction to the agency to reduce this tough non-Federal contribution provision.

My amendment does not mean there should be any added quota or earmarking of funds, but simply a guideline for corrective action when there is an imbalance in this program. I urge you to accept the amendment.

The reason it is so important to emphasize an equitable distribution of these funds for the rural areas, instead of the disproportionate share, or existing inequitable distribution to the urban areas involves or embodies the philosophy of "A stitch in time may save nine." We all know a little repair work or maintenance to buildings or facilities may save greater costs later. This is called preventive maintenance. Emphasis is increasingly placed today upon what is called preventive medicine, to prevent an illness from taking hold or to spend some time and money to prevent illness.

Hardly anyone denies some of our cities seem to have an illness. There are only two or three directions for that illness to go. Become worse, remain the same, or hopefully improve.

Our amendment should certainly appeal to those who want to improve the condition of the cities, because funds of this program spent in the rural areas can go a long way toward preventing the situation in our cities from becoming worse.

In Monday's Washington Daily News there was a story about a plan to "re-route" the rural poor. The headline states "New Way To Deal With City Slums." It pointed out that both the Commerce Department and the Agriculture Department were working on this plan.

The entire idea is based upon the fact that it is useless to try to disperse the poor within the innercity or to clear the big city slums, so long as these inner city areas continue to fill up with more unskilled people arriving from the rural areas.

All the money that we spend on welfare, training, education and even so-called "income maintenance" for the poor in the cities to lift them from their present condition will do little good unless there is some measure taken to prevent new buildups of slum problems from the newcomers that continue to fill up the crowded areas.

There are many plans to prevent this continued migration from the rural areas to the big cities, but one of the ways we can do something about it here today is by voting for this amendment, which should help in arresting the migration from the rural areas to our large cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 210, after line 22, add the following:

"(7) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no financial assistance shall be extended for the construction, alteration, or acquisition of any medical facility or for the provision of health services, unless the facility or the service conforms with any plan established for the area under the provisions of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is on page 210 after line 22, and it simply adds an additional special limitation to section 245. It is submitted for the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who had to be off the floor on account of illness. The amendment is self-explanatory. It would avoid duplication of OEO medical, diagnostic clinic, research facilities, and even hospitals, without clearing with the partnership for health amendments—USPHS Amendments of 1967—which have passed this House as H.R. 6418 and the other body and which is now in conference.

Mr. PERKINS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would require the Surgeon General's approval of a health program before it could be funded by OEO. Am I correct?

Mr. HALL. That is correct. It would simply restrict the extent of these health facilities where we have a critically limited supply of people. I do not believe it would limit them because he would surely approve them, where needed. The House has already passed the bill H.R. 6418 which provides for \$932 million over a 4-year period for this purpose, and this adds an additional \$60 million.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman not believe this will hamstring the present program here, though?

Mr. HALL. No, I do not believe that. This means that they will have to be approved by professional surveys as to needed beds and other facilities before such services can be placed in the various States, just as in Hill-Burton—

Mr. PERKINS. But does the gentleman not believe—

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment my colleague for introducing this amendment. This is completely in tune with the legislation that we have passed here, as recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Subcommittee on Health and Welfare, and I believe this



would protect the public by providing proper supervision of facilities in the public interest. I believe this House should support this amendment. I believe it is a very good one and should be supported.

Mr. HALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and Mr. Chairman, the Surgeon General has said today at Colorado Springs that those programs must be kept under professional control and second, there is the power of consultation in the laws at this time, with other Federal agencies; this amendment would simply make it a matter of required coordination and need. Of course, it will also save \$60 million.

I urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 56, noes 66.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HALL and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 77, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CABELL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABELL: On page 210, after line 22, insert the following:

"(7) The Director shall issue necessary rules and regulations to assure that no person shall be employed to carry out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title who has been convicted of a felony within the preceding five years, or who is then subject to a felony indictment.

"(8) The Director shall issue necessary rules and regulations to assure that programs assisted under this title are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds or property, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner affecting, or intended to affect the outcome of a labor dispute. Rules and regulations issued under this section shall provide for enforcement procedures, which shall include provision for summary suspension of assistance, termination of employment, or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, adoption of this amendment would answer a large percentage of all the charges about bad spots that have developed in our community action programs. Briefly, it would provide for the Director of OEO the right yardsticks or guidelines, if you please, which would prohibit an employee of an OEO project from being employed by the OEO if he is under a felony indictment, or if he has been convicted of a felony within the previous 5 years. The 5-year provision does not prohibit rehabilitated men from being able to serve.

The other portion of the amendment would require that people employed in a community action program cannot take part in any manner in a labor-management dispute, either as a strikebreaker or as those who would in any way further the progress of a certified labor-management dispute. I certainly hope that the Committee will see fit to adopt the amendment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is my colleague aware that there are possibly 500,000 auto thefts annually in the United States, and that in most jurisdictions auto theft is a felony, and that in the case of kids involved in very serious juvenile crime, in a large percentage of those cases an auto theft was the first step down the road to much more serious criminal activity? Should rehabilitation programs not be available to a youngster who has been convicted of auto theft?

Mr. CABELL. I would be glad to include those in the amendment.

Mr. SCHEUER. They would be excluded from any of the rehabilitation features of the program, and from employment as corrections and parole aides, where they are serving very usefully in the new careers program on the west coast.

Mr. CABELL. They would be excluded only from being on salary; they would not be excluded from benefits other than being employed by the OEO.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Just a few short months ago, I reported to this House exactly how the incidences in the city of Providence were so effectively handled and law and order restored completely in 2 days.

At that time, I had inserted in the RECORD, newspaper accounts of the incidences and certain statements by the mayor, the chief of police, and the rank and file of the department. All singled out for special commendation the fine assistance given to them by the so-called "soul patrol" which was composed of young men who spontaneously reacted to the incidences by working side by side with the police department. The majority of the membership of the soul patrol at that time were associated with the poverty program, either as employees or as elected members of the neighborhood advisory committees.

I have in my hand right now police records of members of the soul patrol. Our juvenile code makes privileged the records of many of these young men. However, they have authorized the mayor of Providence to use their names and their records if it will help preserve the poverty program. I have no intention of entering these documents into the RECORD of this House, but I do feel their authorization is a truly significant demonstration of the deep feeling of many people for the continuation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the first part of my colleague's amendment because many of the people involved who were responsible for deterring these riots and for keeping them down to a minimum disturbance were people with police records. Many of them were associated with the program but were not being paid; some of them were on a payroll. As far as rehabilitation is concerned, I cannot see where one has to wait 5 years. If you are going to tell a man he has to wait 5 years, he may well return to crime.

(Mr. ST GERMAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

The amendment was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 168, line 15, after "103." insert "(a)".

On page 184, line 10, before the period insert "; except that the Director shall provide no financial assistance to any church or other religious body, other than assistance for the use of buildings or real property at a normal rental."

On page 211, after line 21, insert the following:

"(b) The requirement in the first sentence of section 221(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 that the Director provide no financial assistance to any church or other religious body, other than assistance for the use of buildings or real property at a normal rental, shall not apply with respect to programs approved prior to the enactment of this Act; but no payments of any assistance of the kind involved with respect to any program shall be made after the end of the current contract, or the end of the current fiscal year, whichever is sooner, or for any new contract."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama in support of his amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I take it the gentleman's amendment would preclude the church from serving as a delegated agency and would bar a church from operating a Headstart program. Am I correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is partially correct. A church could donate its facilities or charge a normal rental for their use. A church could also carry on any program it chose so long as it received no Federal funds to support such a program.

Mr. Chairman, in today's world, as in yesterday's, keeping peace and making war usually requires the forging of alliances. Any student of history is familiar with such terms as the "grand alliance," the "holy alliance," or the "unholy alliance."

In waging the war on poverty this administration has forged what may well be called an "uneasy alliance." Some even believe it to be an unconstitutional alliance. I refer to the entangling alliance of church and state in general and



to that with the Office of Economic Opportunity in particular. By his own admission, Sargent Shriver made this clear when he stated to the national convention of the AFL-CIO in San Francisco, on December 9, 1965, the following:

Three or four years ago it was practically impossible for a Federal agency to give direct grants to a religious group. Today we have given hundreds without violating the principle of separation of Church and State.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Chairman, many of us were not convinced then, and I am not convinced now that OEO has kept faith with the principle of separation of church and state. In 1965 and 1966 I offered amendments to the antipoverty legislation in an attempt to clarify what I believed to be the intent of Congress in this area hoping to restore the "wall of separation" between church and state in the conduct of the war on poverty. I insisted then, as I insist now, that OEO and the Congress are engaged in building a house of cards which will, by ultimate court decisions, come tumbling down, if the OEO persists in making grants to and contracts with churches and church-related organizations.

In a special interview with Walker Knight, editor of Southern Baptists' Home Missions magazine last June, Mr. Shriver was asked, "Do you see any organized participation by the denominations?" Mr. Shriver replied:

Yes, I do. We have something called the Interfaith Committee in support of the war against poverty—composed of the Catholics, and Jews. We have an organization called WICS—Women in Community Service—composed of United Church Women, the National Council of Catholic Women, the United Jewish Women, and the National Conference of Negro Women. We have many church groups that get direct help from us through community action. . . .

Young peoples' organizations connected with all the churches can do work . . . they can run summer day camps. All are possible for church organizations to do while they remain church organizations. And we finance all that. There is a chart, "Where did the war against poverty go—moneywise last fiscal year?" Forty-five percent went directly to private non-profit organizations—YMCA's, church groups . . . and so on. Of the total, three percent went for administration by OEO. Most all the rest went either to educational institutions, business organizations, or to private non-profit groups.<sup>2</sup>

In some instances, grants are given directly to churches or church-related agencies. In many other cases, grants are made indirectly through a private or quasi-public umbrella agency and then, in turn, distributed to church-related delegate agencies to run specific programs.

Germane to both situations is the opinion of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in Abington against Schempp:

Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an in-

separable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members. Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended. . . . it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the First Amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed, it says "no law representing an establishment of religion" shall be made. *What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.*<sup>3</sup>

The concept of separation between church and state is one of the primary bulwarks of religious liberty. But this bulwark may be rendered ineffective through a process of gradual erosion. Time and again history has shown that too close a liaison between church and state ultimately works to the detriment of both. A relationship in which church and state are essentially independent is an indispensable safeguard both of religious and of political liberty.

One of the monumental concepts the American Republic brought to the world is that of separation between church and state. The first amendment to the Constitution marks a dramatic break with church-state patterns of the past. The practice of strict separation has enabled both the Government and the churches to thrive. As a consequence, our Nation has avoided the controversy and corruption which have characterized involvement of the church in government affairs and of government in church affairs of other countries.

The philosophy of complete separation has served Americans well since out of the furnace of colonial controversy our forefathers hammered out on the anvil of experience the words of the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . .

After the adoption of the Bill of Rights, while the strength for disestablishment was still in process in some States, Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to Baptists in Danbury, Conn., in which he said:

I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church and State.<sup>4</sup>

Every American from that day to this has benefited by the erection of that wall. Those of us who live today did nothing to build it, and some have done nothing to preserve it. Consequently, we face today the danger of losing by default that which our forefathers paid for with imprisonment, persecution, and bloodshed.

Some of the dangers we face are the very ones the founders of this Republic sought to avoid: That the government, in seeking to achieve secular ends, will be allowed to use religion and the churches

as a means to achieve them; and that churches, in seeking to achieve sectarian ends, will seek to use the government. This is exactly what the first amendment sought to prevent.

Quite recently, however, modifications of the meaning of church-state separation have been expounded. It is pertinent to ask ourselves whether these modifications will merely alter the rigid concept of separation or transform it so as to destroy it. Concern that the church control the government, or the government control the church seems less pronounced today than yesterday.

Perhaps a lesson in history is in order here. R. Freeman Butts in his work, "The American Tradition in Religion and Education," has stated that, in general, the process of separation from the pre-Revolutionary to the early national periods passed through three identifiable stages: First. Toleration by the single establishment of dissenting groups; second, multiple establishments wherein more and more churches were admitted into the establishment and given the legal rights of taxation for their own public worship; and third, that of complete separation. In conclusion, Mr. Butts states:

It was soon discovered that the compromise of establishing all recognized churches even on an equal or impartial basis was not sufficient. It might be possible to reconcile this kind of establishment with the outward forms of free exercise of public worship, but it was soon clearly seen that it could not be reconciled with genuinely equal rights of conscience. So long as the State was in the position of determining which churches should have legal and financial privilege of support, there could be no real equality of religious conscience. It was still a grant of privilege by the State to a religious doctrine. . . . Therefore, the struggle went on to sever all legal connections and to prohibit all financial support for any and all religious beliefs. It was recognized that if the State could grant a privilege, it could define which religious beliefs were entitled to that privilege.<sup>5</sup>

Thus it was that the final stage of separation came when all forms of establishment were abolished. Complete disestablishment of financial and legal support for religion by the State was necessary to achieve a genuinely free exercise of religion resting upon the solid grounds of equal rights of conscience. This final step was clearly in the minds of those who proposed and worked for the adoption of the first amendment to the Constitution. The first amendment, then, can be understood as an integral part of the larger definition of civil rights as contained in the other amendments which made up the American Bill of Rights.

Despite this lesson of history, there are those who say that the establishment clause neither means nor requires complete separation but only prohibits favoritism. Addressing his remarks to just such a situation Justice Douglas, in Abington against Schempp, stated:

The establishment clause is not limited to precluding the state itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the state to employ its facilities or funds in a way that

<sup>1</sup> OEO Press Release, December 10, 1965, (as recorded in Judicial Review, S. 2097, P. 740).

<sup>2</sup> "Shriver Interview: The Church and the Poverty War," *Home Missions*, Southern Baptist Convention, June, 1967, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Abington School District v. Schempp, 374, U.S., pp. 3-5.

<sup>4</sup> Writings of Thomas Jefferson (Monticello Edition) Vol. XVI, pp. 281-282.

<sup>5</sup> R. Freeman Butts, *The American Tradition in Religion and Education*.



gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone.<sup>6</sup>

In a stronger statement, the Supreme Court has decreed that:

The establishment of religion clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another.<sup>7</sup>

Justice Clark in the Schempp case declared:

If there is anything settled in Constitutional law today, I believe it is the principle that the First Amendment forbids aid to all religions, no less than it forbids aid to a particular religion.<sup>8</sup>

Mutual establishment has been forgotten, conveniently overlooked, or never understood by the various groups today who urge that cooperation between church and state is admissible so long as the state treats all religious groups fairly and equally. But the state would always have to decide what was and what was not a religious group if it set out to "co-operate" with them all.

The principle of separation has allowed every religious body, sect, and denomination to develop independently in an atmosphere free from governmental interference and sectarian struggles for a larger share of the public till. Yet, this is the very direction in which we are headed as seen in the words of Sargent Shriver himself. In answer to, "What plan does the OEO follow to insure the conditions you impose on those transactions with church-related institutions will be adhered to?" he stated:

The conditions are very well known and we have the benefit that everybody watches everybody else. I don't think the Catholics are going to get away with something in Detroit because the Protestants will be watching them. The Protestants aren't going to get away with something because the Catholics, and the Jews, or the atheists will be watching.<sup>9</sup>

Justice Rutledge long ago pointed up the fallacy in this kind of reasoning and said in his opinion on the Everson case in 1947:

The reasons underlying the amendment's policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force. . . . Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings, too, the struggle of sect against sect for the larger share or for any. Here one by numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison experienced and sought to guard against. . . . The dominating groups will achieve the dominating benefit; or all will embroil the state in their dissensions.<sup>10</sup>

Referring to the first amendment, Justice Jackson has said that its strength is in its rigidity and that:

It was intended not only to keep the State's hands out of religion, but to keep

religion's hands off the State and above all, to keep bitter religious controversy out of public life by denying to every denomination any advantages from getting control of public policy or the public purse.<sup>11</sup>

Already four Protestant denominations have set up a corporation known as Urban America, Inc. Located at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., this corporation is designed to serve as a broker to provide all services in obtaining government funds for housing projects for a church and to carry it through to completion.

Since August 20, 1964, when the President signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act, the protective barrier between church and state has come to resemble a sieve more than a wall. There is mounting evidence that the wall is being undermined by a steady stream of Federal money channeled into sectarian hands.

Yet the principle of separation has preserved our religious liberty since it was fashioned by those gallant men in the 18th century, and is essential still. If there is a break in this important dike, it is time, past time, that we repaired it. Closing our eyes to the trickle will not stop its flow nor turn back the flood when the dike, at last, comes tumbling down.

If money is taxed from a Jewish citizen by force of law and given by Government without his consent to support a Baptist program in violation of his conscience, the constitutional rights of that citizen have been violated. This must be the case if the church benefits in any way, whether financially, in reputation, in propagation of its faith, or otherwise, by such a grant. The only way such violation can be prevented is if the church denies its faith, resigns its ministry, forgets its mission and pretends its sacredness is secular in the conduct of such a program.

Suppose, for example, a church agrees to cooperate with the Government in an antipoverty program by sharing its facilities with the Federal project. Once having agreed, the Federal directors of the project rightly advise the church that Government funds cannot be used to support religion, so all religious symbols must be removed from the church and no religious instructions or propagation of its faith permitted in the program. The church agrees, removes its symbols, pretends it is not a church, and the Government "cooperates" in the use of its facilities. Is this not ample example that religion and the state function best when they are separate rather than when they "cooperate"? After all, the same first amendment which prohibits establishment by the Government also guarantees "the free exercise thereof."

For positive evidence that the wall of separation is in a sad state of repair it is unnecessary to look any further than the press releases issued by the OEO itself. In three separate press releases<sup>12</sup> OEO announced grants to a number of church institutions to assist its upward bound program during the 67-68 school

year. Those named were Arkansas College and Coe College—Presbyterian; Norman College—Southern Baptist; Mundell College, Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Fordham University, Marist College, and Loyola University—Roman Catholic.

Still another OEO release announced that the Arizona Council of Churches, a predominantly Protestant group, was to be the recipient of an additional grant of \$1.3 million to continue its program among immigrants in the State.<sup>14</sup>

Why not look around our own doorsteps in the Nation's Capital? I refer to Washington's summer enrichment program directed by Dr. Herman Tyrance, professor of physical education at Howard University. In one instance it was discovered that public program funds were used to repair a church sanctuary, a church school, and church grounds.<sup>15</sup>

When confronted with the evidence, Mr. Tyrance said,

This is an obvious violation . . . the use of public money for a religious institution is wrong, without question.<sup>16</sup>

It was reported that Mr. Tyrance acknowledged that there were other conflicts in connection with churches that run projects. The revealing disclosure went on to say:

Some ministers serve as Summer Enrichment officials and their churches get program money; some churches discarded their regular youth programs to participate in the summer program and obtain funds, . . . some ministers conduct religious services under summer program.<sup>17</sup>

Nadine Winters of Hospitality House, a delegate agency under the program in the near northeast said:

Some ministers have a racket going.<sup>18</sup>

She charged that some ministers were not only collecting rent money for the use of their buildings, but also other money for other projects.

She said one church—merely added summer program persons to its regular staff.<sup>19</sup>

If such irregularities exist in the shadow of the Capitol and OEO headquarters, one can well imagine what violations exist in the more remote sections of this country.

Permit me to digress at this point to interject what may well be a pertinent point.

It has been estimated that the President's proposed tax increase will yield an estimated \$5.1 billion in new revenue. How much would be saved if Federal expenditures of Government funds presently flowing to church institutions were cut off?

Figures prepared by the research staff of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, indicate that Federal aid is presently going to church institutions in seven main categories—education, higher and elementary; the antipoverty program; research programs;

<sup>14</sup> OEO Press Releases: CAP-67-275, February 2, 1967.

<sup>15</sup> Washington Sunday Star, July 30, 1967, Page A6.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Abington v. Schempp, 374 U.S., pp. 3-5.

<sup>7</sup> Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S., p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Abington v. Schempp, 374 U.S., p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> "Shriver Interview," Op. Cit.

<sup>10</sup> Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S., p. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 22, 26.

<sup>12</sup> OEO Press Releases: CAP-67-522, March 10, 1967; CAP-67-392, February 24, 1967; CAP-67-385, February 24, 1967.



housing; surplus foods and property; foreign aid; and public health. It is estimated "that at least \$5.5 billion flows to church-related institutions and groups in the various categories."<sup>20</sup>

Should anyone here doubt the existence of grants made directly to religious and sectarian groups, the following grants on record<sup>21</sup> at the office of Economic Opportunity should be convincing: *Church and church-related OEO programs as of September 26, 1967*

<b>ALABAMA</b>		
Catholic Charities of Huntsville—2 VISTA volunteers.		
Archbishop Toolen's antipoverty committee	\$825,032	
Archbishop Toolen's Project Headstart	470,000	
Archbishop Toolen's Neighborhood Youth Corps	472,510	
<b>ALASKA</b>		
Alaska Methodist University (Upward Bound)	122,980	
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
Arizona Council of Churches (CAP)	349,307	
Arizona Council of Churches (migrant workers)	613,144	
Arizona Council of Churches (day care)	684,818	
Central United Presbyterian Church of Phoenix (day care)	57,161	
Southminster Presbyterian Church of Phoenix (day care)	112,414	
<b>ARKANSAS</b>		
Ouachita Baptist College (Upward Bound)	51,395	
<b>GEORGIA</b>		
Emory University (Methodist) (Upward Bound)	15,645	
Emory University (legal service program)	233,281	
<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
Greater Institution AME Church of Chicago (Headstart)	56,460	
First Presbyterian Church of Chicago (Headstart)	73,222	
Greater St. John's AME Church of Chicago (Headstart)	56,738	
Union Tabernacle Church of Chicago (Headstart)	39,042	
St. Ambrose Catholic Church of Chicago (summer education program)	13,232	
Barat College of the Sacred Heart (Upward Bound)	169,707	
Barat College of the Sacred Heart	28,233	
<b>INDIANA</b>		
University of Notre Dame (study of metropolitan deprived areas)	276,680	
<b>KENTUCKY</b>		
Bellarmino College of Louisville (Upward Bound)	62,984	
<b>LOUISIANA</b>		
Methodist Community Center (day care)	119,833	
Xavier University (Upward Bound)	106,507	
Xavier University (Upward Bound)	79,764	
<b>MARYLAND</b>		
University Methodist Church, Baltimore (day care)	50,932	
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>		
Boston College (Upward Bound)	124,745	
<b>MINNESOTA</b>		
College of St. Theresa, Winona (Upward Bound)	56,444	

*Church and church-related OEO programs as of September 26, 1967—Continued*

<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>		
Father Sweeney Memorial School (Headstart)	\$372,882	
Wesley Methodist Church, Winston (day care)	254,123	
<b>MISSOURI</b>		
St. Stephens Church, St. Louis (educational programs for children-adults in public housing projects) four VISTA volunteers.		
<b>NEBRASKA</b>		
Midland Lutheran College, Fremont (Headstart)	7,393	
<b>NEW YORK</b>		
St. Augustine Church, Erie County (CAP)	25,744	
Bethel AME Zion Church (CAP)	143,880	
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>		
Salina Indian Methodist Mission	6,700	
<b>OREGON</b>		
Portland Council of Churches	12,688	
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>		
Diocesan School Board of Pittsburgh, Inc. (NYC)	947,040	
Diocesan School Board of Pittsburgh, Inc. (CAP)	53,139	
Catholic Chantise of Lackawanna County (CAP)	17,892	
Jewish Federation of Lackawanna County (CAP)	11,056	
<b>TENNESSEE</b>		
Carson-Newman Baptist College (Upward Bound)	18,000	
Carson-Newman Baptist College (Upward Bound)	117,554	
Carson-Newman Baptist College (Upward Bound)	2,000	
<b>VIRGINIA</b>		
First Baptist Church, Midlothain (Headstart)	42,520	
<b>WISCONSIN</b>		
Parochial Education Project, Menominu Co. (CAP)	21,603	
Total	7,366,424	

At this point I should like to include a partial list of those grants made directly to religious and sectarian bodies as recorded in the status of OEO programs as of June 30, 1966.

<b>ALABAMA</b>		
Bullock County: Union Springs, First Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1965, 240 children, May 14, 1965	\$38,950	
First Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1966, 378 children, 17 classes, May 31, 1966	64,418	
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
Jefferson County: Birmingham, First Unitarian Church, Headstart, summer 1965, 87 children June 10, 1965	16,315	
Perry County: Marion, Berean Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1966, 120 children, May 31, 1966, 8 classes	25,791	
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
Arizona Council of Churches: Migrant and Indian Ministry, health and education projects for migrant children, counties of Maricopa, Navajo, Pima, Pinal, Yuma, CAP, migrant worker grant section 311, June 3, 1966	632,316	
Arizona Council of Churches; migrant opportunity programs: Training	246,315	
Improvement program and counseling	77,290	

<b>ARKANSAS</b>		
Clark County: Arkadelphia, Ouachita Baptist College, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	\$51,395	
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>		
Middlesex County: Middletown, Wesleyan University, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	102,889	
<b>FLORIDA</b>		
Pinellas County: St. Petersburg, Fla., Presbyterian College, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 15, 1966	169,551	
<b>GEORGIA</b>		
Bibb County: Macon, Mercer University (Baptist), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 15, 1966	119,232	
Dekalb County: Atlanta, Emory University (Methodist), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	75,681	
Free for All Missionary Baptist Church, Headstart, summer, 1965, 226 children, May 15, 1965	26,486	
<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
Cook County: Chicago, Lutheran Camp for Retarded	14,789	
American Friends Service Committee, Inc., Districts 1 through 13, Vista Volunteers, urban, 5 requested, 6 in service	20,100	
<b>INDIANA</b>		
Richmond County: Wayne, Earlham College (Friends), Apr. 15, 1966	87,793	
<b>IOWA</b>		
Decatur County: Lamoni, Grace-land College (Latter Day Saints), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 8, 1966	78,111	
Winnishuh County: Decorah, Luther College (Lutheran), Project Upward Bound, April 7, 1966	127,332	
<b>KANSAS</b>		
Montgomery County: Independence, First Methodist Church of Independence, Headstart, 60 children, 4 classes, June 7, 1966	15,569	
<b>LOUISIANA</b>		
Caddo County: St. Paul C.M.E. Church, Headstart, 30 children, May 24, 1965	5,023	
Shreveport: The Williams Memorial C.M.E. Temple, Headstart, 54 children, June 15, 1965	9,791	
Caddo County: Shreveport, Hollywood Heights Presbyterian Day Care Center, Headstart, 49 children, June 15, 1965	6,576	
St. Joseph Baptist Church: Headstart, 51 children, June 9, 1965	9,848	
<b>MARYLAND</b>		
Baltimore: First Baptist Church, child care program, CAP-demonstration, Grant, Aug. 30, 1965	83,900	
Baltimore: Douglas Memorial Community Church, Headstart, 60 children, May 24, 1965	7,488	
St. James Episcopal Church; Headstart, 75 children, June 1, 1965	11,705	
Knox Presbyterian Church Community Center: Headstart, 90 children, June 10, 1965	14,496	
<b>MICHIGAN</b>		
Wayne County: Detroit, Protestant Community Services, preparatory school, voter education, and community development, Vista volunteers, 11 requested, 11 active	36,850	

<sup>20</sup> *Church and State*, March, 1967, Page 10.

<sup>21</sup> *Status of OEO Programs*, September 26, 1967.



MINNESOTA	
Ramsey County: St. Paul, Jewish Vocational Service, Neighborhood Youth Corps, 220 participants, Feb. 16, 1966-----	\$211,835
MISSISSIPPI	
Winston County: Louisville, Wesley Methodist Church, Headstart, full year program, Mar. 8, 1966-----	155,498
Wesley Methodist Church: Headstart, 127 children, May 15, 1965-----	21,266
MISSOURI	
St. Louis: United Church of Christ Neighborhood Houses, supplement existing staff of three settle houses, VISTA Volunteer—Urban—6 requested, 5 in service-----	16,750
NEW MEXICO	
New Mexico Council of Churches (statewide), CAP—Migrant Workers Grant, sec. 311, June 25 1965-----	1,360,313
NEW YORK	
Eire County: Williamsville, Methodist Home for Children, Headstart, 30 children, May 15, 1965-----	5,280
Beth Israel Medical Center, develop model medical service program, CAP-demonstration grant, Dec. 21, 1965-----	661,151
NORTH CAROLINA	
North Carolina Council of Churches; Health, education, and housing programs for migrants (statewide), CAP-migrant workers grant, sec. 311, Mar. 19, 1965-----	270,444
Day care program, migrant families, same grant, Apr. 12, 1966--	190,864
Guilford County: Greensboro, Grace Lutheran Day School, Headstart, 30 children, June 10, 1965-----	4,445
OHIO	
Council of Churches of Christ in Greater Cleveland, Neighborhood Youth Corps, 116 participants, June 30, 1965-----	51,180
Hancock County Council of Churches day care program, migrant children-----	16,714
OREGON	
Multnomah County: Portland, Stone Church, Inc., DBA, Christian preschools, Headstart, 46 children, June 10, 1965-----	12,156
PENNSYLVANIA	
Bucks County: Friends Service Association for the Delaware Valley, Inc., Neighborhood Youth Corps, 40 participants, June 11, 1965-----	26,260
Friends Social Order Committee Work Corps, counseling in self-help, housing, health, employment, and municipal, service, VISTA volunteers, urban, 4 requested, 4 in service-----	13,400
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Aiken County: Second Baptist Church, Mount Canaan Baptist Association, Headstart, 100 children, June 10, 1965-----	16,207
TENNESSEE	
Anderson County: Oak Ridge, Council of Church Women, Headstart, 105 children, May 10, 1965-----	18,142
TEXAS	
Harris County: Houston, Protestant charities, Headstart, 70 children, May 13, 1965-----	11,038

VIRGINIA	
City of Danville: The Society of Christ Our King, Inc., Headstart, 54 children, June 15, 1965-----	\$5,602
Arlington County, Macedonie Baptist Church, recreation and remedial education, CAP-demonstration grant, July 6, 1965---	10,150
Chesterfield County, First Baptist Church, Headstart, 205 children, June 15, 1965-----	20,193
Chesterfield County, Midlothian, First Baptist Church, Headstart, 196 children, May 31, 1966-----	38,807
Total-----	5,313,695

A comparison of the two exhibits is highly significant. At first glance the difference in number is negligible—50, as compared to this year's number of 44. Quite frankly, to avoid charges of sectarianism, I included in last year's list only Protestant and Jewish churches and church-related institutions. No Catholic groups were listed at all. The current list of 44 includes Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic. On first impression one would surmise that since that is the case the number of grants to churches and church-related institutions must be on the decrease or even in the process of being phased out.

My experience in studying the two editions of the "Status of Programs," as well as Sargent Shriver's own statements, however, indicate that such is not the case. Evidently OEO has now come to feel that a more expedient practice is to group as many grants as possible under one large heading identified only by the umbrella agency and the general type of program; that is, CAP, Headstart, Upward Bound, and so forth, funded. Upon examination of the Status of Programs as it is now recorded there is no possible way to discover the total number of grants made to sectarian groups.

It would be of great service to the health and well-being of this country if OEO were to make known publically every grant, direct and indirect, to a church or church-related institution along with the amount. In fact, I ask Mr. Shriver to do so at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Chairman, a fitting description of the involvement of the OEO with the church is that of an iceberg. Turning through the pages of the enormous "Status of Programs Record," one sees the overt examples totaling \$7,366,424 which extrude above the surface like the known portion of the iceberg. But there is that involvement which exists covertly, buried beneath the seas of "umbrella" agencies in the fashion of the unseen portion of the glacier. The exact sum of taxpayer's money dispensed by OEO through churches and church-related institutions may never be known. But this money, whenever the church program becomes more efficient, whenever the poverty stricken believe that their help come through a church, whenever any church is endowed to a greater extent than it would ordinarily be through the voluntary gifts of its members, constitutes religious establishment which is

a direct violation of the intent and meaning of the establishment clause of the first amendment.

Those men who drafted the language of the first amendment were not irreligious. To the contrary, they were God-fearing religious men. And because they were, they insisted on preserving and bequeathing the religious liberty they had sought and found in this new land of freedom. Like them, my intent is to preserve the pluralistic religious society that is ours. It is my intention to seek to preserve the Church and State in their distinct and separate roles knowing that each serves best when it serves separately that each may freely serve.

When I read the Economic Opportunity Amendments which we reported out of the Committee on Labor and Education, I was highly encouraged by the language in title II which requires community action agencies to be State, city, and county governments. In my judgment, this is a step in the right direction to the restoration of the wall between church and state. Besides decreasing the bureaucratic administration of the poverty program by putting more authority in the hands of the States and local officials, it will give them great screening power through which the involvement of church with state and state with church may be reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, our forefathers saw the wall of separation as a wall of protection for both church and state. It was and is free of state control, the church has flourished here as in no other land. Freed from clericalism, the state has become as nowhere else the guardian of liberty.

Should the end come to such liberty as we have known in this country to what land could our children flee?

Mr. Chairman, this is the third time I have offered this amendment. I urge its adoption now. I do believe the churches should continue their war on poverty, in which they have been engaged for 2,000 years. I do not believe such churches should participate in the war on poverty with tax funds. This is a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, not just in my judgment but according to the words of the framers of that amendment and according to the words of the present Supreme Court concerning situations such as this.

There is a place for churches, and a major place, to fill in the war on poverty, but churches are not so weak in our time that they must have tax funds on which to operate. Such action is like propping up the Rock of Gibraltar with a toothpick. If the sad day should come when Washington lies in dust and New York City is an ancient, crumbling ruin, even in that day the Christian Church will stand, and serve, and continue her great ministry among men. With faith in the power of the church to fulfill her holy mission without the assistance of the OEO or the support of tax funds, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was rejected.



## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER: On page 196, line 12, strike "80 per centum" and substitute therefor "90 per centum."

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike another very onerous provision of the so-called Green amendment for those communities that can least afford to increase their contribution. The Green provision requires that after June 30, 1967, communities will have to put up 20 percent as their non-Federal share of poverty program costs.

Unfortunately, this committee did not see fit to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] that would have eliminated the requirement for half cash contributions.

The combination of the two Green provisions increasing to 20 percent the proposed local contribution and requiring half that contribution in cash, will kill the program for many needy communities.

For example, for the city of Yonkers, these two dilatory Green provisions will mean, based on the first year's OEO allotment, the city will have to come up with a local contribution of approximately \$240,000, of which \$120,000 will have to be contributed in cash. The city of Yonkers is already desperately hard pressed for funds, having exhausted the entire limit of its borrowing power, and may well be unable to make the required contribution and hundreds of the city's most needy residents will have to suffer.

There are many ways to kill this OEO program besides voting against it. This requirement of a 20-percent local contribution plus half in cash would in effect kill the program for many communities which need it the most. It is one of the many very damaging changes included at the instance of the gentlewoman from Oregon which will have the effect of undermining this important program in the guise of its support.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OTTINGER) there were—ayes 33, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, as we arrive at the closing hours of this debate, and particularly as we conclude the debate on the section relative to community action programs, I would not want the country to believe that there are only critics of this program without recognizing that there are large numbers of persons who are strong supporters of this program who urge its continuation without any major changes.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to have been given the task reading a letter sent to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Most Rev. John F. Dearden, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, dated November 14, 1967.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is Archbishop Dearden.

Mrs. MINK. The archbishop, yes.

The letter reads as follows:

## NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF

## CATHOLIC BISHOPS,

Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967.

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: May I, as President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, respectfully submit a formal resolution adopted unanimously by the Catholic Bishops of the United States, giving evidence of our concern for the welfare of a large impoverished group among our brother citizens.

Religious agencies throughout the country have worked cooperatively in the communities for an effective war against poverty. We are desirous that that war continue in an intensified manner and we pledge our further cooperation.

We urge you to convey to the members of the House of Representatives the recommendation of the bishops that the pending legislation be adopted.

We assure you, Mr. Speaker, of our prayers for the members of Congress who bear a heavy burden in guiding the destiny of our great nation.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN F. DEARDEN,  
President.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
CATHOLIC BISHOPS

The Catholic Bishops of the United States, convened in formal session in Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967, planning the fulfillment of their own responsibilities in fields of education and welfare as these are related to the services of the Church to the nation, respectfully recommend the immediate passage of strong and adequate legislation supporting the War on Poverty. We urge the House of Representatives to defeat amendments which would destroy the ability of our nation and its citizenry to keep faith with the commitments already made to the socially and economically handicapped segment of our population. To formalize this conviction of the Catholic Bishops of this country, the following resolution was passed unanimously.

*Resolved*, That the National Conference of Catholic Bishops strongly urge the House of Representatives to maintain the momentum of our national attack on poverty and its causes, thus reinforcing the confidence of our impoverished brothers that the United States and all its citizenry will keep faith with them in the increasing pursuit of justice, fairness and equal opportunity for all citizens by enacting legislation continuing the War on Poverty as administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity with an adequate budget which will enable to preserve the basic program now in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Hawaii has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF  
WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 200, line 11, strike the words "the Director shall appoint" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Of the assistant directors authorized to be appointed by section 601(a) of this Act, there shall be appointed".

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment would be to make certain that the legislation would not create two additional posts in the OEO hierarchy. The legislation now reads:

The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title.

With the amendment it would read:

Of the assistant directors authorized to be appointed by section 601(a) of this Act, there shall be two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title.

The present wording of the bill could be interpreted as meaning that the Director could appoint two more assistants to handle the title provisions exclusive of the directors authorized by section 601(a). Law now standing authorizes four assistant directors and one Deputy Director.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarifying the law, I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to add my voice to those of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] in protesting the limitation of time. It is truly regrettable that the legislative process is so stifled by limiting the time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, it precludes the appointment of two additional assistant directors in addition to the four we have at the present time.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. It would preclude?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. It would prohibit the appointment of two assistant directors.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The answer to the question of the gentleman is yes, it would prevent the appointment of the two assistant directors for community action by the Director of OEO and would require them to be appointed by the President pursuant to the authority of title VI of the EOA.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to pay tribute to the effort and dedication of both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and wish to call to the attention of the Members the following editorial from the Corning, N.Y., Leader, which appeared on November 13, 1967, entitled "Open Season on Goodell":

[From the Corning (N. Y.) Leader,  
Nov. 13, 1967]

## OPEN SEASON ON GOODELL

Congressman Charles Goodell of the Congressional District encompassing Steuben on the east to Chautauqua on the west, is the target of those who would resist reform of the poverty program to one of helping the poor instead of the politicians and pressure groups seeking power.

Goodell deserves commendation for his overall approach to the Poverty Program and his reluctance to look at narrow concepts



rather than see how the entire program is presently administered in the United States. The Administration proposal would give local control to the city halls of the country. Mr. Goodell wants community participation and poverty participants.

The Goodell approach would cut down the total expended by the government and if the perennial do-gooders will take their blinders off they will recognize that weaknesses do exist within the present structure of the program. They will also realize that, unless check reins are established; unless efforts are made to utilize all resources—government and private—that the minority groups are going to be shifted—the taxpayers to the minority and their ability to carry the tax load precariously impaired if not eliminated. The hue and cry, based on emotional and even isolated cases, is the best known tricks of the trade.

It is time that some one spoke up for all those who need help . . . the poor and the taxpayers.

Mr. Goodell's proposals eliminate the programs that have become pork barrels for politicians and pressure groups who want to build power rather than human dignity and initiative. He proposes a combined government-private enterprise approach on costs and projects. He proposes a dollar return value on every governmental dollar spent.

Because of his proposals he is being called an obstructionist by poverty groups and leaders of the free-spending elements in and out of the administration.

He and those who want realism brought into the war on poverty and who want economy instead of extravagance in salaries and operating costs, deserve support of the taxpayers and those poverty war leaders who want a realistic rather than an emotional program.

Mr. Goodell is fighting an unpopular fight but his premise is sound and will be helpful to those the program is designed to help . . . the poor rather than the politicians and perennial freeloaders.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, as I have previously pointed to the handling of this legislation let me also call to the attention of the committee the following perceptive article from the Monday, November 13, 1967, National Observer, "Why the Poverty Program Is in Trouble":

[From the National Observer, Nov. 13, 1967]

#### WHY THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS IN TROUBLE

To all appearances, Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and its War on Poverty are on the verge of being wrecked in the House of Representatives by a callous coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans. But it isn't so.

When the House decides the immediate future of the antipoverty program this week, the outcome, whatever it is, will be the total responsibility of President Johnson and the Northern Democrats. The floor debate last week left beyond question the fact that OEO is in trouble only because the Administration Democrats refuse to draw a compromise with the GOP. It is also clear that grounds for compromise exist, that the Republicans are anxious to come to terms, and that the end result, while it would be of some annoyance to President Johnson and Mr. Shriver, might actually benefit the antipoverty effort.

First of all, there is no coalition between the Republicans and Southern Democrats. If anything, the Republicans have been trying to discourage an alliance with the Dixie Democrats, even to the point of being nasty to them.

Rep. Charles Goodell, New York Republican, last week called proposed Democratic changes in the antipoverty program "the bosses' and boll-weevil amendment because it is an amendment for the big-city bosses and for the Southerners. . . ."

The amendment, advanced by Rep. Edith Green, Oregon Democrat, is primarily an attempt to lure the Southern Democrats into support of the OEO. It would make community-action programs, which are now independent local agencies that co-ordinate antipoverty programs, subservient to local governments—either city halls, county governments, or state agencies.

Mr. Goodell, who with Rep. Albert Quie, Minnesota Republican, has authored the "Opportunity Crusade," the GOP alternative to the OEO programs, was not winning friends among his Southern colleagues by calling them "boll weevils." Asserted Rep. James Gardner, a freshman Republican from North Carolina, in saying that he supported the Green amendment: "In the South we are perfectly able to take care of our own problems."

The provocation of the Southerners was deliberate and calculated. Mr. Goodell and Republican leaders know it's almost impossible for Northern and Southern Democrats to stay united on the antipoverty issue. As much as the Green amendment pacifies the Southerners, it upsets the Northern liberals, who are inclined to agree that the "bosses' and boll weevil" label is appropriate.

The Republicans believe that if they can crack this rare alliance among Democrats, the Administration supporters will be forced to come to them and agree to compromise. "Let us remember the needs of the poor and the deprived," Mr. Quie told the House. "The hard reality of poverty will be with us far beyond the elections of 1968. Democrats and Republicans should join forces to write a bill which will truly begin to end the tragedy of poverty in this land of affluence."

To Mr. Quie the issue comes down to this: Why should the minority party feel a responsibility to save a Great Society program when their own ideas for improving that program are rejected without consideration? Mr. Quie's compromise would involve taking the Head Start and Job Corps programs out of OEO and having them administered in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He would want a softening of the Green amendment, so the poor would be guaranteed some measure of control in community-action programs. Finally, he seeks a budget compromise at \$1.6 billion, \$460,000,000 less than Mr. Johnson requested. But the Administration can't realistically expect that its alliance with the Southern Democrats will obtain a higher figure for the program.

Privately, House Democratic leaders say they would buy this compromise. "I can't see that it would be a national disaster to take Head Start and the Job Corps out of OEO," says one. But the White House insists that the War on Poverty be a totally Democratic program.

While this shaky Democratic alliance may hold together this week, it does Mr. Shriver little good to threaten to quit unless Congress gives him what he wants, as he did the other day. His problem is with the President, who has only to agree to make the War on Poverty a bipartisan effort. Then many of OEO's annual problems with Congress will be diminished.—JUDE WANNISKI.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think I am a fairly friendly and easy-going fellow, but this performance today has really gotten to me. Today the Commit-

tee has been continuously doing a gross disservice to the American people by very severely limiting the debate. There were 95 minutes of total time allotted to 45 Members of this body to discuss 19 amendments. This is virtually impossible of realistic accomplishment. It is certainly impossible to do an adequate job. What right have we to fear that we here in Congress may work too long today or tomorrow or the next day? I thought the steamroller tactics of the previous Congress were ended, but obviously this is not the case. This is a disgraceful and disheartening exhibition. In my humble estimation, this Committee does not seem as interested in helping the poverty-stricken as it is in making a show of power politics.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. POLLOCK. If I have time, when I am through, I will; otherwise, I will not yield.

Mr. Chairman, whatever decisions we make here for the benefit of the American people should certainly be done after full debate and due deliberation. Our hasty and ill-considered action on important amendments is tantamount to denial of the rights of interested Members to be heard, and to that extent we fail the people who sent us here to represent them.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman on my right.

(Mr. DENNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for 3 days to the debate on S. 2388, the authorization bill for funding the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have seen my colleagues go to the microphone and use every example known to the fertile minds of men as to why this bill should be passed. I have read the entire bill, and am concerned about some facts that I hope my colleagues other than those on the committee have been able to glean from it.

One major fact is that approximately 149 times in this bill the Director of OEO is given discretionary authority in the different facets of the program to expend \$2,060,000,000. I have listened with avid interest to the massive program from the cradle to the grave with Headstart, Followthrough, day care, family planning and payment to the heirs of the VISTA volunteers in the event any of them do not survive the paycheck period.

I would specifically like to call my colleagues' attention to page 163, section 125, wherein it states:

The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

In other words, the determination of who is considered poverty stricken is also left to the discretion of the Director.



I was also interested in page 183, section 220, which states:

The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

This, in effect, gives the Director authority to spend money and to find ways to spend more money.

On page 185, subsection B, under section 221, it states:

If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community, and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to Section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

And further, on page 196, line 13:

The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

Mr. Chairman, in any type of poverty program that does not have as its main thrust the building of conditions wherein the poverty recipient can raise himself to economic stability and be proud of himself, we have as result one of two alternatives: The individual recipient of poverty funds is angry because he has to receive charity or else he is angry because he is not given enough.

I believe it is our sworn duty to see to it that every war on poverty tax dollar is spent in such a manner that it is invested in long-range future planning to help the proven poverty-stricken of this Nation to become self-sufficient and productive.

Mr. Chairman, the way this bill is worded, vesting so much power in the Director here in Washington and granting the right of a few people to control the destinies of millions, it is my firm belief that this will continue the erosion of our representative form of government. By voting for this bill, we are admitting that the time has now arrived in America when we take from the "haves" and give to the "have nots," this is the socialist's battle cry without the incentive to try to prepare the "have nots" to get themselves in the position where they can be self-sufficient, reliable, productive, economy-minded citizens who will continue to make this great country move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I call upon each one of my colleagues to carefully analyze at the time of the rollcall vote how they are

going to explain to their constituents why they voted to give \$2,060,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to one man to administer under rules and regulations that he establishes, and at his discretion can expend funds to cover every conceivable situation that might arise. I contend that this Congress should not abrogate power of this nature by giving it to the executive branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was much intrigued by the last statement made by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska indicates that there has not been sufficient time during which to fully debate the issues involved in this bill. I would point out to the gentleman that we have been engaged in the debate on this bill since a week ago Monday. No measure which has come to the floor of the House for consideration this year has received as much debate as has this particular measure.

Mr. Chairman, I think it ill becomes the gentleman from Alaska to make this complaint.

I say this because I recall that there was a rather hurry-up measure needed for the relief of the constituents of the gentleman in Alaska and on which action was urgent. It was at the gentleman's urgent request that we brought forth a bill, with no debate, under a suspension of the rules, and passed the bill, in order to accommodate the Economic Development Administration in Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, I cooperated on that expeditious action on the part of the House for the Member on that legislation for Alaska as chairman of the subcommittee. There was, however, no debate to speak of on it.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not think your comments are germane at all. The point I was making was that it is impossible to adequately consider 19 amendments which are at the Speaker's desk when 45 Members are allowed only 2 minutes each to discuss all 19 amendments. This is utterly ridiculous and totally irresponsible.

Mr. CAREY. No, I do not yield to the gentleman from Alaska. In other words, the gentleman states what is good for Alaska is not good for the balance of the country? We have had plenty of debate on this legislation, as the record will show.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] has the floor.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman from Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: Beginning on page 183, strike all of lines 19 through line 6 of page 190 and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"(4) A program to be known as basic health services designed to aid in developing and carrying out basic health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of certain fundamental health services including preventive medical advice, examination for, diagnosis, and treatment of tuberculosis, heart disease, venereal diseases, and inadequate vision or eye disease, and basic dental care and services; and

"(B) to assure that such services are made readily accessible to the poor of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any projects, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.

"(f) A program to be known as legal services designed to provide legal advice and representation to the poor when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, or to obtain such advice or representation through other public programs. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. Prior to the initiation of any such program and annually thereafter, the agency shall review the program with local bar associations for their comments and recommendations on such proposal (or program). If administered locally by a delegate or substitute agency such program shall be subject to the direction and control of the governing board of such agency or executive committee thereof, at least one-third of whose members shall be selected by and representative of the poor in the area served by such agency."

Mr. DELLENBACK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman as to what the proposed amendment contains.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, regular order.



The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is—Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I can explain very briefly the difference between this amendment and the committee print. The committee print deals with comprehensive health services. This deals with basic health services. One of our great problems is making the dollars go as far as they will go. In the health field, we face the basic question, shall we take a relatively few people and go into great depth and oftentimes spend a great deal of money in order to take care of a relatively few people? I pose the following alternative question:

Why do we not use the same limited number of dollars to reach as far as we can across the field and give broad scale coverage in basic health services?

We have here provided for supplying the specific medical coverages that the medical people tell us are the most needed coverages.

Within those basic coverages, that service program, we should be reaching with our limited number of dollars as far as possible, so that we would be able to assure that as many people as possible are given essential and needed medical services.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DELLENBACK) there were—ayes 33, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, after 6 days of debate on a rather controversial piece of legislation, things sometimes go awry when we do not intend them, so I would simply like to take this moment to say that there is an amendment pending which could undo everything that some of us have tried to prevent being done during these 6 days. That is, there is a spinoff or fragmentation amendment pending at the desk which would turn over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the administration of much of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to that. I believe all the Members would agree by now that I have made this point clear in that respect. So, as I say, I oppose the spinoff, and I do so specifically for this reason:

I believe that it is vitally important that we in the Congress know what the poverty program does and does not do. We need to know what it costs. We need to reevaluate it from time to time.

Some 20 years ago we undertook a program on foreign aid. We called it the Marshall plan. We had only one program. It was estimated that it would re-

quire 6 years and \$15 billion to rehabilitate 16 countries. This would have been \$2½ billion a year. But 20 years and \$150 billion later we now have not one but 16 different foreign aid programs costing, for example, \$9.206 billion this year for aid going to 100 countries and five territories. This is what spinoff or fragmentation does. If we fragment this program by transferring it to a number of different agencies we will suffer the same fate with this program. Not only will it grow out of all proportion, but never again will we be able to control it. Never again will we know where it is, what it does, or what it costs. This is a mistake we cannot afford and must not make again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to speak out in opposition to the proposed amendment on a spinoff.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that of all the things that the Office of Economic Opportunity has done, the best thing it has done was to commit this Nation to a total commitment against a total problem, and that problem is poverty.

It takes a total commitment. It takes our efforts all in one place to meet that commitment. I submit that we must keep this program intact. We must keep it directed toward this problem. The old-line agencies have done a good job combating poverty problems one at a time. Under OEO we are recognizing the totality of the reasons for poverty and are making a concerted attack on them.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Are there further amendments to section 103?

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 211, after line 21, insert the following new parts F and G:

#### "PART F—HEADSTART AND EARLY YEARS PROGRAMS

##### "ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 251. (a) From the funds made available under section 260 to carry out this part for each fiscal year, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall reserve (1) such amount, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs under this part, (2) such amount as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 253(b) and 256, and (3) not more than 15 per centum during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for the purpose of adjusting State allocations to assure the continuation during such fiscal year of programs which could not otherwise be funded out of a State's allocation for such year. From the remainder of such sums the Secretary shall make allotments among the States as follows:

"(1) he shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number

of children aged three to eight, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

"(2) he shall allot for each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in the State bears to the number of such families in all the States. For the purpose of this subsection, the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The number of children aged three to eight, inclusive, and the number of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 in a State, and in all the States, shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(c) The amount allotted for any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Secretary may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally allotted among those States under subsection (a) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection from funds made available pursuant to section 260 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount allotted to it under subsection (a) for that year.

#### "USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 252. Grants under this part may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 254, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of preschool and early elementary school programs for economically deprived children, as described in paragraph (b), including training of personnel and pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

"(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and for supplies, designed to provide a total preschool child development program for economically deprived children and followup programs for such children in kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school, including activities and services such as—

"(1) comprehensive physical and mental health services for children needing such assistance in order to profit fully from their educational opportunities;

"(2) food and nutritional services, including family consultations to improve nutrition in the home environment;

"(3) specialized social services designed to improve the home environments of such children and to involve parents in the child's development;

"(4) a program of daily activities designed to develop fully each child's potential;

"(5) the provision of special teachers, counseling personnel, and other remedial and noncurricular services and programs for economically deprived children in kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school to maintain the advances realized in preschool programs and to assist such children to overcome educational handicaps;

"(6) other specially designed health, social, and educational programs for economically deprived children both in school and



out of school (including summer, weekend, and vacation programs); which meet the purposes of this part; and

"(7) direct participation in development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level by parents of the children, benefited by programs assisted under this part.

#### "STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

"SEC. 253. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part shall designate (or create) for that purpose a State agency (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "State commission") which shall be broadly representative of public and private education (including the State educational agency), community action agencies qualified under title II of this Act (hereinafter referred to as community action agencies or agency, as the case may be) and public and private child welfare and health agencies in the State: *Provided*, That any State community action commission designated or established by the State for the purposes of title II of this Act shall be deemed the State commission for the purposes of this part; and submit to the Secretary through the State commission a State plan for such participation. The Secretary shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) set forth objective standards and methods for determining the school attendance areas in the State having the highest concentrations of economically deprived children, and a method for determining the highest priorities for preschool and early elementary school programs among such areas;

"(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible programs submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part, and (B) for approving and recommending to the Secretary, in order of such priority, applications covering such eligible programs;

"(4) provides for affording to every applicant which has submitted a program to the State commission an opportunity for a hearing as to any determination of the State commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his functions under this part.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend not exceeding \$10,000,000 during each of the fiscal years of this program under this part in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

#### "APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

"SEC. 254. (a) Applications for grants under this part may be submitted by any (1) community action agency, (2) local educational agency or other nonprofit agency, with the approval of a community action agency, or (3) local educational agency or other nonprofit agency in an area where there is no community action agency. Any such application shall be made at such time or times and in such manner as may be required by or pursuant to regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary for the purpose of enabling him to make the determinations required of him under this part.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve an application which—

"(1) has been approved and recommended by the State commission;

"(2) has been assigned, in accordance with the State plan, a priority that is higher than that of all other applications within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(3) provides that the funds under this part will be administered by the applicant agency and that at least 20 per centum of the cost of the program (which may be in the form of goods, services, or the reasonable rental value of facilities) shall be met from non-Federal funds in administering this subsection, except that, in exceptional cases, the Secretary may reduce or waive the non-Federal share requirement. The value of buildings, facilities, equipment, and other in-kind contributions from non-Federal sources shall be assessed and appropriately credited as part of the non-Federal contribution required herein;

"(4) sets forth a program for carrying out the uses and purposes described in section 253 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(5) provides assurances that in the planning of such program there has been, and in the carrying out of such program there will be, active participation of parents of economically deprived children in the areas to be served;

"(6) provides satisfactory assurances that the educational and developmental programs will be carried out by public or nonprofit private agencies possessing the capabilities necessary to the success of the program;

"(7) provides, with respect to any program carried out by a local educational agency, that adequate methods are employed to involve eligible children in the area served by such program who attend nonpublic schools, and that in no case shall economically deprived children in such area be denied the benefits of the program because of their attendance in nonpublic schools;

"(8) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part; and

"(9) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part and to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting the purposes of the part, and for keeping such records and affording such access to as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the verification of such reports.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"(d) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the Secretary may approve applications of eligible agencies in those States for which there is no approved State plan, providing that the application meets all the requirements of this part except those relating to a State plan, and for any fiscal year thereafter the Secretary may in like manner approve applications in any State which has failed to designate or create a State commission, or to submit a satisfactory State plan;

"(e) If, in the opinion of the Secretary, a State plan or implementation thereof fails, or will fail, to carry out the purposes of this part because (1) State constitutional, legislative, or administrative restrictions prevent full participation of qualified private agencies or organizations in the operation of Headstart or Early Years programs under this part, or (2) it does not meet the needs

of eligible children without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin, the Secretary shall withhold the allocation provided for such State until he has assurances satisfactory to him that the State plan or implementation thereof has been corrected, and in the absence of a satisfactory plan or implementation the Secretary is authorized to make grants from such State allocation directly to eligible applicants within such State for the provision of Headstart and Early Years programs.

#### "PAYMENTS

"SEC. 255. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 251 the Secretary shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this part an amount (subject to the requirements of section 254(b)(3)) equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

"(b) Payments under this part may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(c) The Secretary shall immediately cut off funds to any applicant agency when he determines that such agency is not complying with the conditions for grant approval in section 254(b).

"(d) Payments made under this part are to be considered and treated by the State commission and by each grantee as Federal funds and shall be kept entirely separate from any other public or private funds.

"SEC. 256. The Secretary is authorized to reserve an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds made available pursuant to section 260 in any fiscal year to provide, either directly or through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education or other public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations, for research, demonstration, evaluation activities, and technical assistance designed to support the programs authorized by this part.

#### "ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 257. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Advisory Committee on preschool and early elementary programs, consisting of a Chairman, and not more than fourteen members appointed without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Secretary may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

#### "BONUS GRANTS

"SEC. 258. (a) In addition to the sums authorized to be made available for part A of this title by section 260, there is hereby directed to be made available to the Secretary the sum of \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$100,000,000 for the succeeding fiscal year, for increasing the amount available to States making an additional effort consistent with the purposes of this section.



"(b) A State's allotment under section 251 for a fiscal year, shall be increased, through the use of funds appropriated under this section, by an amount equal to 50 per centum of the aggregate amount by which [attributable costs] during the fiscal year by applicants in the State for carrying out programs described in their applications exceed 100 per centum of the State's allotment (including any reallocation) for such year: *Provided*, That the State shall provide a matching 50 per centum of such amount to such programs.

"(c) In the event the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section are less than the amount necessary to make all the increases in allotments required by subsection (b), the amount of each increase under subsection (b) shall be reduced pro rata.

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 259. As used in this part—

"(1) 'economically deprived children' means children of families having an annual income (as determined by the State commission pursuant to criteria established by the Secretary) insufficient to provide a home environment conducive to learning, or who are recipients of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, except that in no case shall a local educational agency or a private nonprofit school be required to apply an income test to establish the eligibility of elementary school children in need of the in-school services provided under this title;

"(2) 'the first three grades of elementary school' may in addition include kindergarten school in those areas in which kindergarten is provided as a part of a program of free, public education.

#### "PROGRAM; ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 260. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants pursuant to the provisions of part A of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, for the purpose of assisting State commissions to arrange for the conduct of preschool and early elementary school programs for economically deprived children and for the funding of such programs.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there is hereby directed to be transferred to the Secretary from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act the sum of \$375,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969; *Provided, however*, That such amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall include any sums expended by or under the authority of the Director after June 30, 1967, for such programs.

"(c) The Secretary and the Director shall develop procedures for the orderly transfer of existing programs, including jointly developed regulations, which shall assure that policies affecting existing grants shall remain in effect until changed by the Secretary.

#### "PART G—UPWARD BOUND

##### "TRANSFER OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 261. (a) The program known as 'Upward Bound' and conducted under the authority of section 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, shall be carried out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary'), as provided by this part.

"(b) The Secretary shall assume administrative responsibilities with respect to all grants, contracts, or other arrangements made by or on behalf of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the conduct of Upward Bound programs to be carried out in whole or in part after June 30, 1967.

#### "ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 262. There is hereby directed to be transferred to the Secretary from amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, the sum of \$15,000,000 to enable the Secretary to enter into arrangements pursuant to the provisions of this part; *Provided, however*, That such amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall include any sums expended by or under the authority of the Director after June 30, 1967, for such program.

#### "DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 263. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school and among young people from low-income backgrounds who have inadequate secondary school preparation for continuing their education beyond high school.

"(b) The program shall be conducted by means of grants to or contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions which shall include;

"(1) arrangements for cooperative efforts among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools;

"(2) assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the project will include a curriculum designed to develop the intellectual processes, skills, and attitudes needed for success in postsecondary education; and

"(3) necessary health services and such recreational and cultural activities as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

#### "COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 264. The Secretary shall take such action as he deems necessary to coordinate the operation of Upward Bound with the program of educational opportunity grants authorized by title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and he shall take necessary steps to consult with State and private agencies and institutions with a view to developing a coordinated effort to achieve the purposes of this part.

#### "ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 265. Of the funds appropriated or allocated for the purpose of carrying out this part, the Secretary shall first reserve not in excess of 3 per centum thereof for allotment among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs, and he shall allot the remainder among the States, in accordance with the latest available satisfactory data, so that (1) 50 per centum is distributed on the basis of the relative number of children enrolled in grades 9 through 12 (both inclusive) in each State, and (2) 50 per centum is distributed on the basis of the relative number of school-age children in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 in each State. That part of any State's allotment which the Secretary determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Secretary may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States."

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has not yet been read.

The Clerk will continue reading the amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand

the spinoff since it has been debated so much and at length. So I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is the amendment which was offered previously by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] and as to which Members objected to the request that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be considered as read, which request was made to dispense with the further reading because we felt it was unwise that the Clerk spend time reading the amendment when there were Members who were waiting to be heard.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] was not recognized or called upon even though he was standing.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, since Members wanted the amendment to be read, I think it should be read and I object to the request to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 33, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 200, after line 8, insert the following new section 233:

#### "AUTOMATION OF JOB OPPORTUNITY DATA

"SEC. 233. (a) Sections 106 and 107 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. (a) The Secretary of Labor is directed, using every appropriate facility, to develop, compile, and make available information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area, or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act. In the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall give the highest priority to performing the duties prescribed by this section with particular emphasis on identifying and publishing those occupations, skills, industries, and geographic areas in which the supply of qualified workers is insufficient to meet existing and foreseeable future needs.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor is further directed to develop and establish in the United States Employment Service a program for matching the qualifications of job applicants with employer requirements on a local, interarea, and nationwide basis. Such programs shall be designed to provide a quick and direct means of communication among local offices of the Service in the interarea and nationwide referral, recruiting, and placement of unemployed and underemployed workers, and the referral of workers to industries which need them wherever located throughout the Nation. In the development of such program, the Service shall establish a network utilizing elec-



tronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information.

"SEC. 107. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as are appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1968) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training. Such reports shall contain a specific and detailed account of the administration, utilization, and operation of the functions and activities prescribed by section 103 of this Act."

"(b) The Director is hereby directed to transfer to the Secretary of Labor, from the sums appropriated or allocated for the purpose of carrying out title II of this Act, the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, to be used for the purpose of carrying out the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as amended by subsection (a)."

Mr. GIBBONS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR.  
GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time not so much in anger as in shame and sadness. We have had a lively and enlightening debate up until mid-afternoon today. Members from the other side of the aisle where there is now jeering a little bit—Members who are not on the committee—worked for weeks developing amendments to this legislation, and when they presented them in disgust they even refused to try in the 2 minutes' time allotted to them to explain those amendments.

Now, is that fair, I ask you Democrats and Republicans? Is it proper legislative procedure? Can you really be proud of the House performing in that fashion?

Mr. Chairman, we are here representing our people, each of us from large districts. The committee members have had ample time to present amendments up until we reached this point in the bill. When the debate limitation was put on there were 19 amendments pending at the desk. Everyone knew there would be no time to debate. We have seen a travesty. The Members have come down here who have worked hard, most of them not on the committee, most of them without having an opportunity to speak to

this Committee on such amendments, and have had to have them just read up here and have them explained in a short period of time. Even after the debate limitation was put on, a long amendment was offered on our side, and the Member who was a proponent of that amendment stood up and wanted to save the Committee time, and asked unanimous consent that it not be read. You just heard it read, because there was objection from the other side of the aisle to the unanimous-consent request to save this Committee time, and to offer the members of the Committee time to explain their amendments. It took a half an hour to read that amendment. A waste of time for all of us that could have been much more productively used.

But, Mr. Chairman, when parliamentary tactics are used on one side to put a clamp on debate, then there is only one device left for the other side to use, and that is to use parliamentary tactics to punish in return.

It is a sad, sad day when we get into such a dilatory parliamentary tactic instead of debating the legislation that is pending.

This amendment that I have offered is a very important amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not proceeding in order—he is not discussing the preferential motion.

Mr. GOODELL. I am leading up to that.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be instructed to proceed in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the preferential motion opens up the whole bill for discussion, and the gentleman is in order.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an important amendment. It should be discussed. It involves trying to find out where the job vacancies are in our country so we can fit people with skills into those vacancies. We cannot even debate this issue. No one is going to have the opportunity, except for answering on the preferential motion, to debate it. I am more fortunate, because I am the last one, and offer the preferential motion, so I at least have time to stand up and object to this procedure.

But, Mr. Chairman, I say to all the Members that poverty is too important an issue to be decided in this manner. This is a legislative travesty of shameful proportions. We appear to be leading now to a point where other debate limitations will be imposed. It will not be so much a penalty on me and other members of the committee as it will on those Members of the House who are not members of the committee, and want to debate.

The greatest voice raised against this procedure was one of your distinguished and respected Members on your side of the aisle who had worked for weeks and could not explain his amendment and have it considered in a deliberative fashion.

You appear to be playing now the game of chicken with this important legislation—go right up to the end—close up debate, no changes, no deliberative process, and when we get to the brink you think that enough Members on both sides of the aisle will hold their nose and vote for something that they do not like.

Well, the legislation may survive—it may survive this Committee today, but it goes on from there into the appropriation process and thereafter it will survive without the confidence of this Committee and without the necessary appropriations to implement a good program if we had made this a good program. It is a sad day for this Committee, a sad day for the country, but most somberly and seriously, it is a sad day for the poor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to observe that for a good many years I have sat here and have watched a certain coalition at work. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York, for the first time that we have a coalition of Democrats working, he cannot take it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I do agree that we are being deprived to some degree because we never had a chance today to discuss the fact that the minority has now introduced a third crusade—a third opportunity crusade.

I note that in terms of history and in the chronology of time the bill, H.R. 14004, which is the third crusade, is akin to the fact that the third crusade took place in the year 1087.

So the minority are moving up pretty close to the present generation now.

I notice that there are three sponsors of this bill, just as there were three leaders of the third crusade, and they were Richard the Lion Hearted, Frederick Barbarossa, and Philip Augustus of France—and you can guess which one is leading this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of my distinguished colleagues across the aisle, especially after we have taken so much time and have given this legislation such thorough consideration.

This is the sixth day that we have had this legislation on the floor for consideration. The gentleman in his amendment yesterday virtually offered every amendment that was offered today and that he is now complaining about.

Mr. Chairman, the record will speak for itself.

The amendments on yesterday were thoroughly debated. Now, minority proceeds today with practically identical amendments and say: Let us have more time—let us have more time.

The time allocation was reasonable. We all knew what we were voting on. I want to state for the benefit of the gen-



tleman from New York that he had an opportunity since last June to produce any witness that he wanted to produce, and he did so before the Committee on Education and Labor. They were not identified as Republican or Democratic witnesses, and he participated actively. I might add that I do not recall any witness supporting the approach being taken by the sponsors of these amendments. There was never a moment in those hearings that the gentleman did not get exactly what he wanted or what he requested in the way of witnesses to be heard.

Now he is complaining about the procedures here today. The gentleman knows, and I know, that the amendments which were considered within this time limitation were considered yesterday—many of them were considered yesterday—in his amendment that he offered and in other amendments that were offered here by the minority.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. First, not a single amendment that was offered today has been offered previously in any form in this debate. For the RECORD, I would like you to tell us which ones have been previously offered, because none of them have.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

It is true that some of the packaging of the amendments may be different, but in substance they would accomplish the same objective.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment at this time to respond publicly to questions which my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has just put to me.

Mr. PEPPER has a deep concern for the problems facing elderly persons, and he has asked me about several provisions that the committee has adopted in the bill it has reported.

I want to state that we have provided in several places for the participation of older persons in programs authorized by the committee bill.

The elderly will be participants in all training programs authorized by title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

A new special emphasis program providing a wide range of services and opportunities for the elderly has been added to title II of the act.

And finally, the committee has provided for the participation of older persons of VISTA volunteers, and has called for VISTA to design more programs that aid the older poor.

I have had many conversations with my good friend from Florida on these matters, and I just wanted to assure him that the bill before the House contains these added features, which the committee felt would be of great assistance to the elderly. I would add that the committee expects that qualified elderly citizens will be used in administrative, technical, and professional capacities throughout the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division—demanded by Mr. GOODELL—there were—ayes 58, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GONZALEZ: On page 190, strike out line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "related services. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts; and such programs shall include provision for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PERKINS. Have we not already finished section 103?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment would amend section 103, and that section is still open for amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restore to the war on poverty eight local programs across the country which have been providing comprehensive health services to narcotic addicts under the provisions of section 211-2(b) of the OEO amendments of last year.

There can be no doubt that narcotic addiction is a predisposition to poverty. Nor can there be any doubt that narcotic addiction is a health and social problem of national concern. Last year Congress provided for projects for comprehensive treatment and service to narcotic addicts. Eight projects were given life. They will be less than a year old next June 30 and, unless my amendment is adopted, will then die a premature death.

This should not happen. Beyond the human misery involved, beyond the terrible economic loss associated with supporting a "habit," the problems of narcotic addiction demand much for effective techniques of treatment. We need experience on how to work with addicts while they still hold jobs and live with their families; we need to test likely innovations; we need continuity in rehabilitation programs, for it takes years to know whether addicts will remain "clean."

The eight new programs in existence are in Chicago, Washington, D.C., several counties in New Jersey, New York City, Los Angeles, Puerto Rico, Tacoma, and in my district of San Antonio. The reports of their work has been favorable. The project of the Patrician movement in San Antonio, operated by the dedicated and experienced Father Dermot Brosnan, has been singled out for special praise by the official Texas summary of progress in the war on poverty.

The Patrician movement has a three-

pronged program to assist in the rehabilitation of addicts, nearly all of whom come "off the streets." First, the addict is detoxified at a local general hospital. This fills an obvious need, since there are only two Public Health Service hospitals in the country which have any space at all for voluntary commitment of narcotic addicts. And there is obviously less disruption to whatever job or family life an addict might have in staying in the home community. Second, an addict's family is involved in his rehabilitation, and let to understand the various tenacles of addiction. And finally, the Patrician movement follows-up their detoxified addicts, assisting with job training and job placement, and continuing medical supervision. Father Brosnan still maintains contact, for example, with a former addict who is working as an airline technician in Guam.

In a task force report, the recent crime commission of the President declared:

Treatment of narcotic addiction is by no means a certain or perfected medical art. The Commission therefore considers it imperative that treatment programs be flexible enough to follow each promising idea and technique as it emerges.

Adequate health and support services for narcotic addicts is in terribly short supply, and the need for new treatment techniques is great. My amendment would allow for the continuation of those projects which are proving their worth. Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

A possible question on the amendment is: Cannot these projects switch and get funded under the Narcotic Addiction Rehabilitation Act of 1966?

There are several problems with NARA. For one, it does not even have its guidelines out yet, and there is question whether the level of their appropriations will be above subsistence. And further, its assistance is limited to addicts who have been charged with a crime; addicts charged with certain crimes have the option of possible criminal commitment of narcotic commitment. And, I understand, there is a constitutional question about the commitment of NARA.

Another possible question on the amendment is: How much was spent on last year's narcotic addiction program of OEO?

Nationally, it is \$11.2 million. Operation CHAPS of the Patrician movement received \$417,900 as its Federal share, matching it with \$59,000 of local funds. CHAPS has reached about 375 families, and is servicing 300 addicts and their families at present. One addict has a family of 10; while some are divorced. The cost per addict is not low. For one thing, it costs \$75 a day for a hospital bed to detoxify an addict. But compare the per addict cost of rehabilitation to its alternatives: It can easily cost \$7,000 a year to pay for a habit, and if the addict is stealing to support his addiction, the value of the thefts he must make are five or ten times that amount. Or if imprisoned, the Government pays more than that for his confinement.

Another possible question on the amendment is: Why not leave narcotic addiction up to the States, the PHS hospitals, or to private concerns?



While a few States, California and New York especially, have some sort of narcotics rehabilitation program, Texas and most other States have none.

There are only two PHS hospitals expressively for narcotics addicts in the country, Fort Worth and Lexington, Ky. Half of their beds are for Federal prisoners; the beds for addicts who commit themselves voluntarily are on a space-available basis.

The programs of private groups, though highly desirable, are generally small and ill-financed, and inadequate to the dimensions of the drug addiction problem nationally.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] which would provide specifically for programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, including plans for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts. In 1966 the Committee on Education and Labor wrote similar language into the comprehensive health services section of the antipoverty legislation—section 211-2(b). As a result, eight projects for the rehabilitation of narcotics addicts have been approved at a cost of \$11.2 million which is small compared to the social costs which they are designed to obviate.

Section 222 of the committee bill omits explicit language authorizing programs for the prevention of addiction and the rehabilitation of addicts. While it is possible that they might continue to receive funds under section 232—pilot and experimental programs—or under section 221, the limited funds under these sections are available for carefully circumscribed programs. Existing rehabilitation programs may be cut back, and no new programs are likely to start.

One of the eight programs approved under this section should be of great significance to New York City. It is a \$4.7 million 18-month grant to the office of the coordinator of addiction programs intended for a citywide, comprehensive program to cope with narcotics addiction, including steps toward prevention, counseling, treatment, job placement, and local community participation. Unfortunately, although Federal funds have been made available, this program has not yet been put into operation by the city.

I urge that we take action to retain the specific authorization for narcotic addiction and rehabilitation programs. The amendment deserves support.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The amendment was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: On page 174, beginning on line 16, strike out the words "shall" through "and" on line 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to be offered to section 103, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read "PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM", and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read "LOANS TO FAMILIES".

(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards."

(c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting the word "principal" after the word "aggregate", and (2) by inserting after "families" the following: ", and, in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions".

(d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking out "titles III of this Act" in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

SEC. 105. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "enterprises;" and inserting in lieu thereof "enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals;"

(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "employment of the long-term unemployed" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals";

(2) striking out the period at the end of the next to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon; and

(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sentence, "Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency."

(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out the first subsection (b), and by adding at the end of the second subsection (b) the following: "To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary."

(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

(1) renumbering section 405 to read "407" and inserting in such section "and the Secretary of Commerce" immediately following the word "Administration";

(2) striking out section 404; and

(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to read as follows:

##### "DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to

this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

##### "LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

##### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

"(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;

"(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities, and the stimulation of new private capital resources through the use of guarantees, pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

"(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

"(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

"(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

"(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

"(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

"(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

"(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary and appro-



priate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

"(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 104 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of sections 104 and 105.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GURNEY: On page 215, line 1, strike out "Director" and insert the following "Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consideration of any recommendations of the Director,".

On page 215, beginning in line 4, strike out "and the Director shall jointly" and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", after consideration of any recommendations of the Director, shall".

On page 215, line 13, strike out "or the Secretary of Commerce."

On page 215, line 19, strike out "Secretary of Commerce," and insert "Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

On page 217, line 10, strike out "Secretary of Commerce" and insert "Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

On page 217, line 20, strike out "Secretary of Commerce" and insert "Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

On page 218, line 3, strike out "Secretary of Commerce" and insert "Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, as could be observed from the reading of the amendment, what this would do is to remove the Department of Commerce from the administration of this portion of the act and substitute the Small Business Administration and put it in charge. As a matter of fact, it would continue the present state of affairs.

The bill last year transferred the administration of this entire program to SBA. It was the feeling of the House at that time that SBA had better expertise to handle this program more effectively, because the whole purpose of the Small Business Administration is to encourage and help small businessmen.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to discuss these amendments with several Members on our side of the aisle and on the Committee on Education and Labor. It is the consensus among the Members, although

not unanimous, that the amendments should be accepted. Personally I have no objection to the gentleman's amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for that statement.

This amendment amends section 406 of title IV to substitute wherever the words the Secretary of Commerce occur, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

This portion of the act focuses special attention in carrying on programs to encourage small business to locate in urban and rural areas with a high proportion of unemployed and low-income individuals; it seeks to promote, develop, and encourage private enterprise, small businesses, to be owned by low-income people.

I think every one of us in this House would agree that this is a most important part of this act. I wholeheartedly support this part of the amendments of 1967 to the poverty war.

The original act contained such a provision. For the first 2 to 2½ years of the act the Office of Economic Opportunity ran this program, with the help of the Small Business Administration as far as processing the loans were concerned.

The bill last year transferred the administering of this entire program to SBA. The feeling was that SBA had the expertise to handle the program better. The whole purpose of SBA is to encourage and to help small businessmen who do not have either sufficient capital or the means to get sufficient capital to operate their businesses.

Now, in this present bill before us, there is an attempt to shove SBA out of this picture, to push it aside, and to transfer the functions of this part of the act to the Department of Commerce.

All of us here in the House know that attempts have been made over the years to downgrade or wipe out the Small Business Administration and to get its functions over into the Department of Commerce.

We see here in section 406 this broken record being replayed once again.

The only argument that I have seen made by any proponent of this section 406, is that we "need a concentrated approach" to the development of small business in slum areas; that we need technical assistance in management training. No one argues with that, and that is what the language of section 406 provides. But there is no evidence that the huge Department of Commerce, completely oriented toward big business, is going to concern itself with the problem of developing, nurturing, encouraging, and making successful small businessmen in slum areas.

The Small Business Administration was created for the very purpose that small businessmen were being neglected by the Department of Commerce and that a special agency should be set up to help them.

As nearly as I can determine, the record of SBA in carrying out the provisions of this part of the Economic Opportunity Act has been pretty good. For example, when this portion of the act was being handled by OEO from Janu-

ary 1965 to November 1966, 22 months, 3,800 loans were processed involving \$29 million.

After SBA took over full control in the just concluded period of 12 months SBA put out 3,112 loans totaling \$32 million.

It seems to me the record speaks for itself.

It is possible that SBA needs to make greater efforts in this assistance program to slum businessmen. Perhaps this performance could be improved. So could the performance of any one of us, or any agency of Government for that matter.

But, I see no earthly reason for taking away these functions from the only agency in Government especially created for and oriented in the direction of the small businessman and lodging those in a department of big business, the Department of Commerce.

What we have here in section 406 is definitely an attempt to pirate the functions of one agency of Government away from it for the benefit of another agency of Government. I certainly hope that the House refuses to be any part of this shoddy kind of business and I hope that my amendment passes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] and rise in support of his amendment which would delete from the bill under consideration section 406 which would set up a duplicating "SBA" in the big business-oriented Department of Commerce.

I trust the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], will accept the amendment.

This is the third time in 2 years, Mr. Chairman, we see the enemies of SBA seeking to dilute its independence and duplicate or transfer its basic functions to the Department of Commerce.

The enemies of SBA have tried the front door through outright reorganization and transfer of SBA to Commerce—the side through creation of a new department to absorb SBA—and now they are trying the back door through the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

I want to emphasize that members of both parties in the House Small Business Committee have taken a strong position in opposition to section 406 of this bill on the grounds that section constitutes an assault upon the independence of SBA.

Section 406 would authorize the Department of Commerce to establish divisions to perform such SBA functions as financial assistance, management assistance, and procurement assistance.

Section 404 would again create a duplicating SBA-OEO effort in the anti-poverty business loan program.

Section 406 would be primarily an urban program to the exclusion of the rural and small town sections of our Nation. I urge approval of the amendment to delete 406 from the bill.

Section 404 which relates to section 406 was added to the bill in the Senate and would have the effect of again introducing divided authority and divided responsibility in the antipoverty loan



program of the Small Business Administration.

These provisions would bring about duplication, inefficiency and overlapping functions between SBA and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] introduced an amendment in 1966 similar to the one now pending and his amendment was adopted, which provided for an efficient pattern of operation by vesting sole authority for the antipoverty loan program with the SBA.

Under the language of the bill, it is now proposed to return to a system of divided authority and divided responsibility and result in more confusion and redtape and inefficiency in administering an antipoverty loan program.

Officials of OEO testified before our House Small Business Committee that they are not sure of their competence to handle a business loan program.

The SBA is competent, is capable, and experienced and is doing an effective job, and we should not provide for divided authority and duplication and inefficiency.

The proof of the wisdom of the action of Congress in vesting the loan program with the SBA is best shown by the figures on numbers of loans—the antipoverty loans made.

Prior to giving SBA sole authority to make antipoverty loans—and when we had a system of overlapping functions, duplication, and much redtape—very few antipoverty small business loans were made. Since SBA has been given sole responsibility for making antipoverty loans, the number of antipoverty small business loans has greatly increased. Here are the facts:

During the 22 months period with divided authority, a total of 2,800 loans were made—\$29 million. After giving SBA sole authority, some 3,112 antipoverty loans have been made for a total of \$32 million in a period of 1 year.

In other words, in 1 year SBA has made almost twice as many loans as were made in a 2-year period with the divided authority and divided responsibility.

Rather than return to inefficiency and duplication, as sections 404 and 406 would accomplish, I urge deletion of these sections from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, there were gentlemen on the floor seeking recognition to speak on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen were not on their feet at the time.

Mr. CURTIS. I was not, but I observed others who were. Now, the Chair has been acting very peremptorily, I might observe, and it is about time we had a little order here.

The CHAIRMAN. I want the gentleman from Missouri to know that the Chair is here to protect the rights of the majority and see that the will of the majority shall prevail.

Mr. CURTIS. How about the minority? The Chair has not been acting in order, I might say.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a number of my constituents from Washington County, Tenn., have written to me recently expressing their concern over a directive reportedly issued by Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, that the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag cannot be used in OEO programs because the Pledge contains the words "under God."

I am appalled but hardly shocked by this attitude on the part of Mr. Shriver. His outrageous directive is just one more reason for my belief that he should be fired and OEO abolished.

The letters I received express my own feelings so completely that I would like to pass a portion of them for your thoughtful consideration:

This should be a matter of great importance to all of us who believe in our Country and the Christian principles upon which it was founded and by which it must continue if we are to survive the threats of Godlessness which threaten the foundations of our very existence. This is just one more instance of moral breakdown which is all too prevalent today and if not protested by many of our citizens will inevitably lead to the utter collapse of freedom, morality and Christian precepts which we love and for which many of us have fought and died to preserve.

It is a sad day when the people involved in the OEO programs are to be denied the privilege of reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. If we have but one responsibility to these people, it is to instill in them a love for their country and the principles upon which it was founded. We must not allow the Director of OEO to deprive anyone of this precious right.

I call upon Sargent Shriver to make an immediate reply to either confirm or deny this shocking allegation by many very responsible people of my district. If the charge is true, the order should be rescinded immediately.

Do not delay any longer, Mr. Shriver. The people are entitled to know. I would not be surprised should anyone call your office that they would get an automatic denial, because I have been unable to contact you. I wired you 3 months ago on a matter and you have refused to answer my wire and you have refused to return my telephone calls.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the gentleman's statement that the Office of Economic Opportunity should be entirely abolished. I assume you would fight poverty by throwing rocks at beggars.

Mr. QUILLEN. I just want to make sure that my position is clearly made known to everyone. I advocate abolishment of the OEO, and I believe the good programs should be put under responsible Federal agencies.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Has the

gentleman a copy of the directive to which he makes reference?

Mr. QUILLEN. I do not have it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Has the gentleman ever seen such a directive?

Mr. QUILLEN. I have not seen it. Therefore, I am calling on Sargent Shriver to confirm or deny.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentleman is acting solely on hearsay?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am not acting solely on hearsay. I am acting on the letters which I have received from responsible constituents of my congressional district.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, did the gentleman's responsible constituents allege that they saw a directive to this effect?

Mr. QUILLEN. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Did they give any information or reference to the directive by date or any kind of number? As the gentleman knows, most directives are numbered. Is there any way in which the gentleman could identify the directive?

Mr. QUILLEN. No. I say, however, that Sargent Shriver should either deny it or confirm it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the gentleman should have more precise information upon which to proceed.

Mr. QUILLEN. I did call his attention to it.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman from Michigan. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. I am happy to have the gentleman's response.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is a shocking day in American history, if this is true, that one of the Federal agencies of this Government would say that we cannot have the Pledge of Allegiance because it contains the words "under God." I think it is most shocking.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] who has taken the trouble to circulate the scurrilous rumor that OEO, of all things, is opposed to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, has distinguished himself principally by his implacable opposition to every conceivable facet of the war against poverty. He is one of those critics of the program for whom every charge or statement ever uttered against OEO or any antipoverty activity automatically assumes the aura of unimpeachable truth. In this case, as in most others which the gentleman has seen fit to become involved in, the charge against OEO is totally false.

The facts are as follows: A middle level program official serving with OEO's north central regional office in Kansas City, Mo., made an initial judgment, based upon his understanding of constitutional restrictions regarding the use of Federal funds to support church-related activities, that required recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was perhaps impermissible. I do not understand that gentleman's reasoning but in any event do not have to defend his judgment, because it was promptly overruled in a memorandum issued by the OEO General



Counsel's Office. This memorandum clearly stated that recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance is both praiseworthy and to be encouraged and that under no circumstances is a decision on the part of an OEO-funded project director to require such a pledge as part of a program activity to be either discouraged or interfered with.

Unfortunately, as seems to be the case in every single instance in which any individual connected with an OEO program deviates for one moment from what might be considered the purest strain of patriotism, this incident received a ridiculously disproportionate amount of press coverage. There is simply nothing to the gentleman's charge that OEO opposes the Pledge of Allegiance and any assertion to the contrary is both irresponsible and false. Mr. Chairman, that should dispose of this frivolous allegation.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Has not the amendment passed and been so announced by the Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry as to the disposition of the Gurney amendment to section 105.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Gurney amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALL. That is correct; yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the case to which the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has referred is indeed shocking. And, if it is true this represents a perfect example of "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel," because according to the testimony of Sargent Shriver himself, many grants have been given to churches and other religious organizations through the Office of Economic Opportunity for the operation of various programs.

Mr. Chairman, for the period of 2 years I have been working toward passage of the amendment which I discussed a few moments ago. That amendment, at the outset, was intended to nip in the bud a practice which seemed to me to be clearly unconstitutional and a practice which I felt violated the intent of the Congress as contained in the original legislation.

No reasonable person could find a violation of the first amendment in the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag, but many would feel concerned if they knew the amount of Federal funds flowing into church treasuries, directly or indirectly from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is my understanding that OEO has, in fact, sought to prevent a participating church from displaying religious symbols or in any other way influencing participants in an OEO program toward the adoption of that church's faith.

Mr. Chairman, I pose the question as to in just what position does this place the church? It means that the church must submit to restrictions of its function and witness, indeed to pretend it is not what it is, in order to attempt to avoid violation of the Constitution while participating in a program whereby that particular church receives Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Tennessee is correct, he is correct because we got into an unconstitutional area in the first place and no one knows just what ramifications this unconstitutional practice may ultimately have.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, in my district one of these CAP programs was discontinued. One of the reasons given for not funding the program was that the director permitted prayer in the Headstart program. The region director of OEO is reported to have complained of this unauthorized activity and the CAP director was severely criticized.

Now Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not opposed to the Headstart program and would like to see it expanded. But not under the expensive reactionary leadership of the OEO.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, such may be the price of violation of the Constitution in the first place.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. STEIGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the only portion of the war on poverty directed at the economic development of ghetto and slum areas will suffer a serious setback this afternoon by the adoption of the amendment to title IV.

Title IV is the only portion of the poverty program aimed strictly at the economic development of this Nation's urban poverty areas. Although the program contained in title IV will remain if the bill is adopted and goes to conference, the House version is inferior to that which came from committee because it assigns the jurisdiction of this vital program to the Small Business Administration rather than the Department of Commerce.

It is my hope that the vote of the Committee on Education and Labor adopting the original provisions of title IV by a 21-to-6 margin will prevail in the House-Senate conference and I urge the conferees to give this matter serious consideration during their deliberation.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the debate on the provisions of title IV which took place between myself and several of my colleagues through statements inserted in the RECORD was an argument advanced against the concept contained in title IV. Nowhere was an argument ad-

vanced against a program of management assistance for our Nation's ghettos. The program has support and must be maintained. It should not, however, be confined to the Small Business Administration.

In previous statements in the RECORD I have outlined the merits of such a program. I have indicated the value of creating responsible citizens in the ghetto areas. I have pointed out the value of building local ownership of industry and the value of aiding members of minority groups in their attempts at private enterprise. I will not here restate what has already been said.

I do want to point out, however, that throughout the discussion of this issue, there has been a basic misunderstanding of what is involved. This misunderstanding has been perpetuated by a feeling that the assignment of this program to the Commerce Department would in some way sound the death knell of the Small Business Administration. Let me say as I have so often said previously, nothing could be further from the intent of the title IV program which I offered in the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Small Business Administration is involved in the loaning of funds to private citizens who are reasonably good "risks." SBA does an excellent job with this program and should continue its jurisdiction over it. What we are talking about in title IV, however, is not really a loaning program but a management assistance program aimed at seeking out and training those capable of owning small businesses in ghetto areas. Such a program is not simply the reviewing of applications that might be submitted but it consists of the active solicitation and training of ghetto residents.

It is my feeling that the Commerce Department is better equipped to handle such a program of management assistance than is the Small Business Administration. It is also my feeling that a program of this sort assigned to SBA would create hardships on that agency. And lastly, it is my belief that a business program and a loan program should not be mixed. Although they should work together and one should not and must not exclude the other, to mix them would be, as former SBA Director Bernard Boutin said, like mixing "gasoline and matches."

For these reasons I have fought to hold title IV as voted out of the Committee on Education and Labor and as adopted in the other body. It is my hope that the House conferees on this legislation will take this important matter into consideration during their deliberations and will sustain the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening off and on to the various charges and countercharges, but I have never heard anything to compare with what I have just heard. In the first place, we have august colleagues of this House getting up and building up a shadowy charge as if something has happened that has not even been so much as substantiated.



Mr. Chairman, I can testify from personal experience, at least, in my own district, and in a half dozen other districts in Texas, that the oath of allegiance has been read and repeated during the course of the poverty program there, such as in Headstart, and NYC, and other meetings that I personally can testify to as being present and witnessing. Therefore, I can hardly reconcile the charges that have been raised this afternoon on the House floor with anything that approximates the truth.

I can hardly visualize such a directive coming from the national office of OEO. The gentleman from Tennessee who raises this charge by indirection fails to state that he has at any time attempted to obtain an answer from Sargent Shriver prior to bringing up this issue this afternoon. But having seen that the inveterate enemies of the program since 1964 have resorted to every means—flag, home, motherhood, and now God—it does not surprise me. It suggests to me Dorothy Parker's little ditty that goes like this:

Higglety-pigglety, my little white hen,  
She lays eggs only for gentlemen.  
I can't persuade her with pistol or lariat  
To come across for the proletariat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.  
I rise in support of the bill.

[Mr. GRAY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

On page 212 on line 8, there is inserted new wording for section 301. In referring back to the original bill I find that there is no reference to loans.

Now, it says under the new section 301:

It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards.

What is the limitation, or what is the amount, or what is the duration with regard to the loan?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The maximum maturity of the loan is 15 years and the aggregate principal indebtedness may not exceed \$3,500.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The present bill we are operating under, before this bill is adopted, section 301 does not make any reference to loans at all. So I would presume that this creates the authority for making loans. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. This does extend authority for making the loans.

Under the original act, and I have it here, there is authorization to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not resulting in any aggregate or principal indebtedness of more than \$3,500 at any one time to a low income rural family where in the judgment of the director such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting permanent increases in the income of such families.

All the way through the history of the act, it has been the purpose to make loans to low income rural families.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I see that you are reading from section 302.

But at the same time you do not read all of that section where it also says in the new wording there, "in the case of the elderly will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions."

Mr. PERKINS. That is true. We made the elderly eligible for the loans this year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would just like to have the gentleman explain what you mean by this.

Mr. PERKINS. We made the elderly eligible—that is the low income elderly people on public assistance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Are those loans to be repaid or do you expect them to be repaid?

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, yes, they are repayable. The administration is carried out through the Farmers Home Administration—the loans are for 15 years at lower rates of interest.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Where is the reference to the Farmers Home Administration? I do not find that anywhere.

Mr. PERKINS. They administer this program by delegated authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will accept that, but I have not been able to find any reference to that or who the loans are to be made by.

On page 214, on line 6, of the bill, the language reads:

To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary.

Is that what you mean when you say the Farmers Home Administration—do you mean the Farmers Home Administration or the Small Business Administration are included—all of these included? Or are they set forth anywhere in the act? Because I see some reference to the Small Business Administration but I do not see any reference to it at a point where the loans are authorized—except in a general way.

Mr. PERKINS. The rural family loans under title III are administered by the Farmers Home Administration and are limited to \$3,500. The Small Business Administration administers the loan program under title IV which is directed to small businesses, and limited to \$25,000.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Are those the only two agencies through which loans can be made?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is there any limitation upon the amount of money which can be loaned under the authority of this subsection (c)?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, \$25,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at the point where the exchange took place with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reference was made a few minutes ago to a "shadowy set of facts" concerning the poverty program operation.

I want to deal for a minute or two with something about which apparently there is nothing "shadowy" so far as the General Accounting Office is concerned. That is the report on the operation of the Parks Job Corps Center in California.

I would like to have the attention of the gentlewoman from Oregon to ask her if she, having written to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on October 26 asking for additional information with respect to the situation at Parks—what she heard from the chairman with respect to that and whether she ever got the report that she requested which was critical of this California poverty operation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I do not have my file of correspondence here, and I do not remember the date. I wrote our chairman, as I recall, about another matter, the McKinsey reports. I also objected to one of the people in the Office of Economic Opportunity trying to invoke executive privilege. I think this matter has been straightened out.

As far as the Camp Parks report is concerned, that has been given to all members of the committee by the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office made a review in August, 1967. It is an up-to-date report, and it is available to every Member of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentlewoman have a copy of the report which Mr. Shriver refused to make public to Members of Congress, including myself, claiming executive privilege in refusing to make the report available?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman at this time that I have every report which I have requested. At times it has been difficult to get some.

Mr. GROSS. Then I suppose I shall have to go to the gentlewoman from Oregon to get a copy of this so-called critical report for which the taxpayers paid \$250,000 prepared by McKinsey & Co., Inc.



Was this the report that the gentlewoman was able to obtain?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; I do have about a half dozen copies of the McKinsey report. The Camp Parks report is not the McKinsey report. It is a General Accounting Office report.

Mr. GROSS. It is a General Accounting Office report?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentlewoman says that the General Accounting Office is satisfied with the report that it received from the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that the General Accounting Office, as a rule, does not say whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied. They report on the facts, and they report on them in an objective way. I have criticism of the Job Corps, but these reports are available. The report on Camp Parks, I am sure, is available to the gentleman from Iowa, if he will call up the GAO and merely ask for a copy.

Mr. GROSS. I have a copy of everything the GAO has on the subject, but I have not been able to obtain a copy of the so-called critical report that is in the possession of Shriver because he claims executive privilege. I cannot think of anything in connection with the Job Corps that ought to be withheld from a Member of Congress on the basis of executive privilege. I have the GAO report for November of 1967, which is this month, and in which the statement appears—

Our review in August 1967, indicates that the remedial action claimed to have been taken at Parks Air Force Base in certain situations was not effective.

If there are additional reports I would like to have them, because it seems to me that this is all too typical of the poverty operation throughout the entire country.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have taken the time to look into the Parks GAO report, among others, concerning the Job Corps. Other members of the committee have been doing so also. In fact, I have before me a somewhat lengthy analysis of specific points made in the GAO report and responses adduced from responsible representatives of the executive branch with respect to those points raised in the report. I shall not take the time to burden the Committee with them at this time, but I shall place them in the RECORD for the gentleman who just appeared in the well and any other Member of the Congress who has sufficient interest to read the facts about the Camp Parks Job Corps Center.

In the House I will ask permission to include that information in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will that include the information provided to Sargent Shriver who claims executive privilege in refusing to release it to certain Members of the Congress?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. That will include the GAO report which, unfortunately, should not have been released without being properly identified as containing information some 14 months old. There is a great deal of confusion about what that report did cover. I will try to explain that confusion and it will be in the RECORD for the gentleman and everyone else.

The Parks GAO report that has been referred to had to do with a report covering the period of April 1965 to September 1966. The most recent information contained in the report was 14 months old. This report does not reflect what the Job Corps at Parks is today.

The specific findings by the GAO were:

First. The contractor had limited data on placement of corpsmen. The GAO comment that no continuous followup and evaluation of terminated corpsmen is accurate as far as Litton is concerned, because these tasks are not called for in Litton's contract. The responsibility for placement evaluation and followup is shared by Job Corps headquarters, the OEO regional offices, and the U.S. Employment Service. No one contractor at any one location can make any substantial contribution to keeping track of 85,000 youngsters that emerge annually from the Job Corps. Records at Job Corps headquarters show that since inception through July 1967, 2,650 of the 3,395 corpsmen who have left Parks have been placed—A placement rate of 78 percent.

Second. The GAO found that the direct operating costs from January 1965 to December 1966 were \$9,672 per corpsman year. The costs cited by GAO are for the first contract period which includes high initial activation expenses. Since December 1966, the costs have been steadily reduced and the planned cost for the current year is even lower. For July 1967 to September 1967, the annual cost per man-year was \$7,691. For fiscal 1968, it is planned at \$6,500.

Third. The GAO found that the manner of recordkeeping, particularly the records relating to enrollee progress, deserved attention. Initially, records were maintained on a decentralized basis to insure maximum accessibility by the staff working directly with the corpsmen. Later, Job Corps, as well as an independent consultant, identified the need to centralize portions of the corpsmen's records and improve certain recordkeeping procedures. The contractor for the past several months has been engaged in the task of centralizing all corpsmen data and writing programs for maintaining a computerized central data retrieval system. Today, a data retrieval system is in operation at Parks.

Fourth. The GAO found that the center had acquired material and equipment which had doubtful usefulness. The subject material and equipment were and are currently being used to a very substantial extent. It may well be that the report reflects the dissent of some staff members toward the use of certain techniques of training through mechanical devices. Recent review of the use of instructional TV indicates that, as programs are developed, more and more usage is being made of that technique.

Fifth. The GAO found that standards

to govern entrance into various programs were not consistently applied and an individual's lack of aptitude, as indicated by test scores, was not a controlling factor in considering him for entry into more difficult programs. Comprehensive standards and basic requirements have been established for entry into each vocational training course at each center, including parks. In June 1967, these criteria were distributed in Job Corps manual JCH 343.16, entitled "Vocational Course Entry Requirements for Job Corps Men's Urban Centers." Further delineation of requirements is currently being made which will involve tests for such additional factors as "fine motor activity," "eye-hand coordination," "agility," and "ability to lift and carry." The consistent application of these standards and entry level criteria is required of all urban centers.

The GAO report made the following recommendations:

First. They recommended that a policy be adopted whereby appropriate reduction in the corpsman's monthly salary and readjustment allowance be made in those cases where the corpsman's conduct and attendance is not satisfactory.

#### JOB CORPS POSITION

Job Corps concurs, and had instituted such a policy before the GAO report was issued. It is Job Corps policy that:

The time a corpsman is AWOL is docked from his readjustment allowance;

Each center may institute a system of fines that deducts money from a corpsman's living allowance for poor attendance, misbehavior, and so forth;

A corpsman receives no readjustment allowance if he stays less than 90 days and only a partial allowance if he stays less than 180 days;

A positive incentive is available to the Corpsmen in the form of an increased living allowance for exemplary performance. The basic living allowance of \$30 a month may be increased in \$5 increments to a maximum of \$50.

Second. GAO recommended that a study to determine what a reasonable schedule of education and of the Corpsman training should be and on the basis of this study instituting a uniform time schedule for all men's centers.

#### JOB CORPS POSITION

Job Corps feels that a study to determine a reasonable time schedule for all men's centers is not necessary because the Job Corps attitude on this subject is clear cut: Each center should keep each Corpsman meaningfully occupied—either in class, physical education, recreation, on-the-job training, and so forth. All time should be structured, on the simple proposition that the devil finds work for idle hands. For these reasons, the structured activities at Job Corps centers averages 60 hours per week.

Third. The GAO report recommended that a review be made of the implementation of the center's "correction system" to insure that the system is providing reasonably complete data in the counseling area.

#### JOB CORPS POSITION

Parks Job Corps Center has a corrections system which sets forth the sanc-



tions and jurisdictions for specified types of misbehavior. Some offenses result in extra work performed on center. Others result in monetary fines. An accumulation of offenses can result in dismissal from the center.

Fourth. GAO recommended that the cost/benefit relationships and the suitability of proposed purchases of training material and equipment be made prior to approval.

#### JOB CORPS POSITION

Job Corps procedures require Parks—and every other contract-operated center—to submit property requirement lists to Job Corps and the OEO contracting officer and that approval be obtained prior to purchase by the contractor. Two separate offices reporting to different authorities in OEO pass judgment on these purchases. This precludes the acquisition of any items prior to the establishment of the cost-benefit ratio and appropriate utilization studies. The cost of any materials bought by the contractor that have not been approved on the property requirement list are disallowed upon discovery when the contract is audited.

In summary, Job Corps feels these four recommendations are fair and reasonable comments, the intent of which it subscribes to wholeheartedly. We are also gratified that the mild nature of the recommendations indicates that the second largest Job Corps Center, one that opened over 2 years ago, is on the track and doing the job charged to it by OEO and the Congress. Were this not the case, we would expect that GAO would recommend to Congress that the center be closed, drastically revamped or be managed by a different arm of the government. Rather, we find that GAO's four comments have to do with recordkeeping, administrative approvals, and other operational details of running a complicated enterprise.

I think it is obvious from these findings and recommendations that the Parks Job Corps Center does not deserve the criticism placed on it by some of the opponents of the whole Job Corps concept. It is obvious that Job Corps has profited and responded to the findings of the GAO.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes. I know of no amendments pending to the section. If there are pending amendments, I shall withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on section 105 close in 5 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if there is no pending amendment, I will move that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, do I understand there are no amendments at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair knows of no amendments to be offered.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

SEC. 106. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "four" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

(b) Section 603(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "authorized" and inserting in lieu thereof "directed", (2) by inserting "or nonpartisan" after "partisan", and (3) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That the Director may issue such regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort to become a registered voter according to the laws of the State of his residence".

(c) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in titles I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services; and

"(3) the term 'permanent resident of the United States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act." (d) Section 610 of such Act is amended by striking out "carry out such investigations and studies, including consultation with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary" and inserting in lieu thereof "work in cooperation with the Director in lieu thereof work in cooperation with the Director of the Administration on Aging".

(e) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is amended by striking out part A of title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II".

(f) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting after section 610-1 the following new section:

#### "LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE VOLUNTARILY POOR

"SEC. 610-2. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligibility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty, such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his health, age, education, and ability."

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: On page 218, in line 12, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)", in line 21 strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)", and after line 11 insert:

"(b) Section 601 of such Act is amended by inserting a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Of the positions approved for the OEO and its field offices positions in the classification category of GS 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title V, U.S.C. shall not exceed one for every 100 employees."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late. We have a lot of other business. In the words of my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], this amendment speaks for itself.

One of the major complaints lodged against the poverty program is the superabundance of supergrades, in the OEO.

I authorized this amendment in 1966, and it carried. It was deleted in conference.

I merely point out that the most recent statistics on the OEO indicate that of the 2,350 administrative employees almost 1,700 are receiving more than \$10,600 per year. Six of them were in the \$26,000 to \$30,000 category. Twenty-four of them received from \$25,000 to \$26,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman, if I understood him correctly, told the committee that he offered this amendment not this year but in 1966.

I should like to ask the gentleman a question. In view of the thorough hearings we had this year and in view of the consideration that we gave this bill when we were considering it line by line, is it a fact that the gentleman did not offer this amendment in the committee?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is a fact. I do not believe that would in any way diminish the need for it.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman not believe that to come here on the floor and undertake to place a limitation on the grades would be acting in haste? To cripple the Office of Education is certainly no way to improve the administration of this act.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I can assure the gentleman that no one is trying to get even with them.

So far as offering the amendment is concerned, I merely say the House passed it before, and I do not believe in haste.

After 7 years on the committee, I have great respect for the committee; but I would go by which the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union says with respect to my amendment. That is why I offered it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I believe another committee of the House ought to be considering the subject matter of the gentleman's amendment, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I believe a subcommittee of that committee has



already indicated its intention to make a study not only with respect to this particular agency but also with respect to other agencies to determine whether there is a ratio that can be or should be established.

I hope the gentleman will not take us who serve on the Committee on Education and Labor into the work of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe very much that this is a problem of our committee.

Perhaps I sound like a broken record, bringing up this amendment again, but the same argument was given against the amendment a year ago. Nothing has been done on it by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the gentleman ought to tell the members of the committee how the OEO compares with other agencies.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will be glad to.

Mr. PERKINS. On the grades 16, 17, and 18.

I will ask if there is not presently an average of 9.3 in the OEO, whereas in the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Emergency Planning they are up to 11.3 and 11.4.

Mr. ASHBROOK. They do not operate programs. The gentleman is comparing employees who do not operate programs with those who have accountants' backgrounds and so forth.

Let us look at some of the other agencies. In the Department of Defense there is one supergrade for every 1,175 employees. In the Department of Agriculture there is one supergrade for every 525. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare there is one supergrade for every 372 employees. This would be a more reasonable comparison.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would believe that if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can scrape by on one supergrade out of every 372 permanent employees, Mr. Shriver should be able to run his operation on a ratio  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times better, even under my amendment. Under my amendment they would still be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times better off than HEW.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa after I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I personally feel that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] struck the nail on the head. This is a matter for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

They have made this allocation of supergrades and OEO is well below many other governmental agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GROSS. For what purpose does the gentleman ask me to yield?

Mr. PERKINS. For a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. To limit debate?

Mr. PERKINS. Just a unanimous-consent request. Let me make it.

Mr. GROSS. Then, I do not yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I was going to ask unanimous consent that debate close in 5 minutes and you would be entitled to the 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield for that purpose, I will say to the gentleman.

Now, let me ask the gentleman from Ohio if this is not supposed to be a poverty program?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. But according to the argument on the other side, we are not supposed to have any particular concern about the employees working for the program. It is a unique argument, I might say.

Mr. GROSS. I am a member of the Manpower Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and this is a lush payroll by comparison with the Department of Defense and many other agencies of this Government.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Might I add with most other agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And all the while I thought that this was a barebones program. Instead of that it has one of the costliest payrolls in the Federal Government.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I will yield if you do not want to limit the time.

Mr. CAREY. I am sure the gentleman believes in the theory of comparability at least of all of these people and what they are worth over in OEO. The difficulty we experience is keeping the people in the pay grades that they are in over there when they are attracted by much higher salaries in places like New York City.

Mr. GROSS. But with all of the mismanagement all over this Nation in this program, you have been paying some pretty fancy salaries to a lot of misfits.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman is probably correct, because I recall one instance where a regional employee was making only \$15,000 in OEO and now that same employee is in New York City handling only a unit of this poverty program and he is getting \$32,500. The only thing we can do is keep a level of comparability so that the Republican mayor of New York City will not hire them away from us.

Mr. GROSS. Since New York has the highest per capita debt of any city in the United States, I am not surprised by the salaries paid there. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is adopted. The payroll of this poverty outfit should be cut down to size.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have generally supported the committee on its position on numerous amendments to this legislation. I think this is a sound procedure because of the close and careful attention given by the committee in their efforts to make the program as practical and effective as possible. If I have any serious criticism of the overall thrust of this bill, other than costs, it is that it does not give enough attention to the

creation of new job opportunities for the less able. Training the poor for jobs that do not exist is a futility. Just up-grading the status of particular persons to oust less able persons from employment is no solution.

I hope in future years that legislation of a job-producing type can pass Congress. I have introduced such legislation but have been unable to secure hearings on it.

As to my vote on final passage of this measure, that will be determined by whether or not I think our country can afford a program of this type and magnitude at this time. Of course that will depend on what the amended bill will consist of at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHBROOK) there were—ayes 74, noes 74.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes "No."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: On page 220, after line 18, insert the following: "(g) Section 619 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 619. The total administrative expenses, including the compensation of Federal employees, incurred by any Federal agency or other agency assisted under this Act, for any fiscal year shall not exceed five percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for that year; *Provided, however,* That grants, subsidies, and payments to any individual employed by any such agency who either (1) serves as a teacher or is paid as a trainee, or (2) falls within the poverty classification as determined by the Director, shall not be counted as an administrative expense."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, again I will not take the full 5 minutes.

This is an effort to once more limit what many of us feel to be the excessive expenditures that go to the administrative portion of the program. There is a provision in the law as it now stands, but there is no definition on what "administrative" is. So this is in effect to bring about such a definition.

The amendment would limit to 5 percent the administrative costs of a program, whether it be operated at the local level or at the national, with the following exceptions: We have excepted those who fall within the poverty classification. I do not believe they should be counted as administrative. Those who serve as teachers. Obviously those who teach in the Headstart program should not be counted as administrative for the purposes of this amendment. Or any trainee who is enrolled and receiving any funds from the program will not be counted as administrative.



All others would be counted as administrative, and would be subject to the 5-percent limitation.

I would say at the outset this was not offered in the committee, and was not even thought of until today. So when that question is asked I will answer it in advance—it was not offered in committee. I believe the amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment of course is to reduce the absolutely necessary amount of administrative moneys for teachers in Headstart and otherwise.

It comes at this late hour with the admission from the gentleman from Ohio that the committee has never seen it; that it has never been debated and has never been discussed. It comes so late, I think beyond question without a full discussion of it and an understanding of it that it deserves to be defeated and I so move.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. What the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] said in part is certainly true. It does come late. But I would hope that we are competent legislators so that anything that did come so late could be given careful consideration.

He was incorrect and I would want to correct the RECORD and I am sure the gentleman would. It would not cut into the teachers in the Headstart program. The amendment specifically excepts and exempts teachers and trainees and those who fall within the classification of the poor. I want the RECORD to be completely correct. The gentleman from New Jersey, I am sure, would not want the RECORD to show that teachers are covered in this amendment because they are specifically exempted.

Mr. GOODELL. May I ask the gentleman further—your amendment would also exclude from administrative costs any wages or any payments made to the poor themselves; is that correct?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is as to anyone who falls within that classification—plus trainees in a program—they would not be included in this amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. It would exclude the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Absolutely.

Mr. GOODELL. And it would exclude Job Corps enrollees and Headstart teachers and it would exclude all those who are employed in the training of the poor?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Absolutely.

Mr. GOODELL. If I may say further then, as I understand the amendment, you say that 5 percent of the total authorized appropriations is the ceiling on the amount that could be expended for administrative costs?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. And the present law says 10 percent?

Mr. ASHBROOK. But it is not being enforced.

Mr. GOODELL. It is loosely worded, so that it has no impact?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It has no real meaning.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to ask the gentleman if he could comment or if the author of the amendment would comment on what the effect would be of this particular amendment if we had a vastly cut back program in terms of appropriations and had a community action organization that was unable to get programs funded, with the result that the administrative cost that was planned at about a 10-percent level went up to about 20 or 25 percent because of the lack of funding for the individual programs. What would be the effect under those circumstances?

Mr. GOODELL. I will say first, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio to confirm my reaction to that—the amendment as I understand it is drawn as a 5 percent of authorization, and that means, I think we can all understand, that the authorization is likely to be \$1.6 billion or more under the present circumstances and that is the present operating level of the program—or somewhat less than that I might say.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do I understand that this figure of 5 percent is only on the national allocation for administrative costs and not upon the individual county or the individual cities, which would in the latter case be disastrous for some counties?

Mr. GOODELL. That is my understanding of the amendment, that is an overall national 5-percent limitation.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It says, for any fiscal year—shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated which is just what the gentleman from New York said about the effect—for that year—and then it goes on with the exception.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it limited overall nationally and not to apply down to the local level?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It applies, I would say to the gentleman, to Federal employees in any Federal agency or other agency assisted by this act. It would be all the agencies.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, over all the agencies and it would be 5 percent of the overall national authorization.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I had not understood it that way.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Will the gentleman from Ohio respond to a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. RIEGLE. If this program is later cut back seriously in the funding area, it strikes me that we ought to cut back on the administration of the program.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It seems rather interesting that there would be any question that this would be the first place to cut. We want the money to go to poor people, and the less money that is directed to administrative expense the more that will go to help the poor.

Mr. RIEGLE. So you are saying that there would be more dollars for the poor if we can cut out dollars for the bureaucrats?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. RIEGLE. That seems sensible to me.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman from Michigan will note that there is an exception for those who are in the classification of poor. They would not be covered under this amendment.

Mr. RIEGLE. I agree with the gentleman that the poor ought to be an exception from the amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a sensible amendment. Under the amendment we would try to get more of the money going to the poor themselves, whether in wages, salaries, training, or other costs, and cut down on the overall amount that is going for overhead and high salaries in this program.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thought it was a rather liberal amendment because it states "Poverty classification as determined by the Director."

Mr. GOODELL. I do not want the gentleman exposed to the position of offering a liberal amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHBROOK) there were—ayes 82, noes 87.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 131, noes 131.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes "No."

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It was my understanding that the original reported figure by the teller in the negative was 114, and that seven more were added, which would make 121 by any new or old mathematics.

The CHAIRMAN. The original figure in the affirmative, the Chair will state to the gentleman, was 114, and there were 17 additional, which makes 131. The original figure reported by the gentleman from Kentucky was 124, with seven additional, which makes 131.



## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARDNER: On page 220, after line 18 insert the following: (g) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting, after section 610-2, the following new section:

"SEC. 610-3. (a) No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act shall, pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted by such community action agency or such other agency, plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any picketing, protest, demonstration, riot, or any similar group activities.

"(b) No part of the funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, to any individual who is convicted in any Federal, state, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activities resulting in material damage of property or injury to persons."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GARDNER. I will not yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is unfortunate today that we have to have an amendment of this type, but certainly the things we have been reading about and hearing concerning OEO activity in picketing and protest movements call for legislation at this time to prohibit it in the future. Every day we pick up the newspapers or see television, I am frankly astounded by the activities carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I could cite example after example. However, the hour is late today. I would only go back to refer to what I believe is a very clear-cut indictment of OEO and these activities which have been carried on for far too long. I refer to a committee report of the Committee on Education and Labor made when our investigators went to Newark, N.J.

In the city of Newark, where an OEO agency was continually involved in trouble, the investigators from the Committee on Education and Labor went into Newark, on their memorandum that they turned into the chairman of the committee, in section 5, they say:

Whatever the intention, the facts concerning the role of UCC personnel in publicizing and organizing a "Police Brutality Mass Rally"—

I have a copy here of the pamphlet made in the UCC committee room and handed out all over the city of Newark—at No. 4 Precinct the evening of July 13th did significantly contribute to the volatile climate which prevailed.

This happens to be the very same night the riots broke out in the city. This has absolutely no place in the poverty program. It caused and created problems throughout America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee today will see fit to put in legislation that will put a stop to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARDNER and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 133, noes 124.

So the amendment was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: On page 220, after line 18, insert:

"(g) Title VI of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new Part C as follows:

## "PART C—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

## "INVESTIGATION

"SEC. 631. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is directed to investigate and examine programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, and to evaluate to the extent practicable—

"(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

"(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

## "REPORTS

"SEC. 632. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit a report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1968, summarizing his findings and conclusions to date. Such report shall include also such recommendations, including legislative recommendations, as he deems advisable.

## "POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"SEC. 633. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer or employee of the General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated officer or employee.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

"(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems neces-

sary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

"(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

## "ALLOCATION

"SEC. 634. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act, the Director shall transfer to the Comptroller General such sums as he may require, but not in excess of \$5,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the purposes of this part."

Mr. DELLENBACK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment found in the Senate bill?

Mr. DELLENBACK. This is substantially the amendment found in the Senate bill. There is one modification in the very last section. Except for that, it is word for word. The only distinction between that and the amendment in front of us is that instead of saying "such funds as may be required", we have placed therein a figure, "such funds as may be required not in excess of \$2 million". We have placed a limitation on top of the general provision.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the language in the amendment as the gentleman has explained it, with the modification, is substantially that of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont in the other body. There is no objection to the amendment from this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how many amendments there are at the desk on this particular section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are seven amendments at the desk.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that now there are eight amendments at the Clerk's desk.



Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to clarify that this request relates to this section, and not to the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, just to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has asked unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. At 8:05 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, to what section is this request addressed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this is with reference to section 106.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, does that include the remainder of the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. No, it does not. It does not include section 107, or the remainder of the bill. It includes through section 106.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section 106 and all amendments thereto close at 8:05 p.m.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER), there were ayes 123, noes 73.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has noted the names of Members standing at the time of the limitation on debate. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this reminds me of the night we were here on the highway beautification bill. We are being cut off in the same way. I am predicting that this House will adjourn over tomorrow until Monday, instead of taking the time to consider and improve the bill.

I have asked the members of the committee for some interpretations of some of the wording in this bill—and I have been referred to the technical staff to answer those questions.

I say when members of the committee do not know what is in the bill, we should have more time to have it explained to us.

I also want to say, and I am not saying this as a personal reflection on the chairman, but I think it was a mistake a

minute ago when an amendment was offered having to do with the riots and things like that and people who have been convicted, and the committee did not accept that amendment.

I think it showed mighty poor judgment in that respect because, as an American citizen, I do not want to give my money to anybody who is going around here raising hell and having riots and stuff like that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman for a reply to that question.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman that if he has ever sought any information from any member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I believe he could obtain the answers. You did direct some questions tonight to the chairman. I thought I had answered your questions in regard to the rural loan program. Those are the only questions that you have ever addressed to me.

I do not need to defend this committee. The members of the Committee on Education and Labor know what is in this bill. This is one of the most thoroughly considered bills ever to come to the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield any further.

Mr. PERKINS. I just want to tell you that we know what is in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to ask you the question right now, the question that I asked a member of the committee from the State of Florida who I thought would be familiar with an incident, and he said, "I do not know. I will refer you to a member of the staff back here to tell you what it is." I refer to page 219, line 17 of the bill:

(3) the term "permanent resident of the United States" when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959,—

Can you tell me what that language means?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Wait a minute. I want the chairman to tell me.

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly I will tell you what that means. The gentleman well knows about the Cuban problem and about the Cuban refugees in Florida and elsewhere. We treat them as citizens for the purposes of Job Corp and NYC enrollment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield any further.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer your question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri does not yield further.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You made the statement that I know what has happened in Florida. I do not know everything that happens in Florida, but I do know this, that under some of our relief programs we have been more generous with the refugees from Cuba than we have with our own citizens of the United States. I know there was a time when we were giving \$200 a month to Cuban refugees and we were requiring our peo-

ple at the same time to live on, maybe, \$75 a month. That is not fair, and I do not want any provision in this bill to give preferential treatment to a Cuban or any other noncitizen of the United States. That is the thing I want to tell you about.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that I think this is a terrible situation. The President of the United States asked approximately 35 or 40 Members of the House to attend a reception where members of the veterans' organizations of this Nation were meeting with the President to discuss various and sundry things. The gentleman has just said that we will probably go over and have nothing to do on Friday. We have had many of those days. But I think it is a rebuff to the President of the United States that the leadership of this House allows us to sit here until just a few minutes before 8 o'clock when none of us can attend that meeting.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I concur thoroughly in what the gentleman has said. The same thing happened when we considered the highway beautification bill. There was an occasion at the White House that night we could not attend.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I rise in opposition to the motion to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I guess I am the gentleman from Florida that Mr. JONES was referring to, and I was really trying to be helpful to him. I had a lot of other things to do and did not want to spend as much time as I was afraid I would have to spend to explain it to him.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

We can vote down this bill now and come back tomorrow and finish it.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 40, noes 109.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a limitation on debate. As a result of the recent teller vote and other proceedings, there are but 15 minutes remaining to consider five amendments.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLNBORN] rise?



Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I would be in order now to ask for unanimous consent to extend the time limitation to 25 minutes after eight, in view of the fact that so much time has been taken up by the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman.

Mr. ERLBORN. I make that unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ERLBORN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the desk. I was seeking recognition at the time debate was cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ERLBORN: On page 218, line 14, immediately after the first comma, insert the word "and"; on the same line, strike out the second comma and insert a period in lieu thereof.

Strike out all of lines 15 through 20.

On page 220, after line 18, insert the following:

"(g) Section 616 of such Act is repealed.

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, twice this afternoon I have been seeking recognition and have been ignored by the Chair and then heard a motion made on the other side to cut off debate, to the point that although I have serious amendments I want to offer I do not really have an opportunity to explain them.

I wish, really, the Members would look at this one amendment. If you people have any consideration for what kind of job we are doing today, look at page 218 and the proviso:

*Provided*, That the Director may issue such regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort to become a registered voter according to the laws of the State of his residence.

I suppose this means that a Headstart student has to go in and try to get registered as a voter and then be turned down because of his age, and then, and only then, would he be eligible for benefits as a Headstart student.

What kind of foolishness is this to be in the Economic Opportunity Act? This proviso is nothing more than a bold attempt to say that one has to be ready to vote for the administration before he will get any benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] rise?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending. May I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

Mr. ERLBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is another amendment pending. I do not know what the parliamentary situation is this afternoon. I did not ask that the amendments be considered en bloc, but the other amendment was also read. It would strike section 616 from the Economic Opportunity Act, which provides that 10 percent may be transferred at the discretion of the Administrator of OEO. In other words, with a \$1 billion appropriation for community action he can take out \$100 million and put it into the Job Corps. As a matter of fact, he has made some substantial transfers like this, to defeat the intent of the Congress.

I hope this amendment also will receive support, so that Congress will determine where this money is spent instead of having the Director of the OEO transfer it around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman here proposes to strike out the transfer of funds authority which is carried in section 616 of the present law.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The Director now has discretionary authority to transfer, for the good of the program, no more than 10 percent of the funds.

He proposes to take that authority away from the Director by striking out the authority for the transfer of funds, which is very necessary in many cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I utilize my time to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Which of my amendments is now under consideration, so that at least I will know which of them I am voting for. I do not know whether anyone else in this House cares, but I have two separate amendments, and I did not ask that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. No. I certainly do not. Every time I yield to you I lose some more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will be taken separately on each amendment. The question now is on the first amendment.

Mr. ERLBORN. Which is that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman ought to know which of his amendments is the first and which is the second amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Chair tell us?

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the question on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to utilize my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late to utilize his time insofar as these amendments are concerned.

The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Chairman please explain why it is too late?

The CHAIRMAN. I do find the gentleman's name on the list, and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know which amendment we are voting on. However, I do wish to speak on the amendment which would strike:

*Provided*, That the Director may issue such regulations as are appropriate to insure that each person seeking benefits under this Act has made a reasonable effort to become a registered voter according to the laws of the State of his residence.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I understand this is the first amendment we will be voting on, so the membership will be advised. It will remove the requirement that all persons seeking benefits under the act—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ERLBORN and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 169, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to announce that the hour of 8:05 p.m. has arrived and although the Chair tried to protect the minority Members, and all other Members who were on the list as having offered amendments what has happened as a result of there being no further time will be that the Clerk will re-report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ERLBORN: On page 220, after line 18, insert the following: "(g) Section 616 of such Act is repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

The amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman I offer a preferential motion.



The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to explain the amendment which will soon be voted on by the members of this committee.

In a report that was issued in April 1967, by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, it was pointed up that slightly under \$70 million has been used by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purposes of social research, but to quote the report this "research does not include programs of demonstration, training, or education, routine data collection; construction of buildings or facilities; or the development of equipment, materials, devices, systems methods, prototypes, and processes."

One of the great difficulties of the past few months has been the fact that the Congress has been unable to readily obtain the results of the OEO financed research.

The amendment I am offering would require the director or the head of any Federal agency administering a program under this act to make a public announcement concerning: First, the title, purpose, intended completion date, identity of the contractor, and proposed cost of any contract with a private or non-Federal public agency or organization for any study, evaluation, demonstration or research project; and second, the results, findings, data, or recommendations made or reported as a result of such activities.

The public announcements required by subsection (a) shall be made within 30 days of entering into such contracts and thereafter within thirty days of the receipt of such results.

It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to assure that the requirements of this section are met, and he shall at once report to the Congress concerning any failure to comply with these requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am going to have to speak on another amendment and I hope that this does not interrupt the train of thought of the Members of this committee. But this is the only way I can get some time to explain an amendment that I have at the desk and which amendment I am going to offer and which I will not be able to debate.

The amendment I have to offer does one simple thing. It strikes the authority of the Director of the OEO to pay up to \$100 per diem for those who are called consultants for a program.

I think we are all agreed on this side that there are far too many consultants and it has been my experience that many of these consultants are used for direct

lobbying purposes for the program rather than to advise the Director.

So, Mr. Chairman, the amendment when offered will be to strike out the authority of the Director of the program to hire consultants to be paid up to \$100 per diem.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. With reference to the gentleman's amendment, you referred to the \$70 million that has been spent by the OEO on research in the past 3 years. This was the product of a report made by the Government Operations Subcommittee under the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], I believe, and which clearly said that this figure of \$70 million did not include any demonstration programs. It was \$70 million spent on research that could have been going to help the poor in this country.

I strongly favor the gentleman's amendment because I think his amendment is fair. It requires the Director of the OEO to give notice to the Congress and to the General Accounting Office when he makes such grants so that we can at least have the right to see the results of these research reports. We, the Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle cannot get most of the results of the researchers that the taxpayers of the country are paying for.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I recognize that the gentleman has a good amendment to offer and I am prepared to accept it.

I would suggest if the gentleman would withdraw his motion to strike out the enacting clause, we are prepared on our side to accept the amendment that the gentleman wants to offer.

I am sorry that the gentleman did not suggest this in the committee. I think it is a good amendment and I rise in support of his amendment and if he will withdraw his motion to strike out the enacting clause, I am ready to accept his amendment and the Committee will be able to get on with its work.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 220, immediately after line 18 insert the following:

"SEC. 610-3. (a) The Director or the head of any other Federal agency administering a

program under this Act shall make a public announcement concerning:

"(1) The title, purpose, intended completion date, identity of the contractor, and proposed cost of any contract with a private or non-Federal public agency or organization for any study, evaluation, demonstration or research project; and

"(2) The results, findings, data, or recommendations made or reported as a result of such activities.

"(b) The public announcements required by subsection (a) shall be made within thirty days of entering into such contracts and thereafter within thirty days of the receipt of such results.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to assure that the requirements of this section are met, and he shall at once report to the Congress concerning any failure to comply with these requirements."

On page 220, line 9, strike out the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sections."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the order limiting the time to 8:05 p.m. be vacated, and that all time on this section be closed at 8:45 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 219 strike out all of line 17 through line 24.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would I be in order to make a motion that the Committee do now rise so that if we could get back into the House I could make a motion to adjourn?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion that the Committee do now rise is a privileged motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will use the rest of my time to continue my comments on the highway beautification program. The gentleman from Florida made a very good statement, but I am predicting again that what we are now doing is similar to the highway beautification bill. You know, they told us it was a perfect bill. We must stay here. We have to pass it. And we passed it though we remained in session approximately 12 hours that day.

Then the first of this year we came back and one of the first things the chairman of the subcommittee said was:



You know, we made a little mistake. We got it a little too strict. We've got to change the Highway Beautification Bill.

Well, this bill has been pretty well loused up during the evening here, and I have contributed my part to it. I voted for every amendment that I thought would make it unacceptable. I think that we ought to use a little judgment here and use some time to think about it. I have seen people go through the aisle here voting for principles that I know they have been against all their lives. They have spoken against those principles because they feel it is a matter of party loyalty. I am a Democrat, but I will be darned if I am going to walk down the aisle blindly because some administration or some leadership says that this is what the administration wants. As far as the administration is concerned, I am going to vote for what is good for the people down in the 10th District of Missouri and for the people of America. I think we ought to take that into consideration.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that if we tried to run a business like we run the Congress of the United States, we would be in the bankruptcy court in 90 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Under the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Oklahoma, the previous order was vacated. Does that mean the allocation of time under that was also vacated?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair then allocated the additional 30 minutes among the Members on the list he had before him.

Mr. ASHBROOK. What about Members who were not in that previous listing?

The CHAIRMAN. They may not be recognized. The Chair is attempting to do what he has been trying to do since the first limitation of time was proposed, and that is to dispose of the amendments at the desk.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. QUIE. If a Member has an amendment at the desk but his name is not on the list, he will not be precluded from offering his amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. No. There is no question about that. If a Member's name is not on the list, he will not have any time, but his amendment will be voted on.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] have an amendment?

Mr. QUIE. No. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] has an amendment, and I yield now to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio if he has an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: On page 218, after line 11, insert the following new subsection (b) of section 106:

"(b) Subsection 602(b) and (c) of such Act are repealed, and subsections 602 (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), and (n) are redesignated as subsections 602 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively. Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of section 106 are redesignated as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I refer those who have the committee report to page 124, and suggest they read the first 21 lines, because I will not have the time to go through it. These lines indicate the authority the Director has to hire consultants and pay up to \$100 per diem.

We all admit this program is going to be cut. Even the most optimistic supporters of the poverty program feel it will be lucky to have more than \$1.64 billion. They have requested \$2 billion to operate the program. It is my thinking we ought to help them by suggesting a few places to cut expenditures of funds. I would suggest a good place to cut would be the \$100 per diem for consultants.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman putting a lower amount on the amount the Director can pay consultants, or is he abolishing that authority altogether?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say we are abolishing the authority of the Director to hire or retain consultants as authorized previously in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 157, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be offered to section 106? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 107. Section 701(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out "July 1, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1968", and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; nor shall funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the State from complying with the requirements of such subsection, until the first day of the fourth month after the State legislature next adjourns following the effective date of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 220, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through page 221, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adding at the end thereof the following: 'With respect to any period after June 30, 1968, subsection (a) shall not apply.'"

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, while the amendment itself may appear to be complicated as you read it in the legislative language, really the purpose of the amendment is quite simple. In fact, I would call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the purpose of this amendment and what it would attempt to do was offered in the Committee on Education and Labor by the chairman of that committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. All right. Then, let us not waste any more of my time on it. I thought you had, and I am mistaken on it. Period.

Mr. PERKINS. I offered the amendment but—

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As the gentleman will recognize, this was drafted to accomplish the same identical thing by the Legislative Drafting Service.

Mr. PERKINS. But you put a limitation on it of July 1, 1968.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We have no limitation. The basic effect of this is to eliminate the special requirement that is contained in the Economic Opportunity Act with respect to the income that can be considered as additional income for people on old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the aged, aid to the blind, and other public assistance programs. That is all that it does.

Now let me explain it. I am sure that anybody who checks with the Legislative Drafting Service and everybody else will recognize, as I say, that it has to be drafted, unfortunately, in a complicated way, because we already have on the books the original 701 (a) and (b) that this section attempts to amend. So we have to go back and amend something which really, in a sense, we do not have the language before us. That is why you get into the complications. But the issue is quite simple. The question is whether in determining a person's need for public assistance, we are going to have a different rule for those receiving special assistance under the poverty program than we have for those not under that program?

The bill before us would set up a special rule for those under the poverty program. My amendment would eliminate this special rule.

Section 107 of the bill amends section 701(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act to require the States—in the administration of the various aid programs—to apply a special earnings exemption for those employed under the Economic Opportunity Act—a more liberal exemption



than would apply to any other recipient of aid.

Under this bill—that is section 701(a) as amended—a person receiving welfare payments can have greater earnings under the poverty program than they could have from any other source—public or private—without suffering a reduction in public assistance.

Or put another way—they could have greater earnings under the poverty program and still qualify for public assistance than a person not on a poverty program.

Mr. Chairman, what the committee has done—and the gentleman will admit this—they set up a special rule to the effect that if you are under a program related to the poverty program as contained in this bill, then you can earn more in outside income and still receive aid under the old-age assistance program or under any of these other programs than you could if you were working for a private employer.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to engage in that kind of discrimination.

Really, this does not go to the question of changing the poverty program. It goes to what is the rule going to be in connection with the administration of our general public assistance programs.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this would not be considered as a conflict between two committees of the Congress. What I am trying to do and all that we should try to do here is to have a single rule. I say this because we must remember that all of these are poor people. One does not get on old-age assistance unless one is in need and one is poor. There is connected with that program an income limitation.

Mr. Chairman, one does not get on the program of aid to the blind under the State and Federal programs unless one is also poor and in need.

Mr. Chairman, these are poor people. These are the programs which we have had in existence for a long period of time.

Recognizing that we should encourage those who are in need to get out and help themselves, whenever and to the greatest extent possible, the social security law also provides that for each category—the blind, the disabled, the aged, and dependent children—a certain amount of outside earnings should be disregarded in determining need. Otherwise, there would be no incentive for anyone on assistance to do any work. The first dollar earned would operate to reduce the amount of aid they could receive.

There must be some incentive to work, and the Social Security Act recognizes this.

In the social security amendments recently adopted by this House, we added a provision that also exempted certain income of adults under the aid to families with dependent children program. That bill provides that in determining the eligibility for such aid the States must disregard the first \$30 of earnings per month and one-third of any earnings over \$30 per month of an adult in the family, together with all of the earnings of the children except those over 16 who are not attending school.

This exclusion in the social security bill applies across the board. It applies to earnings in private employment and to earnings under any Federal, State, county, or other work-training program.

Similar exclusions apply to the earnings of those receiving aid to the blind—those receiving aid to the disabled—and those receiving aid to the aged. All earnings are treated the same regardless of source.

In determining how much earnings should be disregarded—in each of these categories—the Ways and Means Committee went into the problem in great depth. Ours was not an arbitrary decision.

For example, in considering the AFDC program, we were facing the tremendous growth in the numbers of those receiving aid. In the space of 10 years, those receiving aid had more than doubled. As of today, we are providing aid for more than 1 million adults and 3½ million children under this program alone—4½ million on AFDC.

Everyone recognized that if we are to encourage the parents of these children receiving aid to seek work and to undertake work training, some part of the earnings should be excluded in determining eligibility for assistance in order to get them “over the hump.”

On the other hand, we also recognized that if the income exemption was set too high, a large number of those presently working—and thereby ineligible for public assistance—would automatically become eligible under the new earnings limitation. In other words, if we were not careful, instead of getting people off the program, we would be blanketing-in additional beneficiaries.

After weighing these considerations, the committee concluded that an exemption of \$30 per month plus one-third of any excess for each adult in the family would best meet the situation confronting us. It would encourage the adult to seek employment—but not extend the program to many who were already employed.

The Economic Opportunity Act and the bill before us would change this rule. Those employed under the Economic Opportunity Act could have earnings of \$85 per month without any reduction in aid—and for earnings over \$85 per month—one-half would be excluded—not one-third—in determining their need for assistance. We would have not just one rule but two. There would be one rule for employment in private industry—the rule in the Social Security Act. There would be another rule for employment under the Poverty Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this—

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, and frankly, I really hate to use additional time at this

late hour. But I feel this is an important amendment, not so much as it relates to the poverty program, but what it does currently and for the future with reference to the other welfare programs which we now have in existence.

Mr. Chairman, these programs, insofar as the financing of them is concerned, is something that must give us some real concern and to which we must give serious attention and consideration.

But, even that is not the issue here. The issue here is whether a person on one of these programs should shop around.

Let us look at the practical result of having two different rules. Let us assume that under the AFDC program a mother and three children receive a grant of \$200 a month. Assume that the mother gets part-time work in a hospital and earns \$120 per month. Under the rules established in the Social Security Act, the family can have earnings of \$120 plus \$140 of the grant, or a total of \$260. The basic grant is reduced by \$60 for earnings of \$120.

Now let us assume that the same mother—instead of taking a job in private industry—takes a job under the poverty program—and makes \$120 a month. Under the rules established by the Economic Opportunity Act, the family grant would be reduced by \$17.50—one-half of the amount earned over \$85. The family would receive overall \$302.50.

The net result of the two different rules is to place an incentive—a premium—on employment under the poverty program as distinguished from any other form of employment. The same family—with the same resources—would get \$42.50 more from public assistance if the mother had a part-time job under the poverty program, than the family would get if the mother had a part-time job in a hospital.

The rule established by the bill before us would encourage these people to stay on the poverty program rather than try to obtain private employment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] a question?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand what the gentleman is talking about, the gentleman is talking about the amount of public assistance that one may receive free of the so-called needs test or the family budget. Income, in other words, not considered for purposes of determining need?

In our committee we developed a formula of \$30 plus one-third of the amount above \$30. What the gentleman is complaining about is that if that individual happened to get a spot in a poverty program of some sort, for training, that person would have an advantage over anybody else who got a job or a training opportunity in private industry, or with the county government, or anything else.



Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Absolutely.

And what this does, if this provision remains, if my amendment is not adopted, what it means is that people will shop around to get on the poverty program rather than to go and try to find private employment. And is it not basically our objective to get the poor into training and into private employment, and not onto Government programs? It would seem to me that that should be our objective, to get them in some kind of position where they are not dependent upon Government programs.

If we are to help these people, we must encourage them to get out from under all of these Government programs—neither the welfare programs nor the poverty program should be a way of life.

My amendment is very simple. It eliminates the special rule for those under the poverty program. In other words, all types of earnings will be treated the same—whether those earnings result from the poverty program or whether those earnings result from other forms of employment.

The amount of earnings which should be exempted certainly can be subject to differences of opinion. As a matter of fact, in the Social Security Act, there are different earnings limitations under the various welfare programs.

Some of us might differ as to how much income should be exempted for the blind—for the disabled—for the aged—and for the other recipients of public welfare. I don't know how anyone can argue, however, that within these groups earnings from one source should be treated any differently than earnings from another source.

In determining "need"—which is an essential element in qualifying for public assistance—my amendment would mean that a dollar of earnings will be treated the same—without regard to whether those earnings may have been subsidized by the poverty program. That is all my amendment would do—it would require that in determining eligibility, earnings are earnings, regardless of source.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for the chairman of the committee to make a statement?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, this year since the House had already passed the Social Security Act containing provisions on this matter I offered the Mills amendment in the House Committee on Education and Labor during the committee work-up of this bill. So I have no personal objection to this amendment. In fact, the House, as I have indicated, has already voted on the amendment in the social security bill and, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

Sec. 108. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

##### "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

##### "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

"(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities; and

"(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

##### "TERMS OF SERVICE

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

"(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

##### "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while

they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 5582).

"(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

##### "PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

"(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances at the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

"(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the



recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

#### "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

#### "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

##### "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

"SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons and older persons membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies in the various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

##### "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

"(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a) (2) (B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

##### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

"(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title,

shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

"(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

##### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

#### TITLE II—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 embezzles, willfully misapplies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds, assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or contract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal to renew a contract of employment in connection with a grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 induces any person to give up any money or thing of any value to any person (including such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

#### TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. The amendments made by this Act shall be in effect immediately upon its enactment, except as provided in this section. Until June 30, 1968, the provisions of section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act shall apply to community action agencies in existence and funded prior to the enactment of this Act, except that in any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency prior to June 30, 1968, adequate provision shall be made for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and funds to any community action agency designated pursuant to sections 210 or 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended by this Act.

Mr. ALBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will this serve to expedite the junketeers getting on the high seas and on their way to the foreign countries?

Mr. ALBERT. I could not imagine the bill opening up any junketeers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on a more serious note, do we have any assurances that debate will not be severely circumscribed if this permission is granted for the remainder of the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Not so far as I know.

Mr. GROSS. There will not be any attempt to severely limit debate?

I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, VISTA is often referred to as the domestic peace corps—and through the constructive and effective efforts of its 8,000 volunteers, VISTA has earned the right to the same kind of bipartisan support that Congress has given the Peace Corps. By acknowledging VISTA's past performance and encouraging its future promise, Congress will be responding to the nationwide enthusiasm VISTA has gained.

The national coalition of support for VISTA has just emerged in the last 10 days. When the continuing resolution under which OEO has been operating was allowed to lapse, VISTA Director Bill Crook wrote to the volunteers and told them they might soon be without their meager subsistence allowance. Mr. Crook asked the volunteers to continue serving as long as they possibly could.

The first positive reaction came from the volunteers themselves. But it was quickly followed by unprecedented offers of support from Governors, mayors, industrialists, lawyers, businessmen, sheriffs, clergymen, universities, newspapers, and most importantly and impressively, by the poor themselves.

There was, to begin with, a telegram—to be followed by hundreds of others—from a group of volunteers in San Antonio, Tex.:

We will stay because the poor must stay.

A group of 29 volunteers in Denver sent a telegram to the President:

We want you to know that we intend to keep our commitment to the people with whom we live and work.

And the people with whom the volunteers live and work responded, too. In Cotulla, Tex., the tiny town where Lyndon Johnson taught school over 30 years ago, the community pooled its resources to keep their six volunteers on the job.

If the volunteers have to leave—

Said the local Catholic priest—  
we will be lost without them because they are the only thing we have.

A Colorado mother told a VISTA volunteer:

We haven't got much but what we have we'll share with you.

The sheriff in St. Albans, Vt., opened his jail and put up four volunteers on an open door basis.

Among those who are determined to stay with VISTA regardless of whether funds are withdrawn is Mr. Philip Bobbitt, who happens to be the nephew of the President of the United States. The account of the resolution of this young man is set out more clearly than I can state it in an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on November 18, 1967. I include the article at this point with my remarks:

L. B. J.'s KIN STAYS IN VISTA

LOS ANGELES, November 12.—Philip Bobbitt, 19, President Johnson's nephew who is



working here as a member of the domestic peace corps, says he won't leave the poverty plagued Negro area of suburban Venice, even if funds are withdrawn from the project.

"The programs are one thing," Bobbitt says. "But we are neighbors and often friends of people who have never known a white friend, and many who have never before wanted one."

Bobbitt works for the Volunteers in Service to America. [VISTA].

Seven months ago, Bobbitt was kicked, beaten and had his cheekbone broken by a gang of teen-agers while walking down a Venice street.

#### RETURNS TO AUSTIN

After the attack, Bobbitt returned to his family home in Austin, Tex., to convalesce, but he came back to Venice.

"I have a job to do," he said in an interview. "That's what I said then, and I, along with the other VISTAs, have a job to do still. It only pays \$150 a month, but we believe it's an important job."

Bobbitt was a student at Princeton university a year ago, when he decided to join VISTA. He is the son of President Johnson's younger sister, Becky.

Last week, when VISTA headquarters ordered the project here to begin phasing out, Bobbitt and the other volunteers voted unanimously to try to continue the program.

"Black doors are closing to white idealists fast everywhere in the ghetto," said Bobbitt. "If we blow this chance, I don't believe Venice will give us another one."

Congressional delays have threatened anti-poverty funding for the crumbling beach town, considered one of the most concentrated pockets of poverty in Southern California.

#### TELLS VENICE STATISTICS

Bobbitt mentioned what he calls the "walking statistics" of Venice. There are about 7,000 unemployed, and most of those collect government welfare aid. About 67 per cent of the unemployed are unskilled and under 26, according to the state employment service.

Bobbitt says the efforts of federal and state governments are failing with the people of Venice.

"None of the corporations is willing to counsel beyond working hours, or even attempt to bridge the confidence and communication gap between the unskilled black and prospective employer," Bobbitt said.

He said that he is considering the possibility of introducing a community-run employment agency.

"I want something that will appeal to a black man who is 35 and has failed repeatedly in everything he has tried and who is not willing to sit down and talk to a white interviewer."

The American business community's response was swift and startling. Giant corporations such as Polaroid and H. J. Heinz offered assistance. A large Texas chainstore offered free food and an electric company promised not to shut off the volunteers' lights.

The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce started an emergency fund for VISTA, and in Baltimore business leaders pledged \$10,000 to keep the volunteers in service. The Associated Press reported that 25 New York corporations had agreed to back VISTA with a \$100,000 fund.

Landlords joined the campaign. In Kentucky a landlord offered a volunteer 2 months of rent-free housing. The housing authority of McKeesport, Pa., provided apartments for the volunteers and in Franklin County, Maine, a local hotel offered them free room and board.

Public officials were quick to respond to the volunteers' plight. Governors from Hawaii to New Hampshire pledged support.

"Kirk leads flood of VISTA gifts" headlined a Florida newspaper which went on to report that the Governor of the State had given a personal check to help the VISTA cause.

Mayors like John Lindsay, of New York, and Joseph Barr, of Pittsburgh, who is currently serving as chairman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, pledged their help.

In Arizona a group of lawyers raised \$2,000, and volunteers working with the Philadelphia Bar Association were offered use of the city jail but the bar foundation came up with a grant.

The Episcopal bishop of Atlanta, Ga., promised to mobilize the religious community in support of VISTA.

The Chicago News seemed to sum up the whole story last week when it said:

Everybody seems to love the VISTA Volunteers except their government.

And a Philadelphia Inquirer columnist was lead to write of a young VISTA volunteer:

Her government recruited her, her government trained her, her government assigned her to Philadelphia. And after a little more than two months, her government left her flat—how about talking a kid into signing up for a year's service and then stopping the check. How about that?

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to share with my colleagues information which has come to my attention regarding the work of VISTA volunteers in my State of Oklahoma. In Cherokee County, for example, VISTA volunteers made it possible for a public health clinic to operate on a monthly basis for rural families who previously had no such service.

A very dedicated young lady, Miss Faye Delph, organized a Cherokee Indian women's association in Hulbert, Okla. The Cherokee women of this community now work together to help solve common problems. They recently raised funds for a neighbor's much-needed dental work and this enabled the neighbor to become gainfully employed.

In Oklahoma City, VISTA volunteers Ann Finley and Steve Shaw worked closely with the Oklahoma City Board of Education in setting up a citywide tutoring program which will involve hundreds of local volunteers. Four Oklahoma City schools have approved and are participating in this VISTA-inspired program. These schools are Shiedler, Paige, Dunbar, and Harmony.

And VISTA volunteers are being welcomed into Oklahoma classrooms as valuable "teacher aides." Mary Cole, Marie Holden, and Minnie Welch are serving as teacher aides with the full approval and praise of Oklahoma City teachers and school authorities.

VISTA volunteers are performing in the vital areas of job training and community organization: VISTA volunteers played a major role in helping north-east Oklahoma City residents establish a \$140,000 community recreation and job-training program which hired more than 300 young people out of the hard-core poverty neighborhoods. The VISTA vol-

unteers worked closely with the YMCA and other community organizations in this really productive program.

In rural programs, such as the establishment of a women's hospital auxiliary at the Tahlequah Indian Hospital which gave Indian women in the area their first opportunity to participate in volunteer hospital service, or urban involvement with the problems of the high school dropout and hard-core delinquent, VISTA volunteers in Oklahoma are performing responsibly and quietly to bring hope and opportunity into the lives of many of our less fortunate fellow Americans.

VISTA takes special pride in the 67 citizens from Oklahoma who are serving in the program—out of more than 680 who have applied to work with it.

VISTA volunteers do not make headlines or magazine covers during their service among the poor of America. Their work is often removed from the front pages and the TV screens by the more sensational activities of some of our younger generation. For this reason particularly I want to share with you the genuinely exciting and constructive accomplishments of VISTA volunteers which I have described.

This Congress cannot leave these dedicated Americans flat. The country has spoken in support of VISTA and so must we.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 229, after line 25, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be directly or indirectly utilized to finance labor union or related activity."

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure both sides of the aisle agree that Federal funds should not be used in labor union activity or for organizing purposes. Labor union organization is a proper activity, but it should not be financed by the Federal taxpayers. I am sure we all agree to that.

This is the present policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Regulations promulgated by Mr. Shriver state very clearly that labor union activities cannot be financed through OEO funds. But, unfortunately, as is the case in every large organization, this policy has not always worked out in practice. I hold in my hand a General Accounting Office report entitled "Report on Investigation of Alleged Use of Federal Funds in Support of Labor Union Activities by the California Center for Community Development under Grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

I requested the General Accounting Office to make this report and I received it just yesterday.

The letter of transmittal is signed by the Comptroller General, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, who verifies that a grantee financed by the Office of Economic Oppor-



tunity has utilized funds in support of labor union and related activity. Mr. Staats' letter states further that the General Accounting Office will ask the Office of Economic Opportunity to seek restitution of those funds from its grantee.

All that my amendment does is to simply state in the law what is the present policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In light of the fact that this policy has been violated, I believe that it behooves us to write it into the statute.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I join the gentleman in his statement. I had the same experience in my district and I would strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

I see no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California and ask for a vote in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago our great Nation made an unprecedented commitment to itself to work toward the goal of eliminating from our society that timeless scourge of humanity, poverty.

This was surely a noble dedication worthy of our great heritage. A massive antipoverty program which provides a wide spectrum of guidance, training, educational, and other services to people who need help to help themselves is indeed worthy of Americans who traditionally have given generously of their treasure and themselves wherever such efforts are needed.

No one who knows the proportions of the problems of the millions of poor in this rich land of ours really expects that the programs created under the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 can in 3 years substantially do away with the heartbreaking accumulation of ages of misfortune, illness, neglect, and ignorance which afflict those people who have been relegated to our cities' slums.

But, at least we have made a significant beginning in the praiseworthy effort to stop what we had been doing, in effect, through our neglect—of penalizing the unfortunate poor for the achievements of the able. Before the Economic Opportunity Act our Nation had essentially defaulted in attending to the task of large-scale human salvage of slum-dwellers. But 1964 started changing that.

I want to say that in the operation of antipoverty programs in Saint Paul I have witnessed the rekindling of human spirit in bewildered and hopeless men, women, and children who have through assistance been helped to cope with the demands of society and have become useful individuals. It is an inspiring experience.

With the consideration of these 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act we are really at a critical point in our history. There are observers of the American scene who doubt that our peo-

ple at this time have the willpower to carry through in this crusade against poverty and believe that the people are willing to let it die here before us on the floor of this House under the rain of damaging amendments which will effectively destroy it.

I refuse to believe that the American people are so uncharacteristically lacking in resoluteness to abandon now this great human adventure to banish the specter of poverty from our land.

We here in the House must repudiate those with little faith in America, defeat decisively crippling amendments to the committee's bill and stanchly reaffirm our support in the war against that most relentless of enemies, poverty.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday I called the attention of the House to the widespread support for the Office of Economic Opportunity from mayors throughout the country. I want to add to those expressions of support the following telegrams, letters, and resolutions which have been sent to Mayor Joseph Doorley, of Providence, R.I. In addition to the previous list of mayors throughout the country urging the House to enact a strong OEO bill are the mayors of the following cities: Redding, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Baton Rouge, La.; Boston, Mass.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; North Providence, R.I.; Chester, Pa.; Fargo, N. Dak.; and Bristol, R.I.

Mr. Chairman, I think these endorsements speak for themselves. They signify the growing awareness of the contribution and importance of the Office of Economic Opportunity in improving the lives of the less fortunate and giving hope to the poor of our Nation.

NOVEMBER 8, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY:

The Town Council of Bristol supports you in your efforts to have the House of Representatives pass an OEO fundings bill similar to the Senate bill S. 1545 passed.

ARTHUR R. ROERICK,  
President, Bristol Town Council.

NOVEMBER 9, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH DOORLEY,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: The North Providence Town Council is in complete agreement and supports your efforts in securing the money for the anti-poverty program.

JOSEPH T. MORRISSEY,  
Council President.

CITY OF CHESTER, PA.,  
November 6, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor of Providence, Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: We have a common interest in the OEO Programs and I have been in contact with our Congressmen and our Senators and leaders of both houses to give us the necessary funds and legislation to do the work in urban areas that must be done to insure their future.

Thanks for your letter and be assured of my cooperation.

Very truly yours,

JAMES H. GORBEY, Mayor.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,  
November 9, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY,  
City Hall, Providence, R.I.:

I enthusiastically support the increased appropriation for the anti-poverty programs. I am recommending to our congressional delegation that they support this bill, and I em-

phatically stated to Sargent Shriver that if it were not for the anti poverty programs that have been in existence since 1965 many of the problems created in other cities may have been created here in Baton Rouge. It is of utmost importance that Congress appropriate these funds for all the cities and especially for the city of Baton Rouge.

W. W. WOODY DUMAS,  
Mayor.

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK.,  
November 8, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, Chairman, Mayors Coordinating Committee, City Hall, Providence, R.I.

DEAR MR. DOORLEY: I am pleased to advise you that at a meeting of the City of Fargo's governing body held last night, a Resolution was adopted by a two to one vote requesting our Congressman to support the legislation pending before the House of Representatives for the authorization and funding of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its anti-poverty programs.

The text of my telegram is as follows:

"The Honorable MARK ANDREWS,  
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

"I respectfully call to your attention the Resolution adopted by Fargo's City Commission last evening urging you to support position of United States Conference of Mayors and National League of Cities as set forth in its National Municipal Policy regarding Office of Economic Opportunity and anti-poverty programs, its authorization and its appropriations now pending before the House of Representatives.

"The crisis in American urban centers requires strong bi-partisan support of anti-poverty programs as requested by these two highly respected organizations representing American cities.

"With kindest regards,

"HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,  
Mayor of Fargo, N. Dak."

I am sorry that long-standing commitments make it impossible for me to be in Washington; however, I hope that the telegram containing the Resolution will be helpful in your worthwhile endeavor.

It is apparent that in these uncertain and dangerous times through which we are passing, that a much greater understanding of the various programs will be necessary by people throughout this country if we are to develop the necessary support to meet the urban crisis. I hope that we will have a chance to evaluate in some depth, after the Congress will have acted, as to ways and means that can be taken to develop a greater awareness and a greater sense of individual responsibility of the crisis facing American cities. Our task is a great one and I think it is necessary that we review in depth all of these program and their administration. There is a great wave of indifference, cynicism, and hostility to many of our programs which can only be offset and counteracted by a process of self-evaluation and careful study.

I hope that the Resolution will be helpful and please advise me as to the progress of these matters.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,  
Mayor and President.

BALTIMORE, MD.,  
November 3, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Providence, Executive Chamber, Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter in which you urge an organized concerted effort by the Mayors of the Nation's cities to prevent the house from cutting the anti-poverty appropriation or the passage of the "Continu-



ing Resolution," which would cut Community Action programs to a mere \$600,000,000. I heartedly endorse your recommendation that the heads of city governments convey to the Congress their sense of urgency for the continuation and expansion of the programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I can attest to the value of these programs, which seek to give the poor "maximum feasible participation," in helping them help themselves. I have urged the Congressmen from Maryland to maintain the Office of Economic Opportunity and to support an effort that would increase the appropriation to the agency. I also have urged the Congress to support the appropriations for Model Cities, Urban Renewal, and most other domestic programs.

The apparent insensitiveness of many of our Congressmen who seem bent on drastically slashing appropriation for domestic programs alarms me. One of the reasons for civil disturbances last summer was said to be city governments that were not responsive to the legal grievances of the disadvantaged and poor.

Of course, I will do whatever I can to further impress upon the Congress the need for a continuation and expansion of Community Action programs and I am prepared to assist in a concerted effort by heads of municipal governments to further emphasize this sense of urgency to Washington.

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,  
Mayor.

CITY OF BOSTON,  
Boston, Mass., November 6, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, Providence, R.I.

DEAR JOE: I have taken the liberty of answering your letter of October 27, as well as the one I received today, November 6. I agree with your position and I can assure you that I have been contacting Congress on a continual basis.

I regret that I cannot join you in Washington, as I am trying to get a lot of business cleaned up before going out of State on Friday.

With kindest personal regards,  
JOHN F. COLLINS,  
Mayor.

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,  
Albuquerque, N. Mex., November 8, 1967.  
Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Providence,  
Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: Thank you for your letter of November 2, 1967, to former City Commission Chairman Ralph S. Trigg.

We understand the importance of continued Federal funding of the Economic Opportunity Programs at helpful levels for the local communities, and we will do everything possible to urge upon our Senators and Representatives the maximum possible current appropriation.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
Chairman.

CITY OF REDDING, CALIF.,  
November 7, 1967.

Mayor JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
City of Providence,  
Providence, R.I.

DEAR JOE: In reply to your letter of November 4th, although I will be unable to join you in Washington in support of the authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity, I am enclosing a Certified copy of the resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the Redding City Council last night in support of this Bill.

Certified copies of this resolution have been forwarded to Congressman Harold T. "Bizz"

Johnson; Congressman Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor; and Congressman Gerald Ford, House Minority Leader.

Sincerely,

GEORGE K. MOTY,  
Mayor.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDDING URGING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD CONTINUE THE PROGRAMS NOW INSTITUTED PURSUANT TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Whereas, the City Council of the City of Redding is advised that there has been passed by the Senate and is now being considered by the House of Representatives certain legislation which would authorize the continuation of existing programs now operated in accordance with the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, and

Whereas, this City Council is familiar with the Shasta County Community Action Program and collectively feel that this program has been of benefit to the citizens of the City of Redding and of Shasta County, and

Whereas, it is the collective opinion of this City Council that the discontinuation of this program would work a hardship on all of the citizens of this City and particularly upon the disadvantaged citizens of this City,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Redding, California, that they do collectively and unanimously urge the House of Representatives of the United States of America to favorably consider and enact the necessary legislation required to authorize the continuation of the programs presently instituted and carried on under the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Be it further resolved that the City Clerk be and she is hereby instructed to send copies of this Resolution to Congressman Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson; Congressman Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor; and Congressman Gerald Ford, House Minority Leader.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was authorized at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Redding, California, on the 6th day of November, 1967, and was duly adopted at said meeting by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen: Chatfield, Denny, Doherty and Moty.

Noes: Councilmen: None.

Absent: Councilmen: Fulton.

GEORGE K. MOTY,  
Mayor of the City of Redding.

CITY OF SALISBURY, N.C.  
November 8, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,  
Mayor of Providence,  
Providence, R.I.

DEAR MAYOR DOORLEY: Thank you for keeping us posted on the status of the Economic Opportunity Program.

It will not be possible for Mayor Bernhardt or the writer to come to Washington at the present time. However, we will have a representative there. Councilman O. K. Beatty left Salisbury yesterday for Washington. The main purpose of his visit will be to encourage our legislators to support the requested funding of the Economic Opportunity Program and to do what he can to discourage any setback in the program.

Councilman Beatty is the only Negro serving on our City Council. He is a college professor and is well qualified to speak for the Salisbury City Government.

Very truly yours,

C. L. LINEBACK,  
City Manager.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this has been a long, controversial, and sometimes

heated debate. It deals with one of the most difficult problems before Congress. There is genuine sympathy for the poor and the underprivileged. But there is deep seated concern about mismanagement and waste. There also is reluctance to approve any program which is expendable in this difficult period of deficit spending and growing debt.

Each of us must vote his conscience as expressed in the needs of the people we represent and sometimes as tempered by their desires. That is the way Congress functions—for good or bad. And because I see this program as one which—although useful in part—can be dispensed with in this difficult period for America, I shall vote "no."

In all of this long and difficult process of arriving at an answer to the question before us, one thing has stood out; the leadership of one man has towered; the stature of a champion of honest dealing and fair play has grown.

I speak of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky the chairman of the committee, the Honorable CARL PERKINS.

This very kindly and personable individual has given one of the finest examples of sincere and responsible service to the Congress that I have seen. In the long and tedious process of preparation of the bill for House consideration, he worked tirelessly to eliminate flaws and to produce a product which would be acceptable to the House and the Nation. With patience and tolerance he endeavored to build a good bill, regardless of pressures from any source. Then on the floor, even when debate was most heated, he has continued to demonstrate capable leadership tempered with fairness, and without partisanship.

CARL PERKINS has shown that he is indeed a great committee chairman, an effective leader and a true American. The legislative processes have again produced a champion of the American way.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman. The Clinton-Jackson Community Action Organization is an example of the effective operation of the economic opportunity program in the Second District of Iowa. With the leadership and support of the citizens of the communities in this two-county area, notable successes have already been achieved, particularly in Headstart, the adult high school completion program, and a day care center for handicapped children.

This is the kind of project which we should support and encourage with our approval, here in the House of Representatives, of the program and full appropriations for it.

Recently, Mr. Lee White, of the Clinton Herald, reviewed this activity in relationship to the debate in the Congress today, and I include his excellent, article at this point in the RECORD:

PRUNE TOO CLOSELY AND YOU KILL TREE  
(By Lee F. White)

Shotgun attempts to rectify controversial conditions may achieve their end but at the same time can have some serious side-effects.

This is the kind of a situation which could develop if Congress makes all of the drastic cuts which have been proposed in



trimming appropriations for the war on poverty.

In programs which have been developed under pressure such as has been the case with many of the anti-poverty programs, some are sure to turn out poorly.

When the Clinton Community Action Program was launched a little more than two years ago it was under considerable pressure to get organized and functioning. Because quite a few community-minded citizens of both political parties devoted a great deal of time to it, organization was accomplished in less than three months.

In the functioning of the Clinton county organization and its merger with the Jackson county CAP program, the pressure for program preparation came from the top rather than from beneath.

It has been significant, however, that the Clinton-Jackson CAP organization developed and encouraged the Head Start program to help prepare disadvantaged children for school; the expanded program of Skyline Center for Handicapped Persons; and the Jackson county high school completion program.

Although no funds were made available to it, the Clinton CAP organization helped foster the Clinton County Alcoholic Guidance commission by providing office space.

Those who have had experience with the three programs mentioned do not doubt their value. Head Start has given many Clinton children a new insight into life and has acquainted them with the world around them in a way they might never have experienced otherwise.

Anyone who has visited Skyline Center to observe the dedication of those who staff it, including the Job Corps girls, and the response of the children, could not help but be impressed. Some remarkable achievements have been recorded by Skyline Center children, as a result of the instructional methods used and the personal attention which they receive.

Success of the Jackson county evening high school completion program has been little short of phenomenal. Scores of young men and women have been able to pick up where they left off in school. Through hard work and perseverance they have obtained high school equivalency. The economic benefits to them are almost incalculable. Enrollment in the current classes is excellent and resulted from the great success of the first year.

While there are some programs which, if dropped, would mean no great loss, it would appear that somehow funds should be made available for those which give genuine benefits. The Clinton-Jackson organization has dropped some programs of its own volition when it was seen they did not confer benefits corresponding to their cost. This is as it should be.

We would not like to see a single dollar spent on boondoggling or valueless programs but we think the pruning knife should be used with caution for fear of damaging the whole tree.

The shotgun approach is not the best one.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Economic Opportunity Amendments as substantially passed out by the committee. For years I have stated that we have spent much too much time selling programs to the poor and not nearly enough time selling the programs to the taxpayers.

While there is truth in the statement that the poor are not going to upgrade themselves without disturbing the Establishment, I do not think it necessary for poverty programs to pit class against class or the ins versus the outs.

I am going to cite some examples which I consider to be good examples of poverty

programs operating in my congressional district. I obviously could cite some poor examples also as could, I am sure, many members of this Committee. Little is to be gained, however, by a negative review of what we have done. Our mistakes have been thoroughly reviewed by the Education and Labor Committee. The point is that we have a problem—we have many problems in these United States.

Expanding populations, technological unemployment, population shifts to suburbia, concentrations of impoverished Americans in our cities and rural areas, expanding requirements for technically trained manpower, an increase in urban crime, underemployment and unemployment among young Negro and other minority group youth.

True, it is not solely the function of the big Federal Government to totally resolve the inequities of a social system. Local government and school districts must act; business must participate; and counties and States must contribute their full resource talents. In addition, I believe that in our war to redevelop America we must enlist to a greater extent the greatest, brightest, most creative and disciplined sociologists, psychologists, educational, and medical people in this country. We must not preclude the effective utilization of these experts.

I mentioned that I was going to speak positively about what is right with OEO in my congressional district.

I believe I have one of the finest, most cost effective rural Job Corps camps in the country. At my request, the Forest Service provided a report to my office concerning the Alder Springs Job Corps Camp under date of October 12, as follows:

Supervisor Millar has provided us with the information that you requested following your recent visit to the Alder Springs Job Corps Center.

His analysis of the Alder Springs Job Corps Center program which follows is presented under the headings entitled: Education, Work and placement:

#### "EDUCATION

"The Job Corps enrollees enter the program at all academic levels. We have varied programs to match the levels of all entrants.

"The Corpsmen that begin very low in reading are scheduled into a half day of education and a half day of work. Emphasis is placed on reading in classroom, work habits and attitudes during work.

"Most Corpsmen advance to higher educational experiences and more advanced vocational training in a short time.

"The majority of Corpsmen are in education every other week. During the week devoted to education they receive some classroom training. Basic reading and arithmetic skills are immediately applied to on-the-job experiences. The products of their work are quickly put to use. We may not be able to give each Corpsman exactly the training he desires, however he can see the value of the work he is doing. For example, the carpentry class learns carpentry skills while manufacturing picnic tables and constructing out-buildings or pouring cement sidewalks. The welding class is learning welding while building fire grates for campgrounds. The academic program is designed for quick and lasting success. We have many successes. For most Corpsmen this educational accomplishment is a new and wonderful experience. They are learning to read and do arithmetic. They are learning how to get a job, how much they can make and how to keep a job. They

are advancing two years in reading ability. When you add work skills and the value of adjustments in community living, the true value of the program is apparent.

#### "WORK

"The Corpsmen at Alder Springs are in the process of constructing two Work Centers on the Mendocino National Forest. Each Work Center consists of a 10-man barracks and a kitchen-dinning hall building. These improvements are located at Howard Mill in Lake County and Log Springs in Tehama County and will be used to house Forest Service workers for forest management projects.

"A campground is being constructed at Board Tree in Glenn County. There is repair and improvement work at the Stonyford Ranger Station in Colusa County. Many smaller work projects are also in progress, including installing quail guzzlers, construction of erosion control structures, road maintenance and repair, tree planting, fire suppression and seed collection.

"While working on these projects the Corpsmen learn to use many tools and they acquire basic job skills which will help them to obtain gainful employment later. The primary objective of the Alder Springs Center is to teach the Corpsmen good work habits.

#### "PLACEMENT

"A goal is set for each new Corpsman when he arrives. These goals are realistic and within reach of the individual's grasp as determined by psychometric and personal interviews. Upon attainment of these goals, the Corpsmen is prepared to enter the Armed Services, get and hold a job, continue schooling, or enter some program of technical training; any of which constitute graduation from the Conservation Center Program.

"When a Corpsman has attained the prescribed goals in education and training, and the vocation of his choice is not available, he is transferred to an Urban Center.

"The ultimate objective is to prepare the Corpsmen for successful, productive community living—academically, socially and vocationally. He is taught cultural traits and social interaction skills, along with pride and leadership to help him be successful when he returns to a community. The social adjustments are very difficult for some enrollees.

"The Alder Springs Center has graduated 190 Corpsmen into various activities which include jobs and back to school. Some of the job placements are hospital attendants at Veterans Hospitals, cooks, bakers, welder apprentices, mechanic helpers and forestry workers. In addition to this the Center has raised the academic achievement of 198 Corpsmen to meet qualifying standards for specialized training which has led to transfers to Urban Centers for continued training."

The average cost of putting a young man through the Job Corps program at Alder Springs for the fiscal year of 1967 was \$5,416. This figure included \$1,143 for work project supplies and equipment operation. To further offset the above cost, it is estimated that each Corpsman performed work valued at \$1,559 for the 12-month period. The remainder, \$2,714, is a relatively small investment for the Government to make in the future lives of our less fortunate young people. In the long run, the increased earning power and higher tax returns of these citizens should more than repay the Government for its participation.

We feel that the Job Corps program at Alder Springs is a success and is meeting the objectives. It is reorganizing the lives of the enrollees as indicated by the 388 successes to date.

You asked for a comment on the effect of exclusive operation under the Forest Service. The overall program management was reorganized as of the first of July. As it has been in effect only three months there are no



major differences to report; however there is less confusion and more efficiency, with the Center Director taking orders from one manager rather than two as it was before.

If you need additional information on the Alder Springs Center or further explanation of the material we have given you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. DEINEMA,  
Regional Forester.

A second program I want to mention is the Vallejo community action Mare Island training project. The Mare Island project, at a cost of \$80,000 over the past 9 months, has effectively trained and placed in jobs better than 50 heads of families who formerly had received AFDGU welfare assistance for many years. This project has received material recognition and will result in savings of many million dollars over the next 10 years to Federal, State, and county welfare funds. Some months ago I received a preliminary analysis of the operations of the program from the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, as follows:

This is in reply to the oral request made of the Director of Industrial Relations on 26 April for a statement concerning the success of the Worker-Learner Program established under provisions of Title II-a of the Economic Opportunity Act. This Program commenced 25 January 1967 and subsequent to that date the Shipyard has provided training opportunities for some 50 adult men from the Vallejo-Solano County area who were previously on the welfare rolls.

The Shipyard has not as yet evaluated this Program. However, reports indicate that many of the persons employed under this Program are considered good workers, have developed good work habits, are dependable and have accepted supervision. A few have already moved out into private industry and two have been given temporary positions as Laborer at the Shipyard. A few have been dropped from the Program for civil offenses and not reporting for work.

These Worker-Learners will have an opportunity to compete in the Civil Service examinations for Apprentice, Trainee Draftsman, Helper and Laborer. Thus, they will have the opportunity to be considered for positions in our regular work force.

We are pleased to cooperate in this community program and, for the time being at least, will continue to play host to 50 people in the Program. As some persons drop out, others may be added.

I trust this will give you the information you desire.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

J. H. McQUILKIN,  
Rear Admiral, USN,  
Shipyard Commander.

In a third phase program under the OEO, we have funded three projects to establish temporary agricultural housing. These projects in my rural California district are now completed and are in full operation at Dixon, Solano County; Yuba City, Sutter County; and Madison, Yolo County. A total of 300 units have been constructed.

The units are operated under the management of the local housing authorities and are limited to agriculture worker occupancy. Nominal rents are charged. The effect of the program is to provide better living conditions to a ready pool of workers who are making a meaningful impact on California agriculture. The units, constructed at a total cost of

nearly \$1 million are integrated with day-care centers and health facilities.

In all of these programs, whether Job Corps, worker training, or agriculture housing, Federal poverty funds are used in a meaningful way.

In the first case, the Job Corps is providing leadership to reorient desperate lives along the line of productivity for the individual and society.

In the Mare Island worker training program, the beneficiaries are the individual who is trained to do a day's work and the shipyard which gets the benefit of his productivity.

The housing program helps a progressively better paid people in California agriculture to live like people, not animals, during the agriculture harvest. We have a way to go to improve opportunity, housing and hygiene in my home State. The OEO has taken some meaningful first steps.

The program as passed out of committee requires the further integration of local government in the operation. I think this is good. While local government may exercise some restraint, it also has the capability to provide excellent leadership, community facilities, and good public relations. If local communities dedicate themselves to upgrading themselves from city hall to county seat, I think that we can even further meet the requirements of the underprivileged.

My constituency has expressed a real interest in the problems of the poor and has demonstrated patience in understanding the growing pains of OEO.

Most of the mail which I have received on OEO is positive in tone. Certainly, many of my constituents have written to me suggesting improvements or refinements in the program, but the consensus in my district seems to be that we must continue; to move ahead.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, as we close the debate on S. 2388, I wish to add a few words as to the experience with the various Office of Economic Opportunity programs as they have worked and affected my congressional district. This bill has received much bad publicity, but we all know that that which is bad seems to always get more publicity than that which is good. I believe that the good in the poverty program far outweighs the bad. Certainly, mistakes have been made, but corrective action has been taken, and I believe that as it progresses, the program grows better.

In my congressional district I have a large area which has been designated as a poverty area. While many large cities have had riots and other turmoil, this has not occurred in my district. I believe a great deal of the credit for this can be attributed to the effectiveness of the programs such as Headstart, the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action, and senior opportunities, as they have worked in my district. These programs are really just getting established after what might be termed a "shakedown cruise." Many of the "bugs" have been ironed out. In my opinion, it would be foolhardy to now "scrap the ship" when it is ready for truly effective and productive action.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues

to think carefully on this legislation and to oppose any motion to recommit which is designed to damage these programs. Let us not cripple the programs but rather let them go forward with renewed vigor to perform the many tasks for which they were designed. Let the needy and deprived of our Nation know that we have not turned our backs on them.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise again in support of the bill before the Committee. During the past few days we have seen attempts to amend the legislation before us and while I will grant that many of these attempts were well intentioned, I can only express my gratitude that provisions which might have emasculated this necessary legislation were defeated.

I further ask bipartisan support for this measure and in particular, support for the bill from this side of the aisle.

During the 3 years since the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act, we have seen a major social change, a major revision in social outlook, a new concern sweep across this country. This concern, this change is in our view of poverty. We now have a national acceptance that mass poverty does exist in the midst of plenty. We have seen a strong outpouring of concern from all classes of Americans for the poor. We as a political party, we as elected representatives of all the people, must reflect this local and national concern for our poverty stricken and do something about it.

Our political party has often been concerned with individual freedom, with individual rights, and with individual self-sufficiency. We have praised rugged individualism and have seen the benefits and rewards from this type policy. Because of this past record, this should be a reason for Members on this side of the aisle to support the programs provided under the economic opportunity act. The basic concept of the Act is to provide people a helping hand so that they really can help themselves. No program under this bill provides a dole or any benefits or service without asking a return from the recipient. This program in many ways is a bootstrap operation.

How can the poor pull themselves up by the bootstrap if they have no bootstrap? I maintain this program is one that is designed to provide the bootstrap and to teach the poor how to pull their way, work their way out of poverty. Is this not truly the American way?

Mr. Chairman, the major programs in operation under the act, community action, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, have had problems and mistakes. Yet have not all the great national programs had some problems in the start up years?

It was a Republican President—President Eisenhower—who proposed and initiated the Federal-Aid Highway Act—the program which has provided us the vast network of interstate highways which are coming into use across the Nation. Yet there were startup problems there too. There has been waste and even fraud in the highway program and we have had no cries to shut it down. Instead we have worked to improve the



highway program and to eliminate waste and unethical practices. I give the committee and the OEO credit for working to eliminate waste and inefficient practices in our war on poverty and believe the present bill will go far in this endeavor.

We have also heard criticism of the program for being slow in eliminating poverty. I am quick to say we have not made enough progress. But again let us look at the Interstate Highway System. This act was passed in 1956 and the program is not completed. The war on poverty as directed by the OEO is only 3 years old. Let us be on with it through a nonpartisan approach.

Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty during its initial years has made a very deep impression upon the minds and consciences of the American public. If we are to remain a great nation we must no longer neglect the human resources of the poor. We must turn these citizens into full participants in the American dream. Our party by choice should participate in this and by necessity as responsible representatives we must. I urge support of the committee bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the President's recommendations for the continuation and extension of his so-called war on poverty. Without listing the endless examples of how this program has been misguided, mismanaged, and miserably abused over the last several years, I intend to cite only the salient reasons for my opposition. I feel it is significant that this program has been sharply criticized by Democrats as well as Republican; by friend as well as foe; and, by virtually everyone who has taken the trouble to study it. No program, in memory, has so richly deserved such criticism.

The Office of Economic Opportunity was established for essentially two purposes: First, it was to coordinate the many approaches of combating poverty; second, it was to create new programs to attack the root causes of poverty and to break the so-called poverty cycle. In both objectives the war on poverty has failed. Depending on how they are classified, Federal spending programs that have been in existence for many years, and not including those of the Office of Economic Opportunity, account for \$25 to \$40 billion of our annual budget. The Office of Economic Opportunity has poorly and inadequately duplicated some of these programs, introducing confusion rather than coordination. The OEO has simply added another layer of administrative cost to an already costly process.

As far as innovating new programs designed to strike at the root causes of poverty, the OEO record is also sadly lacking. Generally the President's program can be divided into two parts: the community action programs and the work training programs.

The community action programs may have a valid concept but if so the OEO has lost this concept in the execution of the program. Perhaps the most revealing criticism that can be raised is that no one seems to know for what purpose it was established or by whom it will be run. My colleague, the Honorable

SAM M. GIBBONS, of Florida, who was the floor manager of the 1966 antipoverty bill, told a reporter from Congressional Quarterly:

If you ask 100 people what community action means, you'll get 100 different responses, even from people who deal with it every day.

However, the most vicious abuse of this program, and one that I devoted much of my floor speech to, was perpetrated in many parts of our Nation by those who used Federal funds to develop a political power block. It was their purpose to use this power to force political, economic, and social changes in the community. This certainly is contrary to the constitutional aims of our Government and is personally repugnant to me and should be to every American. Such an abuse cannot be tolerated any longer.

The main criticism I have of the so-called work training programs is the terrible waste created by duplication and incredible inefficiency. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other Federal agencies are better prepared to cope with the problem of poverty than is the OEO. Any programs developed by this office worthy of continuing should be turned over to the proper Federal department.

I find it altogether unbelievable that we are asked to authorize the expenditure of over \$2 billion on a program that has been so thoroughly discredited and is largely a duplicate of existing programs when the President is asking for an extraordinary surtax to fund our other commitments. Before Congress consents to seriously considering this tax legislation, the administration should demonstrate a willingness to cut back throughout its spending programs. The poverty program represents perhaps the weakest link in the chain and should therefore be rolled back.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, because of the dismal record in achieving any degree of success, the antipoverty program has proven to be a monumental waste of Federal tax money.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has carelessly administered this program and most of the antipoverty money has been spent on administration and salaries. The high cost of attempting to assist the poor comes with a price tag in the 1968 fiscal budget of \$25.6 billion under the category of "Federal aid to the poor" and in less than a decade this country has spent nearly \$120 billion for this purpose.

While this money would have been well spent if it really helped the poor, in spite of these enormous expenditures the problems of the poor are becoming more acute in our urban areas, as indicated by the riots this summer. This proves that welfare programs are not the answer to the problems of the poor.

John B. Parrish, a noted economist on the faculty of the University of Illinois, claims that there is now a poverty cult in the country composed of intellectuals from every social science discipline, every religious denomination, and every political and science institu-

tion. Parrish cites increases in juvenile delinquency, a skyrocketing illegitimacy rate, increases in crime, and spiraling youth unemployment as definite problems that the current kind of antipoverty war is not solving. Mostly, he says, motivation is being destroyed and this in turn causes problems of discipline and promotes lack of education. This seems to be an accurate analysis of the antipoverty war.

Columnist Robert S. Allen lists some of the verified instances of OEO personnel participating in lawlessness as antipoverty workers that were arrested in Jersey City and New York City after looting downtown stores, VISTA volunteers who threatened a Buffalo, N.Y., City Council member with riots if certain job demands were not met and the threatened riots subsequently occurred, and raids on Kentucky antipoverty workers homes that turned up literature which resulted in sedition charges. These are only a very few of such instances which have occurred throughout the country.

Dr. George A. Wylie, director of the Washington, D.C., Poverty Rights Action Center, which receives poverty program money for purchase-of-services contracts, was instrumental in forming the National Organization for Welfare Rights that picketed the Health, Education, and Welfare Building in Washington, D.C., and called Federal officials "dirty conniving brutes."

Poverty program money has been used to encourage people to file for bankruptcy and to prepare and distribute political literature, as in the case of the recent mayoralty race in Philadelphia. The Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer reported that a Mrs. Carol King, a mother on welfare, returned in late September from a Liberation Peace Committee conference in Czechoslovakia. There was no explanation as to how people on welfare take trips to Europe, who sponsors them, and why the money was not spent to feed and clothe her children instead of being spent to send her to get Communist indoctrination. There just is not a logical answer to these questions.

Job Corps programs are costing more per enrollee per year than a college education costs per year and less than 15 percent of many Job Corps program graduates are obtaining jobs. In most instances, courses superior to those offered in the Job Corps program are already available in public schools. However, many civil rights leaders, some of whom are paid by antipoverty program money, completely fail to encourage the children of poor families to take advantage of existing educational opportunities. In addition, the number of people on the public assistance rolls have increased from 7 to 9 million people since the OEO program was instituted in November 1964.

It is apparent that the record of gross inefficiency and mismanagement of the war on poverty, along with the fact that the conditions that they are supposed to be correcting are becoming worse, makes it totally illogical to continue the OEO and the war on poverty.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the



pressure to pass this legislation without any attempt to improve the poverty program. We are asked to approve all the waste, inefficiency, political shenanigans, and even the corruption which has been brought out during this debate because, we are told, this is what the people want.

I would like to ask, Where is the pressure coming from? I can tell you it is not coming from the people of the Ninth District of Tennessee. I have just received a report which I would like to share with my colleagues. One of the major TV stations in Memphis, WMCT-TV, in conducting a citywide poll, last night asked the question, "Should Congress reduce antipoverty funds?" In 2 hours the station received 9,668 calls, 71 percent of those voting said "yes," and 29 percent said "no."

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we should listen to the people before we ram this legislation through intact as demanded by the administration.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the enactment of S. 2388, a 2-year extension of the economic opportunity program, would be in the best interest of all Americans. This program has been an overall success in originating and implementing new programs for economic and social opportunity. There, of course, remain very serious problems but these can be worked out if given a chance. The Office of Economic Opportunity, despite severe growing pains, will, I believe, serve as an effective and efficient agency for concerted and coordinated action in behalf of the disadvantaged. A great deal of work has been done, but a great deal more is needed. Now is not the time to cut back and weaken our effort. This is not a supersonic transport program which can be and should be postponed. Our effort to create economic and social opportunity and therefore reduce our welfare rolls must be continued. We must bring those living under poverty into the mainstream of American life. The economic opportunity program has been a small, but good beginning. I hope that the Congress will give the program continued support.

The Job Corps program is a residential human resources program providing remedial education, training in job skills, health services, guidance and counseling to disadvantaged young men and women, aged 16 through 21. The purpose of this program is to increase the employability of the disadvantaged by useful work experience and practical work experience. Over 700 Job Corps men trained in firefighting, have assisted in controlling the recent fires in the States of California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. Their efforts contributed a great deal to the safety of communities and homes in these areas. This program has had its share of problems but overall has been a worthwhile investment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps also provides job opportunities and counseling to the disadvantaged youth but for the purpose of enabling them to stay in or reenter school, or improve their chances for gainful employment in a highly competitive job market. Both the Job Corps

and the Neighborhood Youth Corps can be of great benefit in reducing the upsurge in juvenile delinquency.

The unemployment rate for youths 16 to 21 is almost three times higher than the national average. The cost to the Nation of youth crime is estimated to be \$4 billion annually. Arrests of juveniles increased 9 percent in 1966. Youths between 11 and 17 comprising 13 percent of the population, were convicted of 50 percent of all burglaries, larcenies, and car thefts. I do not believe that we can turn our backs on this problem. Programs such as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps must be continued.

The economic opportunity program also provides for adult work training programs for the disadvantaged including a community employment and training program for urban slums. These programs are designed to help severely disadvantaged men and women become self-sufficient. The work experience section seeks to move unemployed parents and other needy persons from welfare to self-support. This has obvious economic benefit for tax users become tax payers. In 1965, the Federal, State, and local governments spent \$6.1 billion on welfare programs. Removing the nonaged and nondisabled families from welfare would save over \$17 billion over the next 10 years. Each man-year of unemployment costs the economy over \$3,000 in lost wages and production. A reduction in unemployment of 500,000 people would add over \$1.4 billion a year to the economy. I doubt if anyone would object to this goal and I believe the work-training program will help to achieve this goal.

The community action program provides a stimulus to local mobilization of resources to aid the disadvantaged. The program is implemented and directed at the local level by community action agencies. It combines and coordinates Headstart, legal assistance, neighborhood health centers, and various other locally developed projects.

Another aspect of this program is designed to bring to migrant workers special adult and youth education, day care, housing, sanitation, and other basic services. In conjunction with this is a rural opportunities loan program which combines supervised credit and family education to increase the ability of poor rural families to earn higher incomes, through their own efforts, and to join with others in cooperatives that increase incomes and reduce costs. Headstart is a highly successful community action program for preschool children. The program provides for the correction of health deficiencies, the improvement of communication abilities, and the teaching of self-reliance.

Project VISTA provides full- and part-time volunteers to serve in urban and rural slums or wherever there is a need to assist the disadvantaged. They have had a special success in rural communities.

I believe that the economic opportunity program combines self-help and local initiative to provide an effective and imaginative program to develop

jobs and better education and training for the disadvantaged.

In Riverside County, Calif., which I represent, the Office of Economic Opportunity provides assistance in the following areas:

First. Some 150 unemployed persons monthly are offered vocational counseling and job placement services.

Second. Full-time day care to 270 disadvantaged children whose parents are either employed, seeking work, or in training.

Third. Catchup education for 1,200 preschool children in the Headstart program.

Fourth. Prevocational training and other activities to 1,000 disadvantaged youths in the youth outpost program.

Fifth. Legal services to over 300 low-income persons monthly.

Sixth. Approximately 20 local action group meetings monthly for local residents and particularly the poor to help solve some of their problems.

Seventh. Guidance and coordination to other organizations and agencies attacking the various problems of poverty and is thus making a major contribution to its final eradication.

Eighth. A training program to assist 250 welfare recipients to become employed.

Ninth. Work and income for 340 disadvantaged in-school youths so they will be able to continue their education.

Tenth. Summer employment for over 100 youths in tension areas of the country.

These programs are an important beginning and must be continued if the vicious cycle of poverty is to be broken. This cannot be done overnight but requires time and a great deal of patience. Of course, mistakes have been made, but the benefits have far outweighed them. It is not enough to talk about the underlying causes of urban sickness; vigorous action is needed to solve them. The economic opportunity program is a program of action. History has taught us an important lesson. Welfare checks do not eliminate the root causes of poverty—if anything they reinforce and prolong poverty. The economic opportunity program will help to provide education and work for the unskilled and the unemployed.

I am pleased that the bill provides for the continuation of Project Headstart and for a comprehensive day care services proposal. This will help to allow low-income families to become self-supporting.

However, I am opposed to the provision to require a doubling of local contributions. It will be most difficult, if not impossible for local school systems or other operating agencies in low-income areas to find the necessary funds for the 10-percent cash contribution for Headstart programs already underway. The effect of this provision will be to eliminate Headstart programs in those communities where it is needed most. I also feel that a more adequate authorization is needed to support the programs for legal services, Headstart, emergency food, day care, and senior citizens opportunities.



I also feel that it would be a mistake to require local community action programs to be placed under either units of government or private nonprofit corporations. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has opposed this amendment and I do not believe it should be imposed upon them. It would be better to continue to have the flexibility of the present law. Restructuring of the program at this time would only result in confusion, delay, and inflexibility.

The present program should be continued with flexible participation in program development and implementation of all segments of a community—State and local government officials, local business and labor leaders, social workers, educators, and the poor themselves. I intend to oppose the amendment to limit control and participation to local government officials.

The economic opportunity program is one of the most promising weapons we have against crime. Certainly there are other weapons, and we must attempt to find more, but the economic opportunity program strikes at the very taproot of crime. In order to be ultimately successful in our efforts, we must remove the factors that give rise to lawlessness. We must provide all our people a stake in society, a will to succeed as a nation. Without this, nothing else we can do will have any real, lasting effect. As long as people have nothing to gain by obeying the law, they will feel that they have very little to lose by disobeying it.

This country has belatedly become concerned enough about poverty and deprivation to begin attempting to improve the conditions and the opportunities of its poor. The effort against poverty has only begun; and it cannot be won overnight.

Let us not now dismember this effort. The reduction of poverty cannot be postponed. We are dealing with precious human resources, which must be stimulated toward self-improvement and involvement in the community. I urge that the Congress continue this effort through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I stand to affirm my support for a war on poverty. Unfortunately, I regret that proposals which would have proved of far greater benefit to the individuals we seek to aid have been defeated in vote after vote by the majority. The bill which is now presented for a final ye or nay is one of questionable value. Programs which have been discredited are being presented right along with those which have proven of solid benefit.

We who must now decide have been unable to exercise successfully our option for changing the program. We are left with the choice of voting to accept a program which has some good, or voting against one which has serious failings and excessive costs. I do not believe good legislation can come out of a situation like this.

I strongly supported and voted for the Appalachian program, because this is a program aimed at improving the economic base of a region, and therefore has permanent and solid benefit. Conversely, this so-called war on poverty

program has a minimum of long-range benefit activities. I believe that this program in its present form does not contain enough benefit to those in need of help to offset the danger of increased Federal spending. The majority party in Congress has managed to continually increase spending programs, even in the face of a \$29 billion deficit.

The phenomena of shrinking dollars, devalued life insurance, and struggling pensioners are all symptoms of the disease of inflation which now threatens to rack this Nation. If we do not stop increasing Federal spending, inflation will act to reverse the trends toward economic betterment which this, or any conceivable war on poverty could ever hope to advance.

For these reasons, I must regrettably vote against this bill's passage.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening avidly and intently to the debate on the floor as we are struggling with the bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity. I certainly do not question the sincerity of the proponents of the legislation. I believe they sincerely believe that this approach is the kind that is best. Nor, Mr. Chairman, do I believe the opponents of this legislation are against the resolution of the problem. Both sides want to attain the same objective. We only disagree on how it can be best done. In other words, the question is not whether we should do this. The question and debate is how should we do it and how to do it better.

I am concerned about the implication of the proponents who imply that if we are opposed to the present bill, then we are against solving the problem—we are against the poor. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is a truth to note that oftentimes a "no" vote is a constructive or positive vote. So, I suggest if the proposition before us is not passed, we will not ignore the problem. In fact, I am sure we would find other and better answers.

Proof of what I have said about ways the objectives could be attained was brought out by Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity in a letter to me and I want to place his letter in the RECORD and my answer to it, which is further explanation of my position.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1967.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: Did you see the women's ad in this morning's New York Times in support of the War on Poverty? In case you did not, I am enclosing a copy for your interest.

As you may note, this ad is certainly bipartisan in nature since many of the signatories are wives of leading Republican figures—Mrs. Jacob K. Javits, Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller, and Mrs. John A. McCone.

Furthermore, several of these women, such as Mrs. Robert Claytor, and Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, are outstanding leaders in the Midwest.

It is our sincere hope that the War on Poverty is above politics and that there will be bipartisan support for the poverty bill.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director,  
Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Executive Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: Received your letter of the 14th. Good to hear from you again.

Yes, I read the women's ad in the New York Times in support of the War on Poverty. My good friend, let me remind you what you must know from several conferences in my office and in the Capitol with you, your staff and people from Iowa, that I am in as much support of a program to eliminate poverty as anyone could be. I do oppose the terminology—the reference to "War on Poverty." It seems to me that we are too much involved in war now. What we need is an efficient and adequate approach to the real problems of those who find themselves in poverty. This may be caused by their own neglect or because the moral community failed to keep pace with our progress. I recognize that in either case there is an obligation to resolve the problem.

I have found, sir, that in public life there are right and wrong ways to approach solutions, there are adequate and inadequate ways to accomplish tasks. Based upon my studies, observations and conversations with people who have been close to this program, too often we have tried to do the right thing the wrong way. It appears to me you have been forced to hire people who have not been completely prepared either by experience or training for this kind of a challenge. I say that knowing that you were probably the best selection the President could make for the top position and knowing, too, that you have worked extremely hard and given the program a sense of dedication seldom matched in public service.

Let me assure you that whether I vote for the final version of this program or not, my vote will be cast because I do share a concern with you. I can speak from experience because I was a poverty case myself, though I didn't realize it at the time.

Thank you for your letter, your helpfulness, your success and your dedication. Be assured I am as much interested in solving the war on poverty as anyone could be. I want to do what is right. The record I make is for the permanent RECORD and I want it to be as right as possible.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SCHWENGEL,  
Member of Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that I am for a solution and, I believe a better solution, I submit the following summary of a proposition entitled "Opportunity Crusade." I think this is a better title because it does not categorize the people who are in poverty and do not like to be designated as such and who are in the unfortunate position of poverty often times, through no fault of their own. Mr. Chairman, the job of taking care of the unfortunate who need better opportunities is so great that we need to employ all the talent and all of the forces we can especially the force and talent of industry. Therefore, I am for this other approach called, "Opportunity Crusade."

Opportunity Crusade places its primary emphasis on jobs for the poor, involvement of private enterprise, involvement of the States and local governments as partners with the Federal Government and education. It would authorize \$1.4 billion Federal expenditure, providing a total of more than \$3 billion for the poor



through government and private enterprise combined.

Community action boards would continue to be independent of city hall.

Under opportunity crusade, some very desirable changes would be made in the community action program.

It would bar all political activities, partisan or nonpartisan, including voter registration.

We would require at least one-third of the community action boards to be representative of the poor, up to one-third representative of local public officials, and the balance representative of private and public human resource agencies.

Under community action boards, we would require the establishment of job opportunity boards with at least one-third representative of the poor and a majority representative of private employers. JOB's would be charged with the important responsibility for development of programs to find jobs, develop jobs, provide supportive services, and provide appropriate job training for the poor.

Another essential step under opportunity crusade would be the establishment of a State community action commission which would be representative of local community action boards and private and public human resources agencies and the State with no more than one-third of the membership representative of State and local officials.

A State plan would allocate money to local community action boards and to administer the program within the State.

Under this plan, the Director would have the full authority to make grants directly to community action boards in the absence of the State commission and to bypass the State commission if the commission is not fulfilling its responsibility.

The final change in the community action program would be to completely separate the allocation of funds for rural and urban programs.

Headstart would be transferred to the Office of Education with allocations through State commissions to local community action boards.

Job Corps would be under the Office of Vocational Education with authority to carry on present programs to phase-over present Job Corps centers into community and regional training facilities combined with community and regional residential training facilities integrated with area vocational schools and technical institutes.

A portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps authorization would be used for an Industry Youth Corps which would provide private, meaningful, and productive employment for youngsters 16 to 22.

Military career centers would be established to give young men an opportunity of upgrading themselves so they can more readily meet military service requirements.

Finally, to aid in charting a course of a long-range crusade for opportunity, a three-man Council of Economic Opportunity Advisors would be established in the Office of the President to help eliminate poverty, undertake appropriate research studies, evaluate existing pro-

grams and recommend reorganization to eliminate waste and duplication.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been considering the future of the poverty program for more than a week. In the course of this consideration, it has occurred to me that it would not have taken us this long if, instead of using the words "poor" and "poverty," we thought of the broken windows, heatless homes, rotting garbage, rats, roaches, shredded clothing, aching, hungry stomachs, meatless meals, sagging health, and the jobless men, women, and children which are behind these words "poor" and "poverty." If we really let ourselves think of these conditions, of the hopeless futures of the people in this environment, we would not tarry so long over an authorization to continue the most effective antidote to these conditions which we have yet been able to devise.

The conditions in which many of our citizens are living are intolerable—intolerable not only for those who live in them but for all of us as civilized, humane people in our affluent world. For the first time in the history it is physically possible for all the people in this country to have an adequate and decent life. What is wanting is the resolve of the people of this country and of this legislature to bring this possibility into reality.

Three years ago, when we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, we promised that we would try to bring about the end of poverty. We promised the poor people—those living in slum tenements and in rural cardboard shanties, those with jobless fathers and empty stomachs—that we would provide them with the help to help themselves.

These people believed this promise. They want to share in the world that exists in the movies and on television. The American dream is their dream too.

Especially young people are dreaming and hoping. They are tormented by the affluence that surrounds them but somehow seems to elude them. They want desperately to believe there will be the help that will let them earn their way in the world. But youth is impatient, and youth in the intolerable conditions of poverty, conscious of surrounding wealth, is doubly impatient and susceptible to the siren call of the demagogues who are everywhere.

The poverty program is vital for such young people. They have their lives ahead of them, lives which can be useful and productive, or if rejected and ignored, can become social dynamite. The poverty program is a bridge, a ladder, which will enable young people, both racial minorities and whites, to share in the good life that our country offers to most of us.

To the extent that we curtail our efforts to alleviate poverty, we can expect only anger, frustration, and despair. This vast group of frustrated young Americans will reject America, because of their own deep feelings of hopelessness, if we turn our backs on them.

None of us likes crime, violence, or riots, but we can be certain that these events will be with us until we relieve the pressures stemming from the frustrations

and bitterness of broken promises and the denial of full opportunity. This the poverty program tries to do, and this we must continue to do until we have eliminated the problem. Until we act positively, the entire country will be set back, deprived of the productive work of these individuals, and at the same time repelled by conditions in the slums where they live, and frozen by middle-class fears of violence and hatred.

Ghetto conditions are intolerable, but they are not insoluble. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been at work for 3 years, and the result has been revolutionary.

When OEO started, its task was to rush headlong into an area where no one possessed experience or proven ideas or even hard facts. Well, today, our universities, our schools, our cities, our Armed Forces, our newspapers, our authors, and most of all the poor, are at work and are concerned with the problems of poor people.

Where we had almost no information about the extent and depth of poverty in this country, we now have reams of data.

Where we had no experience, we now have tried techniques.

Where we had a very small store of ideas about poverty, we now have a proliferation of experiments and projects numbering in the thousands.

And most importantly, where we had no program, we have an innovative, established program which has made its impression in every State.

Of course this program has made mistakes. And surely there will be mistakes in the future. But the accomplishments of this program are remarkable.

OEO has established a legal services program which for the first time is bringing effective legal counsel to the poor. The law and the courts are no longer a tool only of the moneyed and well-lawyered people.

OEO has built comprehensive health care centers for the inner cities, bringing medical care to people who have not seen a doctor or a dentist in their lives.

OEO has helped to develop the leadership and organizational skills of the poor. They have helped to start daycare centers, consumer education projects, and family planning clinics.

And through OEO we have a Headstart program for disadvantaged children, with the involvement of the parents of those children and their middle-class counterparts.

Through OEO, too, we have the Neighborhood Youth Corps to help young men and women stay in school, earn the money to go back to school, or get the experience they need to get and hold a job.

OEO has run the Job Corps, where government and industry have combined to bring a new and constructive environment and outlook to thousands of youngsters.

OEO has fostered the Upward Bound program to encourage poor youngsters to achieve their academic potential and a college education.

OEO, too, has brought things never before thought possible to the migrant workers in this country.



OEO has programs to bring assistance to the quiet and often unnoticed poverty of rural areas.

And OEO has run the VISTA program where thousands of men and women of all ages have contributed their talents and most of all their dedication and inspiration to the task of making life better for all Americans.

This list is not complete. But it will suffice to indicate what has been done by this agency, and all within the short space of 3 years. And these things have not gone unnoticed. The people in our cities, the labor unions, the churches, the mayors, the lawyers and the schools have noticed and are supporting this program. The poor people recognize that efforts are being made to help them. They are on the wave of rising expectations and are dreaming the American dream. We cannot desert these people now.

And we will, I hope, not desert these people. We will pass a bill to continue the poverty program, and I would like now to address myself to two of the many areas deserving of attention in the consideration of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

In my judgment, one of the most damaging provisions of the bill reported by the committee is section 223(c) which would require one-half of the local contributions to the poverty effort to be in cash.

I need not remind my colleagues of the difficulties which our local governments have in raising the revenues to meet even their most essential needs. In fact, it was this very difficulty which first led us to enact a whole series of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

There is a great and tragic irony in enacting a grant-in-aid program which would require communities with large numbers of impoverished residents to raise cash in order to get any help. The one thing poor people and poor communities do not have is cash.

The poverty program has helped communities to mobilize the resources they do have. Thousands of lawyers have volunteered their time. Thousands of classrooms which would otherwise go empty have been used for summer Headstart and adult education and training projects. Office space and telephones, buses and equipment have been contributed. The increased utilization of our resources is a tribute to the efforts of our communities. We should not reward this effort by abolishing the incentive for it.

Most importantly, however, we should not cripple the poverty effort as this provision would. For lack of cash, millions of dollars will be denied to the poorest communities, which cannot raise the funds. Local efforts will be needlessly and foolishly diverted from community action projects to other Federal programs or to less important poverty related programs not requiring cash contributions.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the cash contribution requirement, and I would support an amendment to strike it from the bill.

There is another important part of the bill which is also facing serious debilitating amendments. I am speaking of the legal services program.

The neighborhood legal services program deserves the respect and commendation of us all. The lawyers working in this program, together with hundreds of volunteer attorneys, have brought a new confidence in the law to thousands of poor people in this country. These lawyers have brought fair and legal treatment not only to their clients, but to many others in similar situations who will receive the benefits of these efforts without the need of going to court. These lawyers have served as ombudsmen. They have protected all of us against the excesses and thoughtless decisions of what often seems to be a distant bureaucracy. These lawyers have provided the more usual legal services also. They have handled domestic relations matters, tenancy problems, debts and the like. And in so doing, they have curbed the illegal practices of many unscrupulous sellers, lenders and landlords.

The result is that we have learned that one of the most effective tools we have in helping the poor is the legal services program.

Now this effective program is faced with several crippling amendments.

The most invidious of these would prevent the lawyers in this program from bringing suits against the Government on behalf of their clients. Equal protection of the law is guaranteed to all of us by the Constitution. But the realization of this right is dependent upon access to the courts and the law. The idea of the legal services program is to insure this equal access. To deny access of the poor to lawyers, is to deny them access to the law. And to deny them access to suits against the Government is to deny them equal protection in the application of the law by the Government.

Perhaps even more importantly, to deny these people the right to petition their Government through the courts is to force them to petition their Government in the streets.

Some have objected to the idea of one federally paid attorney opposing another federally paid attorney. But this is not a novel concept. It occurs when the Justice Department appears before the Federal Communications Commission, and it occurs by constitutional mandate when the Federal courts appoint federally paid attorneys to represent the rights of accused felons who cannot afford a lawyer. Federal agencies and the courts have recognized that it is not possible to obtain one's full legal rights without a lawyer. We should not allow indigent litigants to be deprived of their rights against their Government by denial of counsel.

Another amendment to the legal services program would abolish it in favor of a so-called judicare system. The judicare system has considerable merits, but until there is enough money to provide lawyers for everyone who can afford them, this system will not provide the same constructive thrust which poverty-oriented lawyers provide. Further still, OEO is experimenting with this system, and I believe that we should await the outcome of that study before we depart from the present system that is working so well.

A third amendment to the legal services program would give a veto to local

bar associations over the funding of local legal services projects. The committee bill provides that these associations be given the opportunity to present their views on the local programs. This is a considerable power to give to a local voluntary professional group. To give more power, in fact a veto, would be to allow a small group of nonelected officials to dictate to thousands of people.

These local bar groups are usually not public bodies, and hence are free to discriminate in their membership practices. In fact, in some areas, lawyers have declined to join bar associations because of discriminatory membership practices. These nonpublic, nonregulated associations should not be given the power to regulate people against whom they may have discriminated.

Mr. Chairman, I would again like to urge our colleagues to support the Office of Economic Opportunity and our present efforts to meet the problems of poverty.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this House will overwhelmingly accept, with the adoption of substantial amendment improvements, this bill before us, S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments Act of 1967.

Back in 1964, our people and this Congress, through the enactment of the original Economic Act, declared war upon the poverty of some 30 millions of American citizens in this acclaimed land of abundance.

The bill now before us is intended to extend and carry on the programs that we then initiated for the successful conduct of the war. Let us further that intention and let us make certain there is sufficient appropriation ammunition made available in this bill to reasonably advance the war.

To those who entertain serious and sincere criticisms and skepticisms about various features of the overall operation of this great antipoverty program, let us give earnest and conscientious attention but let us also timely remind them that in every great war some weaknesses are bound to develop and even some battles may be lost. However, that may be, in this crusade for the poor and despairing among us, let us willingly accept wholesome improvements of majority will but, above all, let us get on with the war.

I very deeply believe that most Members here regard this national mission, basically to help the poor and the deprived to help themselves, as the most noble experiment and objective in which this Nation has ever engaged.

Embodied in this experiment and mission is the first real projection in our history of purposeful cooperative action on all governmental and private organizational levels, to help our poorer families reach for self-independence, to take young people off the street corners and train them for steady employment, and encourage the uncertain to remain in classrooms until they earn their diplomas.

Mr. Chairman, the original legislation initiated projects and programs to inspire our communities to create appropriate measures to eliminate the evil roots of poverty at the local level; to en-



large opportunities for our youth to obtain the basic education, skills, and experience they must have to take a proper place in our society and become responsible parents in the future; to provide a better base for the revitalization of poorer areas in our great metropolitan cities by expanding small business activities; to assist destitute rural families in achieving improved living standards through the extension of capital grants and loans; to project selective plans to benefit undereducated adults; to motivate more States to utilize public assistance as a means to help families help themselves; to throw off the discouragements of poverty and to recruit and train volunteers to carry out the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I think any objective assessment of the programs and projects, as a whole, that were initiated by the original legislation, would show that they were soundly conceived and that they have mostly been faithfully and efficiently carried on.

Our business then today is to remedy and repair weaknesses that can be demonstrated and provide for the adequate continuation of this war to eliminate the desperations of tragic deprivation and dependency in this great Nation.

To those who would seriously question even the limited expenditures provided in this measure, we must ask them to just as seriously consider the cost of not approving this bill in terms of direct public assistance payments alone, which amount to some \$4 billion per year.

In addition to these direct payments, it is commonly admitted that the indirect costs of poverty to this country, which show up in juvenile delinquency, crime, health hazards, higher police and fire protection costs, not to mention the loss of productive manpower, would total many billions more, and perhaps everlastingly, of the taxpayers money if we do not do something about it. From all the authoritative evidence and testimony that has been documented here during this debate, it should be obvious that this Nation cannot longer afford the dehumanizing effects of poverty upon our national morale and its tremendous economic drain upon government treasuries at all levels.

Let us, then, in an impartial legislative atmosphere, constructively build upon the experience of these past few years and proceed with the still unfinished task of eliminating the causes of poverty in this great Nation.

By no means do we suggest that programs of perpetual care are to be established. Our only intention is that poverty-stricken people, through no fault of their own, who need and will respond to help will continue to be given such help so that they will help themselves and gradually the desperate need of such help will diminish and the programs themselves can, accordingly, be correspondingly restricted and eventually eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, for those millions of Americans who are truly struggling to free themselves and their children from the haunting bonds of mass economic misery, let us extend our continuing help

and encouragement for the simple reason that it is right for us to do so.

Also, Mr. Chairman, may I say it offers us here a timely opportunity to show our fellow citizens that this U.S. Congress is primarily concerned for, and obligated to, our own people who are still making great sacrifices for the cause of freedom and the promotion of peace and progress in so many other areas of an uncertain world.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, as we near the time of decision on this authorization for the poverty bill, I find it difficult to conceal my disappointment that the Committee of the Whole did not see fit to adopt the two amendments which I had proposed, which, in my best judgment, would have greatly improved the operation of the program in the rural areas.

True, there have been frequent and repeated complaints against the administration of the program in the suburban areas we represent. But the chief and principal complaints have come out of the eight rural counties it is my privilege to represent. They say their programs have never been adequately funded. I tried the best I could to put in language a formula to correct this imbalance between the rural and urban areas. Were it not for limitation of debate being imposed, my amendment might have fared better, because I believe our big-city colleagues are fairminded enough to realize that it is in their own interest to improve conditions in the rural areas.

Another amendment which I offered that I thought had a worthwhile purpose was to require consideration of the number of aging in a rural area as one of the criteria for the Director to correct an imbalance of programs. If it is true that the poverty program has a humanitarian purpose, and no one can be against the principle of the elimination of poverty, then the aged in the rural areas are truly the forgotten poor.

In supporting my amendment I made particular reference to and put emphasis upon those who receive only minimum social security benefits and those persons who receive special social security benefits because they have no record of coverage. All of these classes of persons receive well under \$600 a year. Surely their lot should be bettered. I was keenly disappointed that this amendment was not accepted by the chairman of the committee, or at least favorably accepted by the Committee of the Whole. I feel certain the reason was because of the frantic hurry under limitation of debate without time enough for others of the same kind to join with me to explain the necessity as well as the importance of our amendment.

As I remarked near the end of general debate and before the bill was read for amendment I had an open mind on the authorization bill this year. At that time I said there had been a lot of criticism and complaint against the program but much of it concerned projects not in our congressional district. I reported there had been complaints made month after month against the administration of the program. Then within the last few weeks there have been some who spoke out in

support. I noted these recent supporters were not our earlier correspondents who had changed their mind but were in praise of the program because of some direct or indirect connection with the operation of the program. I would have felt much better and this recent mail would have been much more persuasive had it been from those who had written earlier in complaint and had changed their mind to believe the program should continue at its present tempo.

To oppose a large authorization of over \$2 billion at this time is not to be construed as being against those who are classified in one category or another as disadvantaged or in some particular or another as underprivileged. I have withheld final judgment on this authorization bill until all of the many amendments have been considered.

I am most disappointed there was a failure to eliminate the Green amendment which would provide for participation in the management of the program by political subdivisions. There have been many irregularities reported because of political participation but if this new part of the bill stands and becomes law as much as I regret to make the forecast it is my prediction we are going to have to listen in the year ahead to some most unpleasant news for mixing politics and poverty.

There are undoubtedly areas of our country, perhaps in Appalachia and maybe elsewhere that the economy is not good. In our congressional district with the exception of a portion of our rural areas the economy is the best it has ever been. In the suburban position of our district poverty has been taken care of by employment. As I try to reach a final decision whether or not to support this bill I cannot square in my own mind expenditures of near \$2 billion nationwide when all the economists tell us we have an economy that is going so good they fear runaway inflation.

Mr. Chairman, it is not consistent to talk about reduction of all nondefense expenditures including the old established executive branches of government all to avoid a tax increase and then continue a new program such as the war on poverty without the same measure of cuts or reductions. If the fiscal year 1967 level of expenditures is to be fairly applied to all of the other executive departments the same rule should be applied to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In reaching a decision to support a reduction in the overall authorization, I cannot be unmindful of the results of a poll we submitted to our constituents a few months ago. Fifty thousand questionnaires were sent out. Over 10 percent were returned. Only a small fraction of those who replied, or a little under 15 percent, favored continuing the program in its present form and the present amount of funding. Something less than 40 percent favored discontinuance or abolition of the entire program. About 37 percent favored transferring such worthwhile programs as Headstart and job training over to the appropriate Federal department or agency already peopled and housed to handle such programs and



eliminate the Office of Economic Opportunity. While this effort to so transfer these failed in the amending process on the floor, reduced funding will permit these generally acceptable portions of the overall program to continue uninterrupted.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I can support the motion to recommit which I understand will be offered. As I understand it cuts the program to \$1.6 billion for several reasons.

First, I shall support it because although we have not improved the bill as much as I would have liked, we have done a lot.

But when the Republican leadership agreed to limit the cut to an amount approximating the level of this year's expenditures it was a figure that could assure the continuation of the currently existing programs.

Furthermore, knowing that the Senate wants an even larger amount next year than this year, it is a foregone conclusion that the amount finally arrived at will be in excess of what was spent this year.

I regret that the House did not accept the so-called Industry Corps. This amendment would have enabled the private sector of our economy to have participated more than is contained in the bill as it goes to conference. It would have generated many more dollars for the poor than will be available under the bill before us.

On balance, the House has tightened up the program in several important respects. There will be less politics, there will be closer supervision, consultants at \$100 a day will be a thing of the past, more money will go to the poor because of cuts in administrative costs. Objectionable community action activities have been prohibited, such as voter registrations, partisan politicking and penalties for citing to riot, picketing, and demonstrating.

We did not win the closer participation by United Fund and other private and charitable agencies in the poverty program—and it is now possible that city hall can run these programs without permitting the poor to be pawns in the hands of politicians.

Nevertheless, it is a better bill than last year and one that should continue to help us solve the problem of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I enclose two editorials from the New Bedford Standard Times that express in many respects my feelings on this legislation:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Nov. 8, 1967]

#### OEO VERSUS CONGRESSIONAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Undermined by ulterior motive, provincialism, partisan politics and evasive foot-dragging, the Congress, pious declarations notwithstanding, has dealt a severe blow to the Office of Economic Opportunity by failing to provide promptly either funds or reform for OEO. As a result, thousands in the nation's trouble spots are on the threshold of bitter disillusion and OEO's director may resign.

At the moment, with no continuing resolution and no appropriation, OEO is out of funds. Its employees for the past week or two have been working as "volunteers," and between now and Nov. 30, approximately 50 community action agencies will have to

close their doors unless Congress ends its anti-antipoverty harangue and acts.

The truth of the matter is that OEO has some good programs that have produced results, including the Job Corps, Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps and Upward Bound, for example.

It also is true that sensible reforms would insure more service per dollar. The original law creating OEO was loosely written; experience has shown that some programs consequently suffer from poor administration; others, such as legal services, compete with existing agencies or, in the social welfare areas, suffer from lack of professional competence.

OEO ought to be funded and reformed without delay and congressional reforms ought to concentrate on achieving greater community involvement and cooperation with existing private agencies, a need to which many OEO leaders would subscribe. There also ought to be increased recognition of the fact that no two communities are alike in need or makeup. For example, Small Business Development Center (SBDC) worked fine here, although this was not a national pattern, and perhaps also reflects variety in quality of leadership. Care also has to be taken in applying broad federal yardsticks of what is "good" for a local area.

As an example of the kind of OEO-community partnership that should be the national goal, New Bedford's Head Start program is outstanding.

OEO provides funds for health services and feeding in this preschool program; through HEW funds, the city's public school administration provides the other necessities, including professional services. This not only guarantees synchronization of school and preschool systems, as well as professional competence—it also means, because they share expenses, that both OEO and the schools have more dollars to spend elsewhere.

The basic weakness of OEO seems to have been rooted in the belief that since local agencies had not been able to eliminate community problems, it was necessary to set up totally new structures to cope with the same problems.

This ignores the fact that what frustrated most local agencies was lack of money. It also overlooks the fact that, in most cases, the best and cheapest way to handle a program is by supplementing the local agency and its professional staff—through making federal funds available to it—rather than competing with it, as has occurred in the case of legal services and other UF functions.

One of the biggest assets existing agencies and local professionals could give to OEO embraces (a) specific experience in the area, and (b) general experience in the professional field. Had OEO exploited these more fully from the beginning, much of its painful and wasteful experimentation—and the Job Corps is a good example of this—would not have been necessary.

Thus, proposals for OEO reform to which Congress should give serious attention are those, for example, that call for:

Consultation with courts, schools and other local authorities in Job Corps recruit screening.

Affording the community a "meaningful voice" in Job Corps center affairs;

Encouraging participation of employer and labor organizations and "capable public and private organizations" in work and training organizations, and authorizing programs to provide incentives to private profit-making employers to train low-income people.

Illustrating the area in which sensible reform can take place is the statement of purpose of OEO's community action programs. In the present law, it is stated very generally that the aim is to provide stimulation and incentives for communities to mobilize resources to combat poverty.

But the House committee spells this out,

to include within this purpose "strengthening local capacity to relate assistance to local needs . . . and securing involvement of business, labor and private groups."

This is the key to a better OEO and more help for those who need it. Involve the community, and utilize its existing assets to the fullest.

Congress, which appears to have forgotten last summer's violent demonstrations in 27 communities and their obvious relationship to the hopelessness of the underprivileged, ought to wade out of the muddy waters of politics and get to work on a strengthened and improved OEO.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Nov. 10, 1967]

#### A MORE EFFECTIVE WAR ON POVERTY

The nation's war on poverty ought not to be thwarted by congressional tightening of the purse strings, because the need for this type of effort is more, rather than less, critical than it was a year ago.

The general effort ought to be funded at the same, or even at a slightly higher level, that is, between \$1.6 billion and \$2 billion.

However, the evidence suggests that the new congressional appropriation ought to be accompanied by tighter and more competent Office of Economic Opportunity administration and the transfer of some OEO programs to existing federal or local agencies.

The OEO act of 1964 states: "... no funds appropriated to carry out this act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office."

It may well be, for example, that some of OEO's concern with education, such as the Head Start program, would be more appropriate in the Office of Education.

ONBOARD's legal services nationally might be turned over to legal aid societies or bar associations on a judicare concept, aimed at aiding low-income groups and giving them a choice of attorney. OEO already has done this in some Wisconsin counties.

There is insufficient critical analysis of OEO programs and their impact, locally and nationally. Present law requires Job Corps officials to "try to secure" information concerning "employment, etc." from former enrollees. The House Committee on Education and Labor bill would require "careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, including costs and benefits," and this is needed.

Similarly, with regard to OEO work and training programs, there is no provision in present law for program data and evaluation.

The House committee bill properly recommends "development and implementation of program data system and publication of results; continuing evaluation of programs as to effectiveness" and requires "comparative studies with other work and training programs; development and publication of standards of evaluation and achievement, to be used in decisions on financial assistance."

There is need within OEO for more coordination and cooperation with existing local welfare and service agencies. Purchase of services from existing agencies by OEO should be required, thus providing private agencies with new funds to acquire the expanded staff that would be needed.

The original purpose of OEO was to stimulate the private war on poverty, to utilize local resources—not to create a new federal structure to take over the job from already established agencies.

The United Fund spends approximately \$600,000 yearly in this community. So does ONBOARD, Inc. Theoretically, this should mean twice the amount of service that UF alone could provide, but it does not because



we now have competition, rather than coordination between the two.

In considering amendments to the OEO act, Congress should:

Place the emphasis on programs that educate and train for jobs, enabling the poor to help themselves;

Revise the community contribution formula. Communities now pay 10 per cent of OEO costs, in kind only. It is not unreasonable to increase the community contribution to 20 per cent, 10 of which could be in kind, and 10 in cash. This cash contribution would make taxpayers more concerned with the success or failure and general efficiency of OEO projects, which they now feel "cost us nothing." If OEO were required to purchase services from existing agencies, it might be possible to pay the 10 per cent in cash to UF agencies, for services provided for OEO programs.

Make it mandatory that officials of community action programs, such as ONBOARD, meet OEO's own professional and experience requirements. This is not always the case at present.

Keep ONBOARD and other war-on-poverty community action programs in independent non-profit corporations free of direct local political control. A House amendment would put local community action programs under control of local government and politicians.

Some OEO programs work reasonably well, including Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, Head Start, Small Business Development Center, and Upward Bound, at least as far as our local experience is concerned.

In other areas, such as legal services, Operation Mainstream, and Neighborhood Centers—especially bearing in mind that administrative salaries were listed as consuming an estimated \$250,000-plus of New Bedford ONBOARD's fiscal 1967 appropriation—program purposes are intangible and results indefinite.

Further, it might reasonably be asked whether ONBOARD's Neighborhood Center information, referral and education functions are duplicating those of school and private agency programs.

Let's have money for OEO—but a tighter, more efficient OEO that serves more people more effectively.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 966, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on my amendment, which is on page 163, line 6.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on my amendment on page 188, which is the amendment to prohibit funds or personnel to be utilized for unlawful demonstrations or civil disturbances.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 163, strike the period and insert a semicolon in line 6, and after line 6, insert the following:

"(5) no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 188, after line 18, insert: "No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this act) shall be utilized (A) to organize or assist in organizing any unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance, or (B) for the defense of any person charged with participating therein or with the commission of a crime committed in the course thereof; if such person organized, or assisted in organizing, any such demonstration, or such civil disturbance."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 79, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—332

Abbitt	Buchanan	Dowdy
Abernethy	Burke, Fla.	Downing
Adair	Burke, Mass.	Dulski
Addabbo	Burleson	Duncan
Albert	Burton, Utah	Edmondson
Anderson, Ill.	Bush	Edwards, Ala.
Anderson, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, La.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cabell	Eilberg
Arends	Cahill	Erlenborn
Ashbrook	Carey	Esch
Ashley	Carter	Eshleman
Ashmore	Casey	Evans, Colo.
Ayres	Cederberg	Evins, Tenn.
Baring	Chamberlain	Fallon
Bates	Clancy	Fascell
Battin	Clark	Feighan
Belcher	Clausen	Findley
Bell	Don H.	Fino
Bennett	Cleveland	Fisher
Berry	Collier	Flood
Betts	Colmer	Flynt
Bevill	Conable	Foley
Blester	Corbett	Ford, Gerald R.
Blackburn	Cowger	Fountain
Blanton	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Boggs	Cunningham	Friedel
Boland	Curtis	Fulton, Pa.
Bolton	Daddario	Fulton, Tenn.
Bow	Daniels	Fuqua
Bray	Davis, Ga.	Galifianakis
Brinkley	Davis, Wis.	Gardner
Brock	de la Garza	Garmatz
Brooks	Delaney	Gathings
Brotzman	Denney	Gettys
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Giallomo
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Gibbons
Broyhill, N.C.	Dickinson	Goodell
Broyhill, Va.	Dole	Goodling
	Donohue	Gray
	Dorn	Green, Oreg.

Griffiths	Maillard	Schadeberg
Gross	Marsh	Scherle
Grover	Mathias, Calif.	Schneebell
Gubser	May	Schweiker
Gude	Mayne	Schwengel
Gurney	Meskill	Scott
Hagan	Michel	Selden
Haley	Miller, Calif.	Shibley
Hall	Miller, Ohio	Shriver
Halleck	Mills	Sikes
Halpern	Minish	Sisk
Hamilton	Minshall	Skubitz
Hammer-	Mize	Slack
schmidt	Monagan	Smith, Calif.
Hanley	Montgomery	Smith, Iowa
Hansen, Idaho	Moore	Smith, N.Y.
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Smith, Okla.
Hardy	Morris, N. Mex.	Snyder
Harrison	Morton	Springer
Harsha	Mosher	Stafford
Harvey	Murphy, N.Y.	Staggers
Hays	Myers	Stanton
Hébert	Natcher	Steed
Hechler, W. Va.	Nelsen	Steiger, Ariz.
Henderson	Nichols	Steiger, Wis.
Horton	O'Konski	Stephens
Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.	Stratton
Hull	O'Neill, Mass.	Stubblefield
Hungate	Ottinger	Stuckey
Hunt	Passman	Sullivan
Hutchinson	Patman	Taft
Ichord	Patten	Talcott
Jarman	Pelly	Taylor
Joelson	Pepper	Teague, Calif.
Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Teague, Tex.
Johnson, Pa.	Pettis	Thompson, Ga.
Jonas	Philbin	Thomson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	Pickle	Tiernan
Jones, Mo.	Pirnie	Tuck
Jones, N.C.	Poage	Tunney
Kazen	Poff	Udall
Kee	Pollock	Ullman
Keith	Pool	Van Deerlin
Kelly	Price, Tex.	Vander Jagt
King, N.Y.	Pryor	Vanik
Kleppe	Pucinski	Vigorito
Kluczynski	Purcell	Waggonner
Kornegay	Quie	Walker
Kupferman	Quillen	Wampler
Kuykendall	Railsback	Watkins
Kyl	Randall	Watson
Kyros	Rarick	Watts
Landrum	Reid, Ill.	Whalen
Langen	Reifel	Whalley
Latta	Reinecke	White
Lennon	Rhodes, Pa.	Whitener
Lipscomb	Riegle	Whitten
Lloyd	Rivers	Widnall
Long, La.	Roberts	Williams, Pa.
Lukens	Robison	Wilson, Bob
McClure	Rodino	Wilson,
McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.	Charles H.
McDade	Rooney, Pa.	Winn
McDonald,	Rostenkowski	Wolf
Mich.	Roth	Wright
McEwen	Roudebush	Wyatt
McFall	Roush	Wydler
McMillan	Rumsfeld	Wylie
Macdonald,	Ruppe	Wyman
Mass.	St Germain	Young
Machen	Sandman	Zablocki
Madden	Satterfield	Zion
Mahon	Saylor	Zwach

NAYS—79

Adams	Fraser	Morse, Mass.
Barrett	Gallagher	Moss
Bingham	Gilbert	Murphy, Ill.
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Nedzi
Bolling	Green, Pa.	Nix
Brademas	Hanna	O'Hara, Ill.
Brasco	Hathaway	O'Hara, Mich.
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Olsen
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Pike
Button	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Rees
Celler	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Cohelan	Howard	Resnick
Conyers	Irwin	Reuss
Corman	Jacobs	Rogers, Colo.
Culver	Karsten	Ronan
Dawson	Karth	Rooney, N.Y.
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Dent	King, Calif.	Roybal
Diggs	Leggett	Ryan
Dingell	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Dow	McCarthy	Tenzer
Eckhardt	Mathias, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Waldie
Farbstein	Meeds	Wiggins
Ford	Mink	Yates
William D.	Moorhead	



## NOT VOTING—21

Andrews, Ala.	Everett	Martin
Annunzio	Heckler, Mass.	Multer
Aspinall	Herlong	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broomfield	Kirwan	St. Onge
Clawson, Del.	Laird	Utt
Conte	McClory	Williams, Miss.
Dwyer	MacGregor	Willis

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Andrews with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. McClory.  
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Everett with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Multer with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. MOSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PATMAN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, and Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AYRES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AYRES moves to recommit the bill, S. 2388, to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions that it forthwith be reported back to the House with the following amendment: On page 128, in line 6 strike out "\$2,060,000,000" and insert "\$1,600,000,000"; in line 8 strike out "\$874,000,000" and insert "\$667,500,000"; in line 10 strike out "\$1,022,000,000" and insert "\$776,500,000"; in line 13 strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000"; and in line 14 strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

## YEAS—221

Abbott	Battin	Brinkley
Abernethy	Belcher	Brook
Adair	Bennett	Brotzman
Anderson, Ill.	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Andrews, N. Dak.	Betts	Broyhill, N.C.
Arends	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Ashbrook	Biester	Buchanan
Ashmore	Blackburn	Burke, Fla.
Ayres	Blanton	Burleson
Baring	Bolton	Burton, Utah
Bates	Bow	Bush
	Bray	Byrnes, Wis.

Cabell	Hunt	Reld, Ill.
Cahill	Hutchinson	Reifel
Casey	Ichord	Reinecke
Cederberg	Jarman	Rivers
Chamberlain	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Clausen,	Jonas	Robison
Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Roth
Collier	Jones, N.C.	Roudebush
Colmer	Keith	Rumsfeld
Conable	King, N.Y.	Sandman
Cramer	Kleppe	Satterfield
Cunningham	Kornegay	Saylor
Curtis	Kuykendall	Schadeberg
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Scherle
Davis, Wis.	Landrum	Schneebeli
Dellenback	Langen	Schwengel
Denney	Latta	Scott
Derwinski	Lennon	Selden
Devine	Lipscomb	Shriver
Dickinson	Lloyd	Sikes
Dole	Long, La.	Skubitz
Dowdy	Lukens	Smith, Calif.
Downing	McClure	Smith, N.Y.
Duncan	McCulloch	Smith, Okla.
Dwyer	McDonald,	Snyder
Edwards, Ala.	Mich.	Springer
Edwards, La.	McEwen	Stanton
Erlenborn	McMillan	Steed
Eshleman	Mahon	Steiger, Ariz.
Findley	Mailliard	Steiger, Wis.
Fino	Marsh	Stephens
Fisher	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Flynt	May	Stubblefield
Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne	Stuckey
Fountain	Michel	Taft
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Ohio	Talcott
Fuqua	Mills	Taylor
Gardner	Mize	Teague, Calif.
Gathings	Montgomery	Thompson, Ga.
Gettys	Morris, N. Mex.	Thomson, Wis.
Gialmo	Morton	Tuck
Goodell	Mosher	Vander Jagt
Goodling	Myers	Waggonner
Gross	Natcher	Wampler
Grover	Nelsen	Watkins
Gubser	Nichols	Watson
Gurney	O'Konski	Watts
Hagan	O'Neal, Ga.	Whalley
Haley	Passman	White
Hall	Pettis	Whitener
Halleck	Poage	Whitten
Hammer-	Poff	Widnall
schmidt	Pollock	Wiggins
Hansen, Idaho	Pool	Williams, Pa.
Hardy	Price, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Harrison	Pryor	Winn
Harvey	Purcell	Wyatt
Hébert	Quie	Wydler
Henderson	Quillen	Wyllie
Hosmer	Railsback	Wyman
Hull	Randall	Zion
Hungate	Rarick	Zwach

## NAYS—190

Adams	Donohue	Hawkins
Addabbo	Dorn	Hays
Albert	Dow	Hechler, W. Va.
Anderson,	Dulski	Helstoski
Tenn.	Eckhardt	Hicks
Ashley	Edmondson	Holifield
Barrett	Edwards, Calif.	Holland
Bell	Eilberg	Horton
Bingham	Esch	Howard
Blatnik	Evans, Colo.	Irwin
Boggs	Evins, Tenn.	Jacobs
Boland	Fallon	Joelson
Bolling	Farbstein	Johnson, Calif.
Brademas	Fascell	Karsten
Brasco	Feighan	Karth
Brooks	Flood	Kastenmeier
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Kazen
Brown, Mich.	Ford,	Kee
Burke, Mass.	William D.	Kelly
Burton, Calif.	Fraser	King, Calif.
Button	Friedel	Kluczynski
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton, Pa.	Kupferman
Carey	Fulton, Tenn.	Kyros
Carter	Galifianakis	Leggett
Celler	Gallagher	Long, Md.
Clancy	Garmatz	McCarthy
Clark	Gibbons	McDade
Cohelan	Gilbert	McFall
Conyers	Gonzalez	Macdonald,
Corbett	Gray	Mass.
Corman	Green, Oreg.	Machen
Cowger	Green, Pa.	Madden
Culver	Griffiths	Mathias, Md.
Daddario	Gude	Matsunaga
Daniels	Halpern	Meads
Dawson	Hamilton	Meskill
de la Garza	Hanley	Miller, Calif.
Delaney	Hanna	Minish
Dent	Hansen, Wash.	Mink
Diggs	Harsha	Minshall
Dingell	Hathaway	Monagan

Moore	Pucinski	Smith, Iowa
Moorhead	Rees	Stafford
Morgan	Reid, N.Y.	Staggers
Morse, Mass.	Resnick	Sullivan
Moss	Reuss	Tenzer
Murphy, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Murphy, N.Y.	Riegle	Tierman
Nedzi	Rodino	Tunney
Nix	Rogers, Colo.	Udall
O'Hara, Ill.	Ronan	Ullman
O'Hara, Mich.	Rooney, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Olsen	Rooney, Pa.	Vanik
O'Neill, Mass.	Rosenthal	Vigorito
Ottlinger	Rostenkowski	Waldie
Patman	Roush	Walker
Patten	Roybal	Whalen
Pelly	Ruppe	Wilson,
Pepper	Ryan	Charles H.
Perkins	St Germain	Wolff
Philbin	Scheuer	Wright
Pickle	Schweiker	Yates
Pike	Shipley	Young
Pirnie	Sisk	Zablocki
Price, Ill.	Slack	

## NOT VOTING—21

Andrews, Ala.	Heckler, Mass.	Multer
Annunzio	Herlong	Rhodes, Ariz.
Aspinall	Kirwan	St. Onge
Broomfield	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del.	McClory	Utt
Conte	MacGregor	Williams, Miss.
Everett	Martin	Willis

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Kirwan against.  
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Annunzio against.  
Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Multer against.  
Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Broomfield against.  
Mr. Everett for, with Mr. St. Onge against.  
Mr. Herlong for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.  
Mr. McClory for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. CLANCY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill S. 2388 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 128, in line 6 strike out "\$2,060,000,000" and insert "\$1,600,000,000"; in line 8 strike out "\$874,000,000" and insert "\$667,500,000"; in line 10 strike out "\$1,022,000,000" and insert "\$776,500,000"; in line 13 strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000"; and in line 14 strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 129, not voting 20, as follows:



[Roll No. 388]

YEAS—283

Adair  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Anderson, III.  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Ashley  
Ayres  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bates  
Battin  
Bell  
Biester  
Bingham  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bolton  
Bow  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brooks  
Brotzman  
Brown, Calif.  
Brown, Ohio  
Burke, Mass.  
Burton, Calif.  
Burton, Utah  
Bush  
Button  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cabell  
Cahill  
Carey  
Carter  
Casey  
Celler  
Clark  
Clausen, Don H.  
Cleveland  
Cohelan  
Conable  
Conyers  
Corbett  
Corman  
Cowger  
Culver  
Cunningham  
Daddario  
Daniels  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Dent  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Dow  
Downing  
Dulski  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Eilberg  
Esch  
Evans, Colo.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Flood  
Foley  
Ford, William D.  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Galifianakis  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Giaino  
Gibbons  
Gilbert

Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Grover  
Gubser  
Gude  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hammer  
Hammer  
Hansley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Harvey  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Hicks  
Holifield  
Holland  
Horton  
Hosmer  
Howard  
Hunt  
Irwin  
Jacobs  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Karsten  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kee  
Keith  
Kelly  
King, Calif.  
King, N.Y.  
Kluczynski  
Kupferman  
Kyl  
Kyros  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Lloyd  
Long, Md.  
Lukens  
McCarthy  
McCulloch  
McDade  
McDonald, Mich.  
McEwen  
McFall  
Macdonald, Mass.  
Machen  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Mathias, Md.  
Matsunaga  
May  
Meeds  
Meskill  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Monagan  
Moore  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris, N. Mex.  
Morse, Mass.  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nix  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
Olsen

O'Neill, Mass.  
Ottinger  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Philbin  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Pollock  
Price, Ill.  
Pryor  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Rallsback  
Rees  
Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Resnick  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riegle  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roush  
Roybal  
Rumsfeld  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Saylor  
Scheuer  
Schneebeil  
Schweiker  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Taft  
Talcott  
Tenzer  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tiernan  
Tunney  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waldie  
Walker  
Wampler  
Watts  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Charles H.  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zwach

NAYS—129

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Belcher  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blackburn  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brown, Mich.  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Fla.  
Burleson  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Collier  
Colmer  
Cramer  
Curtis  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
Denney  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Dole  
Dowdy  
Duncan  
Edwards, Ala.  
Erlenborn  
Eshleman  
Findley  
Fino  
Fisher

Flynt  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fountain  
Fuqua  
Gardner  
Gathings  
Gettys  
Goodell  
Gross  
Gurney  
Hagan  
Haley  
Hall  
Halleck  
Hansen, Idaho  
Harsha  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Hull  
Hungate  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jarman  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kleppe  
Kornegay  
Kuykendall  
Langen  
Latta  
Lennon  
Lipscob  
Long, La.  
McClure  
McMillan  
Marsh  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mayne  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio  
Mize  
Montgomery  
Myers

Nelsen  
Nichols  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Passman  
Poff  
Pool  
Price, Tex.  
Quie  
Quillen  
Randall  
Rarick  
Reifel  
Reinecke  
Rivers  
Rogers, Fla.  
Roudebush  
Satterfield  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Sikes  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Okla.  
Snyder  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stuckey  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tuck  
Waggonner  
Watkins  
Watson  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wiggins  
Williams, Pa.  
Winn  
Zion

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews, Ala.  
Annunzio  
Aspinall  
Broomfield  
Clawson, Del  
Conte  
Everett

Heckler, Mass.  
Herlong  
Kirwan  
Laird  
McClory  
MacGregor  
Martin

Multer  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
St. Onge  
Utt  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Martin against.  
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Everett against.  
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Utt against.  
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.  
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.  
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. McClory.

Mr. COWGER and Mr. PETTIS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read:  
"An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Messrs. THOMPSON of New Jersey, DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, ALBERT, GIBBONS, AYRES, QUIE, GOODELL, ASHBROOK, ERLBORN, and DELLENBACK.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, could the Speaker inform us as to how many Members were appointed as conferees for both the majority and the minority parties?

The SPEAKER. It is 8 and 6.

Mr. ARENDS. I think the Speaker.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CITATION AWARDED EARL J. MORGAN

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks



Those who try to distort our position in Vietnam by saying we are simply trying to save face, and add that the cost is not worth it, shamefully distort the facts.

National honor in this instance means nothing less than our ability to live up to certain international contracts which we have signed—for our own very enlightened self-interest.

Those contracts are the mutual defense treaties which today bind us to more than three dozen nations around the world.

Without those treaties, communism would be tempted around the globe to escalate its adventures far beyond anything we have seen so far. It is these mutual security treaties which spell out to communism the will of all those who have signed them to resist aggression, to resist force with force if need be.

Tyrants and aggressors understand no language better than this!

One such treaty and promises have bound us to the defense of South Vietnam. Three American Presidents have taken steps to make good on our pledges there. Our involvement in Vietnam is an American involvement; not a partisan involvement.

Should we pull out of Vietnam, leaving it defenseless, or should we have failed to respond to its plight in the first place, we would have pulled the rug out from beneath the security of the entire free world.

Who would yank that rug now? I know that today we hear cries of concern from some of the very nations with whom we are joined in those defense treaties. I cannot help but wonder, however, how much louder would be those cries of concern—and how much more heartfelt—if we suddenly renounced our role in the world, our partnership in security, and turned tail in Vietnam to dig ourselves into an isolated America.

Our mutual security agreements must mean exactly what they say or they would mean nothing at all. And what they say simply is that an attack against any one nation shall be considered an attack against all or, in most practical terms, as an attack against us.

Under these treaties, in effect, and necessarily, any one of the nations involved can call us to *instant war* if attacked. Harsh as it sounds, there is no better way to assure peace. An aggressive enemy is never appeased by slow reactions to his ambitions. Instead, such slowness of reaction just breeds new recklessness and new perils.

Three Presidents, a Republican and two Democrats, have reacted point for point to the enemy's actions in Vietnam. The enemy has chosen, point by point, to go ahead. Does this mean that the policy of opposing him has failed? It does not and it has not.

First, the enemy has been stopped from a key conquest. Second, while he has been stopped in Vietnam he actually has been hurled back and out in Indonesia—a major success for the friends of freedom. A major success which, it seems to me, would have been altogether impossible had not our show of strength in Vietnam been underway at the same time.

If the policy in Vietnam has left anything to be desired—and I am one who agrees that it has—it has been that it has not been firm enough and fast enough and honest enough. It has, too often, held out to the enemy false hopes of our weakening and thus has encouraged him.

Today, all who see horror in Vietnam, and would turn their eyes from it, also must shut their eyes to the horrors to come should we get out by giving up.

It is not too much, I feel, to hope that Vietnam will, when we have won, represent more than a milestone of mutual security.

It may well represent a watershed of new hope for a world purged of violence between nations.

For, deeply involved in Vietnam is, at last, the free world's recognition that when vio-

lence is substituted for political process—no matter the disguise—that men who treasure peace must march to war.

This is the entire key to our involvement there. It is the deepest meaning of the concept of mutual security. It is the deep awareness that aggression in these times no longer parades only under the banners of regular armies marching across regular battlefields.

Aggression can take many forms and, of course, so may the defense against it.

The economic aggression of politically priced and aimed marketing is one form—and the greatest merchant nation on our earth surely should be able to counter that and even counter-attack.

The political aggression of international pressure and internal subversion is another form—and surely this Nation, with its unbroken record of freeing, rather than enslaving people should be able to counter that, and even counter-attack.

The psychological aggression of chanted slogans and slanted viewpoints is another form—and surely this Nation, with the world's most exciting story of progress and prosperity should be able to counter that and even counter-attack.

But when it comes to violence, let me remind you, there often is no time for the weapons of those other forms. When murder became the Vietcong substitute for reason in Vietnam it became a question of immediate self-defense at the most basic level.

Thus, beyond everything else, what we are saying by our deeds in Vietnam—what we are saying with our lives in Vietnam—is that we will not stand by, no matter the time or the place, when violence is thrust upon a friend and when violence is substituted for political process.

The day we seek is the day when no man's hand will be raised against another, when violence will be rejected everywhere as a substitute for reason.

Until that day, we can no more tolerate violence in the affairs of nations than we can tolerate violence in the affairs of our own people.

In self-defense, violence must be opposed. Thugs, whether international or in your neighborhood, cannot be given a license to murder. They will use it. Those who initiate violence anywhere must be stopped—even if they must be stopped violently.

That is what, at the root, Vietnam is about. That is why those who say that we should turn back do not seem to have the haziest notion of why we have gone ahead. They speak of everything but they do not speak of the most important thing—the fact that it was not we, but the enemy who substituted violence for the processes of peace in Vietnam.

It is that very use of violence that is being tested today. Should the cause of violence win, then, of course, days of new violence would dawn everywhere. Violence proven in Vietnam would be violence made useful everywhere.

By the same token, violence beaten back in Vietnam, violence deprived of reward and sanction, violence deprived even of sanctuary, would mean second thoughts about violence everywhere. Yes; even here at home.

If peace is to be won in this world, it must be won from those who threaten it and violently shatter it.

We seek such a victory in Vietnam; a victory over violence itself.

Let no Republican, let no American ever seek less.

#### POLL ON OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days many of our offices, including my own, have been deluged with pleas from many organizations representing themselves to be in sympathy with the plight of the poor of America. Most of these communications have implored us not to "wreck the Office of Economic Opportunity" by voting to reduce the requested appropriation, or by transferring most of its programs to other departments and agencies as proposed under the opportunity crusade.

Judging from the defeat of many of the amendments offered to the committee bill we are now considering, it would appear that the effort put forth by the public relations machine of the Office of Economic Opportunity, organizations which depend for their existence on OEO funds, and some communications from those who are honestly concerned have had their telling effect.

However, I took the liberty during the summer to poll the constituents of my own district in Oklahoma concerning their thinking on the Office of Economic Opportunity's so-called war on poverty. The viewpoints of the people of southwestern Oklahoma do not coincide with the militant expressions my office has received from OEO organizations. I feel sure that the Oklahoman's views are representative of most Americans.

Of particular interest is the fact that 91 percent of those replying to the more than 180,000 questionnaires sent out do not think that the poverty program has been successful in their area. Over 94 percent registered their opinion that they did not believe that the \$4 billion appropriated to date for the uses of OEO have been well spent.

I agree.

#### SPEAK UP, PLEASE

After almost three years, the Administration's War on Poverty has spent \$4 billion of the taxpayers' money and has created a poverty bureau of 91,000 administrators. I believe it has lost sight of its goal.

That's why I have co-sponsored a bill called Opportunity Crusade which would dismantle the OEO, transfer the programs to other existing agencies, save the government \$300 million the first year, and yet would provide funds for the Headstart and Community Action programs which are substantially more than now proposed.

But because I represent the more than 400,000 people in Sixth District, I want to know what you think. What is your opinion of the Poverty Program? Will you please answer these seven questions and return them to me? If you so desire, your name will be kept confidential.

#### [Answers in percent]

(1) Do you think the Federal anti-poverty program has been successful in your area?

Yes .....	5
No .....	91
No opinion .....	4

(2) Are the poor people in your community better off because of the Federal poverty program?

Yes .....	6
No .....	89
No opinion .....	5

(3) Are you satisfied with the Headstart program as it is being run by the OEO?



[Answers in percent]—Continued

Yes .....	9
No .....	83
No opinion .....	8
(4) Would you favor transferring Headstart to the U.S. Office of Education?	
Yes .....	64
No .....	20
No opinion .....	16
(5) Would you prefer an Industry Youth Corps (ages 16 to 22) where youths are trained for jobs in and by industry, rather than the current Neighborhood Youth Corps whose employees are generally employed in state, community and non-profit related projects?	
Yes .....	83
No .....	10
No opinion .....	7
(6) Would you favor converting the Job Corps Training program to a Community Vocational Training Center program?	
Yes .....	73
No .....	16
No opinion .....	11
(7) Do you believe the \$4 billion appropriated to date for anti-poverty programs has been well spent?	
Yes .....	4
No .....	94
No opinion .....	2

## THE LATE GINNY DUKERT

(Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans throughout Maryland have had a sad day. Ginny Dukert, whose untimely loss saddens all our hearts, was a person whose sparkle, humor, and attractive way were an inspiration and source of pride to all who knew her. She exemplified the dedication of a wife whose husband faced every hour the responsibility of political leadership.

In this moment our hearts go out in deepest sympathy to her husband, chairman of our party in this State, to her family, and to her many friends.

## OPERATION PUERTO RICO: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, N.J.

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues may recall that from time to time in recent years I have reported on the activities of Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J., in providing practical, on-the-job experience in the functioning of our free enterprise economy for the benefit of hundreds of youthful citizens of the area each year.

With the cooperation of local industry and of officials of sponsoring firms who serve as Junior Achievement advisers, thousands of school-age youngsters in the Union County area have received valuable experience, training and direction which have helped to equip them to be more productive and responsible adult members of society.

At a time when we seem to be inundated with reports of juvenile delinquency, misguided youths indulging in antisocial behavior of various kinds, and permissive parents whose interests are elsewhere than in their children, it is especially appropriate and encouraging to report on the progress of this outstanding example of Junior Achievement.

For the 1967-68 program year, Junior Achievement of Union County has planned a dynamic and positive youth incentive and economic education project entitled "Operation Puerto Rico." The climax of this project, as the name implies, will be an award trip for about 30 of the more successful Junior Achievers, accompanied by approximately 12 adult representatives from business, education and government, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which is itself an excellent case study of private enterprise at work.

This year, 30 junior achievement companies have already begun operations—the largest number to date. Approximately 900 boys and girls, representing 20 public and parochial high schools in the area, have been assigned to the various companies.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Harry F. Frank, publisher of the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., who has been a guiding light to the junior achievement program, I have received a detailed description of this year's "Operation Puerto Rico," prepared by Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, the outstanding executive vice president of Junior Achievement of Union County who is once again in charge of the project. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this material for the interest and inspiration of our colleagues:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF  
UNION COUNTY, INC.,

Elizabeth, N.J., November 1, 1967.

To: Junior Achievement Sponsors, Advisers, Company Presidents, and High School Principals.

From: J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President.

Subject: Operation Puerto Rico.

AWARD-WINNING JUNIOR ACHIEVERS TO VISIT  
CARIBBEAN COMMONWEALTH

There is a definite need for all who are associated with Junior Achievement to inspire our young people to rededicate themselves to the principles of Free Enterprise, and to effectively teach and demonstrate that our Free Enterprise System is not just a system for carrying on business, but much more: The best system for promoting human progress while preserving individual freedom—a system which leads the world in industrial growth and high standards of living.

Nationwide surveys of high school students confirm the need for dynamic, positive programs to create better understanding of how business operates, its problems, its invaluable contributions to a better life for all people.

Operation Puerto Rico will be a three-pronged youth incentive, economic education, and public relations project. It will continue throughout the Junior Achievement program year. It will be climaxed with a weeklong visit to Puerto Rico, beginning April 29, 1968, by about 35 Junior Achievers, and adult advisers from industry. There the Junior Achievers will have an opportunity to develop personal knowledge of the industrial, educational, scientific and cultural growth resulting from the Puerto Rican eco-

nomie development program, long identified as "Operation Bootstrap". They will return better prepared to assume their future responsibilities as voters, community leaders, employees and managers in a world where international relationships are becoming increasingly more important.

The group will meet Puerto Rican government leaders and educators. Arrangements for these meetings are being worked out in cooperation with the Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration. This is a return visit. Twenty-eight of our outstanding Junior Achievers were guests of Puerto Rican officials in 1959.

Extensive press, radio and television coverage, locally and in Puerto Rico, will be planned throughout the 1967-1968 program year, as well as during the visit to Puerto Rico.

The Itinerary and Program for the visit will be distributed at a later date.

## Why Puerto Rico?

Because Puerto Rico is one of the world's fastest growing industry-based economies and we believe it offers one of the best current case studies of private enterprise in action.

For almost two decades a confident, dynamic spirit has prevailed there and Puerto Rico has experienced amazing economic growth, its people demonstrating a keen awareness of both its accomplishments and its present needs.

In Puerto Rico there will be visits to industrial installations, educational and cultural centers. Arrangements will be made for the Junior Achievers to meet with student groups and to be guests in the homes of industrialists and their families, many of whom will be stateside citizens on assignment in Puerto Rico.

The most important phase of the visit will be meetings with industrialists who will discuss with the group the results of "Operation Bootstrap", pioneered in Puerto Rico as one of the first attempts of an undeveloped area to chart a course of economic development on a massive scale. They will also show them their modern manufacturing facilities and discuss the most up-to-date management techniques.

Puerto Rico today is bubbling with new ideas and excitement about the future, buttressed by solid achievements in economic development: 1,500 U.S. plants have been established under the "Operation Bootstrap" industrialization program; 92,500 jobs were created directly by these plants, with an annual payroll of over \$212 million; The Commonwealth per capita income has passed the \$1,000 mark compared with \$279 in 1950; between 1950 and 1967 Puerto Rico Gross National Product rose from \$775 million to over \$3.2 billion and external trade soared from \$580 million to \$2.9 billion, with Puerto Rico becoming the fifth largest U.S. overseas market.

## Objectives of Operation Puerto Rico

Operation Puerto Rico has been planned and developed by the Board of Directors of Junior Achievement of Union County to meet our present-day challenges. Its objectives are:

(1) To provide Junior Achievers and Advisers with a positive educational and incentive program designed to stimulate full understanding of the principles, motivations and rewards of the American Private Enterprise System

Operation Puerto Rico will demonstrate that every individual—whether employee, manager or community leader—must be ever aware that the vigor of the private enterprise system depends upon a heritage that attaches prime importance to liberty, opportunity for the individual, and personal initiative. It will emphasize the responsibility of the individual to adequately prepare himself to carry his share of the load, and to discharge his responsibilities to the best of his ability.



but underutilized. Nevertheless, the unit is ready for U.N. service in any emergency.

Premier Erlander suggests that because we were only in Sweden 3 days, and did not meet with what he would describe as top Swedish officials, we were not in a position to make such an observation.

I did have the opportunity to visit Sweden as a student in 1952, so this was a return trip for me. My grandmother came from Sweden to this country when she was 16 years old, and throughout her long life her love of Sweden was transmitted to our family. For this reason, present attitudes in that country are therefore of particular personal concern to me.

However, no one has to go to Sweden to be aware of that neutral nation's attitude toward American foreign policy or the incessant criticism of selected aspects of American domestic life. All you have to do is read the newspaper accounts of the repeated demonstrations and attacks on the American Embassy or the statements of public officials in the press.

And I can tell you that you only have to be in Sweden a matter of hours to have these impressions confirmed.

We were there 3 days, and we did meet with prominent persons who play a very direct role in the formulation of Swedish official policies as well as public opinion, including the Chief of the Information Division of the Foreign Ministry, the Chief of the U.N. Division of the Foreign Ministry, and the foreign editor of one of Stockholm's major newspapers.

Private assurances of the Swedish affection for the American people by top Government officials would not have been either effective or attractive when those same officials are publicly denouncing American motives, as indicated in the following news item which appeared in the Washington Post on October 24:

SWEDISH OFFICIAL DOUBTS U.S. MOTIVES IN VIETNAM  
(By Wilfred Fleisher)

STOCKHOLM, October 23.—Swedish Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson told a Social Democratic Party congress here today that he doubted American policy in Vietnam "is based on the ideals of peace, democracy and justice which American officials profess," Nilsson also declared bluntly that "the world is losing confidence in the United States."

He charged that American policy is "based on an over-simplification of world events in which communism is branded as evil in all circumstances and anticommunism is regarded as the only alternative. Those who claim to serve mankind by the increasing use of force," he said, "must produce overwhelming evidence that they really serve the cause they claim . . . American leadership has not been convincing abroad or at home . . ."

Nilsson said world opinion "is becoming increasingly critical and the United States risks to be morally and politically isolated."

Nilsson's speech, evidently intended to appeal to left-wing voters in next year's parliamentary election, is regarded here as the strongest attack on the United States made so far by any official Swedish spokesman.

The Social Democratic Party congress wound up a three-day session tonight by repeating a demand that the United States cease bombing North Vietnam unconditionally, that peace talks include the Vietcong and that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Vietnam.

It is one thing to criticize the wisdom of our policy in Vietnam, as is done by many here at home and abroad. But it is quite another thing to impugn the motives of the American Government, as did the Swedish Foreign Minister in the address before the Social Democratic Party Congress in Stockholm which I just cited. He said then that he doubted whether American policy in Vietnam "is based on the ideals of peace, democracy, and justice which American officials profess."

Sweden certainly raised no such question about the sincerity of American policy when we were fighting or prepared to fight for the maintenance of the freedom of Western Europe from Nazi or Communist domination. Those government officials who jealously safeguard their neutrality today might do well to stop and ask themselves if they could still enjoy this neutrality in the absence of United States sacrifice in two major wars and present dedication to the freedom of Western Europe.

Premier Erlander contends that—

Sweden alone is to be the interpreter of its neutrality.

If that in fact is the case, then perhaps he would suggest that the United States alone should be the interpreter of its commitment in Vietnam.

I think that our Swedish friends would agree that a policy of neutrality does not confer a state of immunity or infallibility. Mutual criticism of imperfection in policy does not violate either standards of international conduct or the ideals which democratic nations share.

It is dismaying that some leaders in Sweden now seem to feel that criticism is one directional. If any tradition has typified Sweden in the past, it is the spirit of open inquiry and honest debate. I hope that these reactions by the Premier of Sweden represent only a momentary departure from that standard of fairness and good will.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add a comment of support to the observations just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER].

As his colleague on this study mission to the Soviet Union and Scandinavia, I concur in his excellent statement. The conclusions of our report simply reflect the facts as we saw them. They were not the product of our imagination or prejudice nor were they random or trivial attempts to find fault with Sweden.

The fact that there may be some pertinence and validity in what we say is suggested by the excessive sensitivity and self-righteousness reflected in the statements made by the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Sweden. They seem to feel that they deserve a sanctuary from criticism or comment. That is a new and disturbing definition of neutrality. I commend my colleague for his reply to the reported statement of Prime Minister Erlander.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

## PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WAR ON POVERTY CARRIED FORWARD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic date for the American people. Just a few minutes ago this Chamber adopted by a spectacular vote of 283 to 129 a continuation of President Johnson's firm determination that poverty shall be stamped out from our society as Americans.

This is a historic date because it reflects on the tremendously impressive leadership of this House. Less than 3 weeks ago many of the pundits, political writers and analysts, and, yes, the leaders of the opposition, were confident in predicting that the war on poverty would be scuttled, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity would be eliminated, and it was just a matter of time, they were saying, before this would bring to an end the President's valiant efforts to stamp out poverty in this country. They had the votes, and they had the confidence. The newspapers all over this country were reflecting the propaganda being put out by our adversaries.

I believe that the vote today of 283 to 129 for the continuation of the President's war on poverty clearly reflects the good judgment of this House, and it reflects the dedicated leadership of the Speaker of this House, Speaker McCormack, who has worked tirelessly for the Members of this Congress to prepare a formula that would preserve this very important aspect of the President's domestic program.

Undoubtedly the war on poverty is President Johnson's most important domestic program, because the President well realizes that democracy cannot survive when a large segment of its people live in privation.

It reflects the unyielding leadership of the majority leader of this House of Representatives, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. It reflects the leadership of our whip, and the whip system that worked so well throughout the day in preserving this legislation and preventing it from being emasculated here on the floor.

It also reflects upon the impressive leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, CARL PERKINS, who tenaciously held to the idea that this was a program that could not be abandoned. Although on many occasions the situation looked very bleak so that one would be led to expect that the votes could not be marshaled in support of this legislation, by his patience and dedication and his true understanding of the great challenge that lies ahead, he held his committee together and carved out a bill and reported out a bill that was acceptable to the overwhelming majority of this House today.

It also reflects on the members of the Committee on Education and Labor who worked so tirelessly to put together a combination of ideas, restructuring the



bill in those instances where it was weak, and shoring it up and firming it up and bringing to the floor a bill that brought the Democrats together as one party, dedicated to their fundamental and traditional policy of working for the people.

Mr. Speaker, since the early days of Jefferson this party has believed that when a nation invests in its people the return is manifold indeed.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, today was a great day because on vote after vote the Democrats in this Chamber stood together in the firm belief that the days of poverty in America must be eliminated.

So I say to the pundits who were so quick in trying to write off the Democratic Party that today clearly demonstrates to them to write no epitaphs for the Democratic Party. We are strong and virile and strong in our belief that so long as we serve the cause of the American people, we shall be victorious in all our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all disturbed about the motion to recommit. That was an honest expression of many of the Members in this Chamber, Members who feel that perhaps because of the situation in Vietnam we may not be able to progress as far as we had hoped to through the committee bill.

But I think the important thing here is that the leadership of the House of Representatives can take great pride that the prophecies of despair and destruction so far as the Office of Economic Opportunity is concerned did not come true. Today as we leave this Chamber after many hours of hard debate and after many hours of voting, the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity is secure. It is going to continue working to help those communities in America that need help to eliminate the ravages of poverty.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that the leadership of the House of Representatives was able to put together a winning combination today and that those prophets of doom and gloom and those who thought they were going to bury the Office of Economic Opportunity and those who were openly suggesting that Sargent Shriver should look to new fields because there would no longer be any Office of Economic Opportunity and those who tried to dismember this bill and those who could not understand the totality of the challenge that confronts us were rejected by their colleagues in this Chamber today by overwhelming vote of 283 to 129.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the leadership of the House. I want to congratulate the chairman of our committee. I want to congratulate every single member of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I have never been more proud of any group of men and women than I am today, proud of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President. The President of the United States who has the vision and who has the depth of understanding and who has time and again said that democracy cannot survive when a vast number of people, some 30 million of its citizens

live in privation and poverty—a President of the United States who has had the courage to marshal the resources of this country in this all-out war on poverty—a President who has bravely said that this country is big enough and wealthy enough to wage a war against communism and subversion in Vietnam and wage war against poverty and privation in this country.

I think it is an historical day, Mr. Speaker. It is an historical day for the Speaker of this chamber who in recent days has been maligned by men of little faith, little vision, and less understanding—men who do not understand the dynamics of the legislative process, men who do not understand what it takes to put together understanding among 435 Members in a chamber like this, the greatest deliberative body of the world.

I say that this is a proud day for the Speaker of the House, a proud day for the majority leader. It is a proud day for all of us Democrats who stood together on a crucial issue, probably the most crucial issue before the Congress. This has been a great day.

Just one footnote to some of the earlier debate. As to those who try to say that somehow or other we stifle debate, I want the RECORD to show that, unlike most bills before this chamber, this chamber spent 6 days of intensive debate on the amendments and the structure of the poverty program. Our committee spent 18 days in executive session marking up this bill, and those who scream the loudest today that somehow or other they were being foreclosed from debate were the men who not only voted against the bill today but who also tried to frustrate this committee from bringing the bill to the floor by not attending to committee meetings. It was not until the day that the chairman of the committee [Mr. PERKINS] took the brave move of opening up the executive hearings and letting the whole country see who were the obstructionists to helping the poor people of America that they began attending meetings, and the last 5 days were open sessions.

I would like the RECORD to show that this committee held 26 days of public hearings to see what America wants in the way of an antipoverty program. So for anyone to suggest that somehow or other we had stifled free debate is to run contrary to the facts and to torture the truth. No legislation has received more attention and more study by this Chamber than this poverty program, and I say it was because of the extensive debate that this bill today was adopted by an overwhelming majority of 283 to 129 votes, when 3 weeks ago the opponents of this legislation were confidently predicting that they would bury the program and the effort in the war against poverty.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks he has just made, and concur in his judgments as to the action of the House today.

Let me begin by stating that this is, indeed, a day of major victory. But it is not to exalt in victory but to be humble in the recognition that this program has gained the support it deserves I stand in the House now. I agree. President Johnson deserves credit for his stewardship in this legislation. From the day when he first, in a Presidential message, called upon Congress to deal with the problems of the needy he has been unswerving in his devotion to this program. Despite all the very many trying requests that are directed to him to fund vital programs both at home and abroad and in defense of our country, he has so well managed our fiscal resources that he has been able to make available not only the minimum sums with which we began to fight the war on poverty but an increased commitment to the war on poverty. In every year of its existence since 1964 the President has shown confidence in the administration of the war on poverty under Sargent Shriver.

In the person of Sargent Shriver we have a devoted public servant, one who has brought his considerable talents to bear on this most vexacious problem of our time. I think he deserves also to have the vote of confidence that the House gave him and his program tonight.

As to the leadership of the House, let me say to my colleague from Illinois that I cannot find adequate words to express my admiration for the leadership shown by our Speaker, by our majority leader, and by the chairman of our committee and all those who serve there, including the staff of the great Committee on Education and Labor, who have worked with cohesion and close cooperation to bring this bill to the point where it could receive the overwhelming support and the vote of confidence that it received here tonight.

I think possibly only the Speaker with his legislative experience, with his close contact with all the Members of the House on both sides, and with his ability to read the mood of the House from day to day, could have brought us to this juncture of victory tonight.

There were those who said, and said quite correctly and confidently and almost punitively, that the House would kill the poverty bill as soon as it came to the floor, and their predictions probably would have been true—probably would have been true. These were reckless predictions. Perhaps they wanted to see the havoc that would be created in the country if the poor had a new sense of frustration thrust upon them by the decimation of this program, but, true to his country as a great legislator, the Speaker read the mood of the House, and with his leadership team chose the time and the place to bring this bill up and to debate it thoroughly and have it discussed from end to end for day after day in this House.

When all this criticism was heaped upon it and all the unfair judgments cast upon it and all its enemies could do to it had been done to this bill, then the House rose up and backed its Speaker, after he gave a tremendous address here in the House supporting this program.



I think we can well express our own confidence again in the judgments the gentleman in the well and I have made in choosing Lyndon Johnson to be our leader and in choosing JOHN McCORMACK to be our Speaker and CARL ALBERT to be our majority leader.

Let me just observe that this was made more than a simple crusade and cause here in this House—the debate as to whether we were for or against this program. In a way, this program spoke for itself—the things that have been done for the children, the things that have been done for the elderly, the starts of new housing and rehabilitation of housing for all people which have been begun under this program, and the Upward Bound work, and the VISTA work, and all the hopes and ideas that have been started to help people with their dreams.

This bill has turned out to be almost the “Unsinkable Molly Brown.” No matter what was done to it, its merit came to the fore. That is why the bill was able to garner the votes it received here in the House tonight.

Let me suggest again briefly in closing these remarks, because words simply cannot express my admiration for the President and the Speaker and my comrades here and the gentleman in the well, to all who contributed to the passage of this bill, we go forth united in this House, united behind this cause for a better life, for a better America for all people, united on our platform, united in our pledge and promise to the American people that we can move forward under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

I think unwisely and not too well the opponents of our President thought they could seize a great political victory here on this bill. They thought they could show the people of America that President Johnson did not have enough followers and friends to pass a program behind which he has put the prestige of his high office. A defeat to President Johnson on this bill would, they thought, be interpreted by the American people as a vote of no confidence to a great President. Instead, overwhelming numbers of the President's party and men of good will in the Republican Party came together this day.

The President has proven his leadership in this program. He has wisely recommended additional sums. He has given this program his full support and the prestige of his office. We are not going to let the President down, because letting him down would be letting down the poor people of this country who have found in President Johnson and in the leadership of this House the friends they have needed for so many years.

I would recall to my friend in the well that it is not uncharacteristic of our President to be carrying a good fight for this program. Those who know him well recall that in his earliest service in government he was in a similar program in the National Youth Administration when, back in his native State, he gave his time and his energy and his leadership to helping young people gain careers in high school and college with the assistance of the National Youth Administration funds.

He was in the business of helping the poor then. He is in the business of helping the poor today. If we have given him a few additional tools to work with, then we have responded to his leadership as men of good will from any party should respond to leadership.

Let this bill be a warning, a note and a caveat to the opponents of our party and to the opponents of the poor. We will survive. We will move forward. We will continue to build his great society.

Thank God in this day of America's need we have men like President Johnson and JOHN McCORMACK leading the fight.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks.

I thank the gentleman for putting into proper perspective the full significance of what happened here in this Chamber today.

I thank the gentleman for calling attention to the fact that had we faltered in our complete confidence in our leadership, in our great President, this would have been a message to people all over the world that our system was failing.

I believe that the vote which was scored here today was probably the most eloquent message we could send to people all over the world, “Democracy cares for all of its people, rich and poor.”

The fact that we have voted this program tonight, by this overwhelming majority of 283 to 129 votes, clearly indicates that certainly the destiny and the future is on our side. The wave of nations now wavering as to which way to go will go with us.

I say again, this is an historic date.

The Speaker of this House, the majority leader, the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee who worked so hard to put together the kind of bill that would get this kind of overwhelming support can be proud Members of Congress today.

Above all, President Johnson can be proud of the team he has in this Congress to stand behind his program. We are grateful.

We are grateful for the support we got from the minority Members of this Congress, from those who voted with us for final passage of this legislation. We are grateful that they rejected the false prophets who tried to mislead them and joined us to work together in this great cause of making America the first nation in the history of civilization to eliminate poverty.

That is the great dream of a great President, President Johnson.

We are grateful to all those who joined in this huge victory today.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his fine statement. I agree wholeheartedly with the effort made on the war on poverty, and I would like to congratulate the gentleman personally for his efforts in behalf of the poor, in behalf of community action agencies, and in behalf of many people involved in this particular struggle.

I would certainly agree with the gentleman and commend the leadership on the other side for putting together the entire party in such a spirit and manner. I trust it will be a good example for the rest of us. So often we have difficulty getting our geographic opponents on the same side of the aisle.

In all seriousness, I would like to ask the gentleman how I can go back and reply to questions I have already received from people in the community action agencies in my district. They say:

Coming as we do from a poor and needy district, how are we expected to put up not 10 percent but 20 percent of the cost of the program? For the first time, frankly, as very poor and very needy communities, how are we to be called upon to put up 10 percent cash contribution?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would be glad to try to help the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, the beauty of our American system and of our legislative process, in our bicameral form of government, is that the other body has not written this kind of provision into its bill. This Chamber has. The vote was reasonably close.

I am sure the representatives of the gentleman's party and the representatives of our party, the Representatives of this Chamber, will go into conference. They will listen to all of the arguments. The arguments have been convincing and persuasive.

I do not want in any way to prejudge how the conference will act, but I certainly would not be at all surprised if the conferees heard the impassioned voices of those who today said perhaps this limitation might place great difficulty on some of the communities.

I would suggest to my colleague that we withhold judgment on this particular question until the conferees have had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the Members of the other body, and to see what kind of a report they come back with.

If the arguments made today in support of eliminating the 10 percent cash requirement were persuasive and convincing, then I think that the conferees are responsible Members of Congress, and I am sure that the arguments we heard today are going to bear on the ultimate decision. So I would suggest to my colleague not to write this question off at this time. We do have a conference. There is going to be considerable discussion and debate among various Members on this point.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on this point?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I share the same concern as the gentleman who has just spoken here about this change which now requires a 20-percent participation, 10 percent of which must be in cash. I have many Indian and Eskimo and Aleut communities that need vitally to share in this program. In fact, they are too poor now to participate, because there is no way that they can get the 10 percent in order to do it. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House and the Senate in the conference committee will



very seriously reconsider the position of the House in this regard. I think many good things were done to this bill today. There were a number of bad things done today, because a number of amendments did not get the consideration today that they should have gotten. This is one of the areas which is very serious. I happen to be one of the Republicans who voted to support the passage of the bill. I am very happy that it passed, but I am seriously concerned in this one regard. I hope that the final law which passes this 90th Congress will be one which will have rejected that portion of the proposition which passed the House today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman's voice will certainly be considered by the conferees and the arguments put forward by him earlier will be considered also. The fact of the matter is I think we can all rejoice. The gentleman addressing the House now and all of us can rejoice that we came out of this day with a bill that will keep moving forward the war on poverty. This is the important thing. The comments made by the gentleman from Alaska and the earlier speaker are certainly going to be considered and are very valid, but I think the most important single thing here is that those who would have destroyed the OEO as a vehicle for waging this very important effort against poverty in America and those who would have stripped a tremendous American—and I know of few Americans who have given of themselves as much as Sargent Shriver has—and I know of few men in Government who are thoroughly dedicated to their job as Sargent Shriver is—those who have tried to strip him of his great effort to eliminate poverty in America have failed. Now we are going to move forward. Certainly in conference we are going to try to correct whatever shortcomings might have been voted by either chamber in the normal process of legislation. I am confident, though, that by the staggering vote of 283 to 129 this tremendous endorsement of President Johnson's program at a time when there were those who said because we lost 47 seats in the last election that the poverty program would be the first victim of last November's election have been proven wrong. Today we can move forward with a program. We are going to correct it and are going to work it out in conference. I am sure when we come back we will come back with a program every Member could and should support. I suppose we will continue the great effort of President Johnson to help the needy of this country to become decent, dignified citizens participating in the great dream as wage earners and not people dependent on the public dole. This is the great dream of a great President.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that 283 Members in this Chamber today said:

Mr. President, we agree with you; we may have some differences here and there, but we agree upon your basic premise and we are going to give you an opportunity to continue this great program for America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REVISION OF ORIGINAL REQUEST UNDER GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL S. 2388

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the order heretofore granted to permit Members 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 2388, that they may include extraneous matter if they desire to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PUCINSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### AIRCRAFT PARACHUTES MAY SAVE PLANES AND LIVES

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been focused on aviation safety in recent months. One proposal which has never really received the consideration it merits, however, is to equip small aircraft with parachutes which could guarantee a safe landing in the event of engine failure or some other serious malfunction.

Apparently such a parachute has been developed and tested successfully. I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a New York Times article describing a test of this device and commend it to the attention of all those interested in air safety:

#### THREE CHUTES SAVE PLANE AND PILOT AFTER EXPLOSION

(By William E. Burrows)

LAKEHURST, N.J., November 9.—A pilot flying 4,600 feet over the Naval Air Station here today used small explosive charges to blow the wings off his light plane to demonstrate that the craft could parachute safely to earth.

It was the first time that a disabled plane had landed by parachute, according to the technique's developers, Dario Manfredi and Angelo Raiti. Work on the safety device has taken 20 years and cost about \$100,000, Mr. Manfredi said.

The single engine, four-seat Stinson was flown by Tommy Walker, a 52-year-old flight instructor and former World War II fighter pilot.

When the plane passed over a large, clear field, Mr. Walker pulled a lever above him that simultaneously shot off the wings of his 19-year-old plane and opened three parachutes.

A small parachute on each of the wings pulled them away from the fuselage, and a fuselage parachute 64 feet in diameter opened directly above the pilot.

#### PILOT REMAINS INSIDE

An instant after he had pulled the lever, the plane and Mr. Walker, still sitting at

the controls, began dropping. Then the large chute blossomed, and the craft floated down slowly.

While the plane's wings plummeted straight down, the fuselage, its orange and white striped parachute billowing, settled at a much slower 17 or so feet a second (A parachutist descends at about 15 feet a second.)

Mr. Walker said later that the jolt he had felt when the three pins holding each wing to the fuselage were blown loose was less than the jolt caused by the opening of the large chute.

When the fuselage reached about 1,500 feet, Mr. Walker parachuted out of it. Mr. Walker landed safely and the fuselage settled right side up, virtually unscratched, in a swampy pine area about a mile and a half from the open field.

"It went fine," said Mr. Walker, as he removed his parachute harness. "If anybody had been in the plane, the worst they would have gotten was a broken arm or a broken leg."

#### WING EJECTION VITAL

The happy inventors, who have patented the system, were among the first to reach the pilot. They said the wing-ejection system and main parachute had functioned perfectly. The smaller chutes on the wings became tangled in each other, Mr. Manfredi said, causing the wings to crash on the ground.

On larger planes, such as airliners, the wings constitute more than 60 per cent of the weight of the plane, said Mr. Manfredi, and include fuel tanks and landing gear. Removal of the wings, he added, is a key part of the invention because it not only means less weight for the parachute; it also removes the danger of fire from the fuel tanks.

Mr. Manfredi and Mr. Raiti, who, besides being partners in a New York real estate company are founders of the Aircraft Safety Release Corporation, would like to see the wing-ejection system and parachute used on all planes.

The size and weight of the plane would not matter, Mr. Manfredi contended, because parachutes, like planes, can be made in all sizes. The loaded weight of the plane used today is about 2,500 pounds; empty, it weighs about 1,500 pounds. Releasing the wings lightened it by about 1,000 pounds.

#### RESOLUTION TO CONSIDER REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY MEETING OF UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MCCARTHY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with Congressman OLSEN, of Montana, and others in introducing the so-called Mansfield resolution. This resolution was signed by the majority leader of the other body and 54 other Senators.

It encourages the President to "request an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council to consider all aspects of the conflict in Vietnam and to act to end the conflict in accordance with article 25 of the charter," and "if the Security Council is unable to act, the United States should take all steps necessary to assure action on the issue by the General Assembly."

I realize that many people believe that the United Nations does not want the problem. And indeed the U.N. has shown no inclination to take it up. However, I



The Senate "Truth-in-Lending" bill emphasizes standardization in presenting the terms of such consumer financing as personal, automobile, and appliance loans. We think the House should do the same.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, July 13, 1967]

#### TRUTH-IN-LENDING PROGRESS

The 92-0 vote of the Senate in favor of the long-stymied truth-in-lending bill probably is as much a tribute to the adroit compromises worked out by the bill's sponsor, Senator William Proxmire (D., Wis.), as to the merit of the measure itself. But, after a seven-year stalemate, it obviously represents a long step forward for the consumer.

Complete disclosure of loan costs, in both annual percentage and dollars and cents, is required under the Proxmire bill (handled for years by former Senator Paul Douglas), but the compromises to get it through the Senate exempt first mortgages from this disclosure, as well as items on which interest charges come to \$10 a year, or less, and ordinary revolving credit accounts.

The point of the bill, of course, is to give consumers an accurate idea what time payments cost them. The Senate Banking Committee hearings brought out the fact that some consumers badly need to be told; a survey of 800 representative families showed that they thought they were paying about 8.3 percent on borrowed money, on average, when actually it was 24 percent—a whopping difference when family budgets are being figured.

The bill should also serve to reduce, at least, the number of flagrantly abusive charges with which consumers are sometimes saddled by unscrupulous lenders: rates as fantastic as 289 percent were reported to the committee, and this did not involve illegal loan sharks.

In the House, it has been reported, an effort will be made to toughen up the measure at the points of compromise, but it may at least be hoped that Congressmen will not be so insistent on a "perfect" piece of legislation as to kill it or delay it still further. Seven years is long enough for the consumer to wait for at least a glimmer of what "buy now, pay later" is doing to his bank account—and a chance to "shop" for the best terms.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, July 14, 1967]

#### AT LAST, THE LENDING BILL

From the way the truth-in-lending bill breezed through the U.S. Senate (92 to 0), it is hard to believe that it will have much trouble in the House. The proposal has been successful this year because Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin drew a realistic, workable bill and because consumer protection laws are becoming politically appealing.

Before Sen. Proxmire took up the cause, Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois had labored unsuccessfully for seven years to get his truth-in-lending measures out of committee. The Proxmire bill won approval because its author was more willing to compromise than Sen. Douglas on some of the controversial details, but it achieves essentially the same purposes as the earlier proposals.

Basically, the Senate-passed bill will require on numerous credit transactions full disclosure of the annual interest percentage and the total finance charges in dollars and cents. Included are automobile loans, personal loans, purchases of appliances and other consumer goods, single payment loans and loans for repair and modernization. Exempted are first mortgages on homes and revolving charge accounts, deleted in Sen. Proxmire's major compromise.

The most important contribution of this legislation would be to require that merchants and lenders use simple, uniform

methods in disclosing credit charges to customers. Under rules to be prepared by the Federal Reserve Board, the charges would be stated so that a buyer could compare credit costs in stores and lending institutions.

This simple requirement should not place an undue burden on the credit business. But it will provide a vitally needed safeguard in a country whose people now carry almost \$100 billion in consumer debt (excluding long-term mortgages). It will help to prevent the consumer credit system from victimizing the poor, the ill-educated, the gullible and the careless.

Actually, though, Congress should never have had to consider truth-in-lending laws. State governments should have enacted them years ago but, as with so many other problems, they chose not to act. The states could regulate consumer credit far more efficiently because they have the power to enact usury laws (many of which are outdated) and could more easily develop uniform systems for disclosing credit costs.

If the House of Representatives approves the Proxmire bill, however, perhaps the new federal law will be an incentive to the state legislatures to develop their own laws for consumer protection and cover some areas of abuse not included in the congressional bill.

#### RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES OF WASHINGTON SUPPORT ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last night, 2,000 members of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant religious communities of the city of Washington participated in an appeal to the conscience of this Congress. They asked for our support of the antipoverty program now before us.

This rally was itself a near miracle. This was no rally staged by powerful national organizations with experienced staffs. It was organized within 3 days by a small group of priests and ministers who were working within the inner city.

They who are dedicating their lives selflessly to helping the poor ask us to search our consciences and decide whether we are doing our share. In the legislation before us, we are committing little more than 1 percent of our national budget. Can we do less?

I would like to pay special tribute to Father Kane and Father Broderick who sparked this appeal to conscience and to their fellow sponsors of all faiths.

Following are the appealing and incisive remarks of Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle whose speech keynoted the rally:

#### REMARKS OF CARDINAL O'BOYLE

These are critical times regarding the continuance of our national War Against Poverty. The Congress is now finalizing legislation designed to continue this essential program. Some members of the House of Representatives have leveled criticism against it and properly so. It stands to reason that in a program as extremely young as this program is, that there will be defects in its formulation and administration. Happily these difficulties are related to specific individuals and to splinter aspects of certain programs. These defects can, and must, be corrected. In evaluating the value

of this effort, the criticisms do not pertain to the essence.

Nothing is being alleged against the rationale of the program nor against the principles on which it rests. It is important to keep in mind that the essence of the program is sound and practicable.

This is a workable method by which we can promote the projecting of the democratic process. First of all, it recognizes the innate worth and dignity of every citizen. Secondly, it recognizes the importance of being personally involved in the program or process designed to improve a citizen's level of living. Thirdly it assesses, positively, his potential for contributing to the solution of his own problems. Lastly it places in his hands the tools for improving his social, cultural and economic situation.

This program presents itself to Catholic people at a providential time, as well as, in a dramatic way. In the post-conciliar church, we must assume the responsibility of making the social teaching of the Church relevant to the severe problems of our times. This is one of those times.

The application of our own effort and the sharing of our christian motivation is the least we can do. By the leadership we give and the personal service we render we keep faith with our democratic ideals and with our christian principles. Let us not react, solely, to the danger of increased social unrest or the violence which it may produce as these programs are terminated. Our reaction must be to demonstrate the responsibility we now have to the poor in this situation. The best reaction is the most perfect exemplification of a christian performing up to his ideals in a truly democratic society. This reaction is based on an appreciation of the inherent worth of our neighbor and the love we must have for him. Among other efforts to meet the needs of the poor, we must continue our support of the War on Poverty.

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### THE SINKING OF THE "GOOD SHIP LOLLIPOP"

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the pleasure of the House, I should like to indulge in a bit of commentary on certain news which has just reached the Nation's Capital City from across the Rocky Mountains. From a community on continental America's western shore comes word: "The 'Good Ship Lollipop' only recently having left a fictitious port after many years of public inactivity and a recent refitting—has sunk." She sank in a squall at sea.

On board was an invasion force of an undetermined number of screen personalities who were poised for an assault upon the mainland, under the admiralship of Mrs. Shirley Temple Black—a child star turned political war-horse.

The characters had begun the voyage under an aura of great expectations, hav-



ing recently elected some of their own number to public office. The visions of an America overrun with successful political images spurred them on toward their goal.

Apparently the plan was to reach a landfall, have their images projected on moving picture screens, and assault the American audience in a Chinese man-wave attack on political rationality. But alas, the ship was violently tossed at sea by what was described by those aboard—in one of their last messages—as a violent and illuminating storm. Reports from the coast, however, indicate that the disturbance was not even of gale intensity.

In any event, at the point of illumination, the images faded and the "Good Ship Lollipop" disappeared. All aboard were lost. In the end Mrs. Black was heard in a soliloquy in which she discussed her plight: "It was the light that did it. Curse the light."

"I will repair to the world of sweet fiction where the 'hobgoblins' of the real earth are harmless. For they have played a cruel game with my crew, but now I have mastered it, and shall on a far, far, better day return to fight."

Mr. Speaker, in a more serious vein, there is a moral to this story. The people of the 11th Congressional District of California have narrowed down the field of candidates being considered for filling a congressional vacancy in a special election. They have rejected the bid of yet another motion picture figure for public office.

Mrs. Shirley Temple Black, her reputation and impression in the American consciousness having preceded her entrance into politics, and with great financial backing, has lost to a lesser known, but more relevantly experienced candidate. The soft image projected on the screen, and so deeply imbedded in the memories of a generation or two of moviegoers, was not transferable to the lucid—albeit hard-bitten—world of politics. "Image politics" failed.

Let me say that no one here would dance on the grave of a career which was never born. But the principle of running people for public office because of the "recognition factor" of their names is a dubious practice at best, and a dangerous one, at the worst.

I do not think that we need to be reminded that the Oscar is neither the Pulitzer, nor the Davis Cup; and that a competent performance for one is not necessarily qualification for the other. Surely, as there are those who write as well as compete in tennis, there must be political competence among actors. But the mere ability to say lines well in front of the camera is not the essence of political understanding and statesmanship. By itself it does not even indicate a potential for it.

It is heartening, indeed, to see that perhaps the unfortunate trend to electioneering on the basis of image, rather than substance, has been stopped. A pretty face, fame or notoriety in a particular field do not necessarily indicate talent for another. Voters are becoming more aware of the nature of the challenges which face the country. They are more able to discern the type of profes-

sional background, experience, and attitudes that fit the elected representatives of an intelligent and free people.

All of Mrs. Black's natural advantages: her money, name, and fortune, could not get her even nominated in spite of her incompetence.

The ship of state is quite another sort of vessel than the "Good Ship Lollipop." Certain California voters have recognized it. They have made a first long step toward public reason. Come the general election, I sincerely hope that they remember this and vote on the basis of issues—not personalities. If they do, they will have taken a second step in that direction.

(Mr. TUNNEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TUNNEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### FEDERAL INSURANCE CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in August a front-page article in the Washington Post declared "Insurance Hard to Get in the District of Columbia Ghetto," and outlined a major issue for Congress in its attempt to come to grips with the problems in our urban areas.

The plain fact is that ghettos today are risky business, and insurance companies have scaled their policies accordingly. The Detroit Common Council reports that city insurance companies actually drew red lines on a map around districts where "it was difficult to obtain insurance at standard rates, if at all." And the unfortunate result is that these areas of high premiums almost inevitably coincide with the ghetto districts.

Though it is just now receiving national attention, this problem is not a new one. The National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters states that premium rates for mercantile safe insurance in the District of Columbia have risen a remarkable 101.8 percent between 1964 and 1966, with the growth of other types of insurance almost as sharp.

But since the civil disturbances this past summer, insurance in certain urban areas is almost impossible to come by. A veteran insurance broker confided to the Washington Post:

I can't say that there is an industry-wide policy to cancel insurance in high crime areas, but among the individual companies that I know about, I'm afraid the answer is yes.

There can be no question that the problem exists, and the result is that large areas of this Nation's cities are finding it virtually impossible to underwrite their businesses. The private insurance industry simply cannot meet the coverage demands of the urban ghetto.

I believe this need must be met, and

am introducing today a bill which would establish a Federal Insurance Corporation which, working together with the private insurance industry, can provide the low cost coverage so urgently required.

Basically the corporation would be authorized only to operate in areas where there is no insurance now, or only at exorbitant rates. There it would offer reinsurance to private firms who then could financially afford to provide reasonable premiums to its businesses. Where coverage is not available at reasonable rates and on a nondiscriminatory basis from private insurers, the corporation would be empowered to write insurance directly.

In certain respects my bill is similar to others introduced in the Senate but there are important differences, the most fundamental of which is its emphasis on the nature of the Government's role. In these bills the corporation can give discount rates, below actual estimated cost for direct insurance but not reinsurance.

I feel that there is at issue here the nature of Government-industry partnership with significant import for many of today's urban ills. Here we have a definite insurance problem and one which we would like the private sector to handle. When it is having difficulty as it is at present, Federal Government's first move should be to stand behind private enterprise. My bill would allow discounts on reinsurance premiums thereby attracting industry back into these high risk areas. This is by far the most logical solution with the Federal Corporation relieved of only the risks of disaster that are assumed by the Government under any circumstances. Only when insurance cannot be obtained at reasonable rates and on a nondiscriminatory basis would the Corporation be empowered to issue insurance directly, also at a discount rate. The result of this approach is an effective role for Federal Government aid to a beleaguered nation attempting to cope with problems of crisis proportions.

What is the alternative to this bill? What will the situation be if we do not act to provide adequate standard rate coverage?

Let us look at Watts where the story is clearly and tragically told. After the disorder was stilled, insurance companies declined to write policies against theft, vandalism, and malicious mischief. Crime insurance was available—at rates hiked from 300 to 500 percent. The predictable result was that only eight businesses reopened out of the 40 that were destroyed. Without coverage businesses simply will not stay in the ghetto.

I am not saying the problem is simple, far from it. The real problem is the vicious triangle of poverty, poor education and poor jobs which traps people in city slums. And there is no easy way to break it.

But this one facet of the problem is clear: industry will not move into the ghetto to create those needed jobs unless their risk is covered. Looted stores will not reopen unless they can get insurance against future losses. Permanent order cannot be restored to riot-scared cities











# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued November 17, 1967  
For actions of November 16, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 187

### CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....14	Foreign aid.....10,11	Personnel.....9,16
Award.....9	Forest insects.....27	Poverty.....4,17
Budget.....23,29	Forest lands.....2	Public debt.....29
Butter.....8	Forest products.....7	Public Law 480.....28
Classification.....16	Honey imports.....30	Research.....7,13,27
Commodity reserve.....24	Housing.....21	Rice.....14
Expenditures.....29	Loans.....3,21,25	Small business.....25
Farm Bureau.....22	Marketing.....14	Social security.....1
Farm loans.....3,31	Meat inspection.....6,18	Watersheds.....15
Farm prices.....19,26	Monopolies.....32	Weed control.....5
Flammable fabrics.....12	Pears.....14	Young farmers.....20

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House debated foreign aid appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to facilitate exchange of forest lands and farm-loan interest rate bill. Sen. Kuchel introduced and discussed bill to remove certain restrictions of food for peace program.

### SENATE

1. **SOCIAL SECURITY.** Continued debate on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. S16569-70, S16610-42
2. **FOREST LANDS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10442, to facilitate exchanges of forest lands for use for public schools (S. Rept. 793). p. S16555



3. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2565, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act with respect to interest rates on farm loans (S. Rept. 794). p. S16555
4. POVERTY. Conferees were appointed on S. 2388, the anti-poverty bill. House conferees have been appointed. pp. S16570-83
5. WEED CONTROL. Sen. Carlson urged the enactment of a weed control program and inserted a resolution in support of this program. pp. S16558-9
6. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Clark recommended a strong meat inspection program. p. S16601
7. FORESTRY. Sen. Talamadge praised a new pulpwood harvest concept developed by a forestry research project in Ga. p. S16589
8. BUTTER. Sen. Mundt was added as a cosponsor to S. 2527, to encourage the movement of butter into domestic commercial markets. p. S16558
9. AWARD. Sen. Ellender congratulated SCS Administrator Williams on receipt of the Rockefeller Public Service Award for Administration. pp. S16550-1
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Harris inserted a statement by Sen. Monroney and a speech on "The Crisis in World Development." pp. S16598-601  
Sen. Javits commended the work of the Pan American Development Foundation, an organization designed to "mobilize the energies and resources of the local private sector and to stimulate and reinforce participation in self-help efforts at all levels of society." pp. S16586-7

HOUSE

11. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on H. R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill. pp. H15404-39
12. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was given until midnight Sat., Nov. 18, to file a report on S. 1003, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics. p. H15457
13. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1477, to permit the National Advisory Committee on Agricultural Research to meet annually rather than quarterly and at such other times as are deemed necessary. p. D1042
14. MARKETING; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10564, amended, to extend marketing orders to canned or frozen pears, and S. 2195, to provide that, if the farm marketing excess of rice determined for any farm is delivered to the Department, such farm would be considered to be in compliance with farm acreage allotment for such year. p. D1042
15. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture Committee approved work plans for several watershed projects. p. D1042



a thing as courtesy, good manners, and decency, and if a man is invited, whether it be to your house, to a college or university, or to a gathering in a hotel, it is my belief that that individual, regardless of the views of those in attendance or outside on the street, should be given the right to express his thoughts and to make his case.

I would hope that out of this speech made by the distinguished Senator from Utah there will come a sense of responsibility on the part of all Americans, regardless of how they feel on a particular subject; acknowledging that those who are in office by the will of the people or at the will of the President should be given the consideration, the decency, and the courtesy which is every American's right, whether he occupies the highest position in this land or whether he is the lowliest of our citizens.

Irresponsibility, on either side, has no place in our Nation. Neither does intolerance of one's views.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the very forceful and thoughtful comments of the majority leader. I think he said far more eloquently than I could the things I was trying to say in my little talk this morning.

I think that when some of our citizens act as they have in the past, such acts are signs of weakness and immaturity and ill manners as the majority leader has stated.

I think the majority leader has, by his own example in speaking out on policies with which he does not agree, or in making suggestions in a rational, straightforward manner, demonstrated the type of criticism to which we are entitled under the first amendment.

I, like the majority leader, want to be among the first to acknowledge that the right to dissent is inviolate, but it must be exercised with reason. In the past people have exceeded the bounds of reason.

I associate myself with all the remarks of the majority leader and thank him.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Utah on the magnificent address he has made today. He has rendered a real and needed public service to the Nation in saying what should have been said, and in saying it in such a superior manner.

At the same time, I associate myself with the splendid remarks made by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have listened to the statements made by the distinguished Senator from

Utah [Mr. Moss], and the distinguished majority leader.

The statements, in my opinion, have been thoughtful, forceful, reasonable, responsible, and constructive.

I associate myself with the viewpoints expressed by both Senators, and I congratulate them.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

#### SOUP KITCHENS AND BREAD LINES MUST NEVER AGAIN BE TOLERATED: OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM MUST BE LIBERALIZED AND EXPANDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the pending bill, H.R. 12080, as amended in the Senate Finance Committee, is a great advance in social legislation. The 11 members of the Senate Committee on Finance who signed the majority report and reported the bill, as amended, are to be congratulated for the real and needful public service they have performed for the Nation.

Mr. President, more than 32 years ago, the most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history, the Social Security Act, was enacted into law. The man who proposed this legislation and whose signature placed it on the statute books is dead. This is one of many imprints that Franklin D. Roosevelt left upon the pages of American history which will endure forever. I am very happy that during my first term as Congressman at Large from Ohio, I voted for and spoke in favor of passage of the first Social Security law.

Since passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, Congress has made changes in the act in keeping with fast-changing times. We have a duty to further expand and liberalize this program. The Social Security Amendments of 1967 will help assure that millions of Americans will enjoy a measure of security and dignity in their old age.

It is a happy personal recollection that as Congressman at Large from Ohio and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives, I helped draft our present liberalized and expanded social security program. Over the years I have always supported and voted for liberalizing amendments. I consider it a privilege to vote this week for this bill as reported by a majority of the Senate Committee on Finance and for some amendments which are among the most far-reaching improvements to our social security insurance program since its enactment more than 32 years ago.

When the Social Security Act became law, there were fewer than 7 million Americans 65 years or older. Today, there are more than 19 million men and women 65 years of age or older. By 1970 there will be more than 20 million.

The majority of men and women beyond 65 years old have inadequate incomes. Most do not receive private pensions. The majority cannot afford proper medical care. Many are ill-housed and, unfortunately, too many lack means to obtain proper diet and are undernourished. It is clear that social

security benefits must be greatly increased and the social security program greatly expanded if we are to meet present needs of older Americans.

The proposal reported by the Finance Committee raises average benefits for nearly 24 million social security recipients—men, women, and children—by 15 percent across the board. It increases the monthly minimum benefit from \$44 to \$70. The optional retirement age is lowered from 62 to 60 at reduced benefits for those who may choose to retire at this earlier age. This will cause 760,000 additional Americans to be eligible for benefits amounting to \$524 million during the first 12 months after this act goes into effect. Benefits have been liberalized for disabled widows and for widows of workers covered during their lifetime. This proposal eases eligibility requirements for payments to the blind.

Our social security system, which is actually the old-age, survivors, disability, and health insurance program, is an actuarially sound insurance system. The present surplus in the social security and disability trust funds exceeds \$23 billion. Under the bill as amended by the Senate Finance Committee, this program will continue to be actuarially sound without imposing unduly heavy premium payments on Americans.

Mr. President, in the United States we have gone a long way under great leadership since those dark depression days of 1931 and 1932, when a high-placed Government official said, "Relief is a local problem."

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more. As age creeps on, there is a constantly declining capacity to earn, until at 65 many find themselves unemployable.

There was no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who had struggled all his life to gain a competence and who, at 65, was poverty stricken and dependent upon charity. The black slave knew no such tragedy as this. It was a tragedy reserved for the free worker in the greatest nation on earth in an era which now seems remote but in fact was as recent as the late 1920's and early 1930's.

Mr. President, back in 1931, in my home city of Cleveland, and in cities throughout the country, there were bread lines and soup kitchens. Unless one lived through and can recall the terrible depression, he would have difficulty in believing the conditions that existed at that time. Banks in 48 States were closed. Many had failed and the savings of millions of citizens were wiped away. In the final months of the administration of President Herbert Hoover, the entire financial structure of the United States had collapsed. Never at any time since the Federal troops streamed back into Washington in panic in July 1861, after the Battle of Bull Run, or Manassas, in the War Between the States, was our Nation so imperiled.

Farmers were not making enough money to pay their taxes and the interest on their mortgages. Groups of farmers gathered on courthouse steps threatening to hang judges, demonstrating



against foreclosures of farms, and interfering with the orderly processes of the law. At that time, 14 million worthy and industrious men and women walked city streets jobless. This represented 26 percent of the Nation's workingmen and workingwomen, eager to be gainfully employed but denied any employment whatever. Time and events have proved that since the enactment of the social security law, under which checks totaling more than \$20 billion in social security benefits were paid last year to almost 23 million beneficiaries, there has been and is no possibility of a cruel depression such as was experienced commencing in 1930.

Where would the American people have been without that law? Think of the distressful situation of our country during those three recession periods of the Eisenhower administration. Where would they have been except for social security and the payments that came in every month to the beneficiaries of the social security system? Those recessions would have become great, deep and sorrowful depressions. No one today seriously questions the need for our social security system or its importance in promoting economic and social stability.

Americans now know that private charities, bread lines and soup kitchens must never again be the answer of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problems of unemployment and indigent old age.

Mr. President, at present social security recipients may not earn more than \$1,500 per year without suffering deductions from their social security benefits. The present limitation imposes a cruel financial burden on people still able to work after 65 and denies them a right which they have earned by their own contributions into the social security fund. It is reasonable to look forward to dramatic new breakthroughs in the search for cures for cancer and heart disease that will push higher and higher the life expectancy of Americans. Men and women of 65 and 70 and 75 will—and many now do—have the ability to participate in gainful employment after retirement.

It is unfair to bar these men and women from receiving social security retirement payments for which they have paid premiums during their more active years. This can be remedied at no cost whatsoever to taxpayers by increasing the earnings limitation.

In four successive Congresses I introduced legislation to increase the earnings limitation for social security recipients. I was very glad that the Senate Finance Committee has recommended that the earnings limitation be increased from \$1,500 to \$1,680 in 1968, and \$2,000 annually thereafter, with no reduction in social security benefits. I am hopeful that in the future the earnings limitation will be increased even further and finally removed altogether.

Social security payments totaling more than \$90 million are now delivered each month to 1,250,000, Ohio men, women, and children. With the enactment of the pending bill, this amount will be increased to more than \$105 million. Soon, 24 million Americans—children,

men, and women—will receive social security checks amounting to \$2 billion, or more, each month.

Mr. President, I congratulate our colleagues who serve on the Senate Committee on Finance for their outstanding work. The Nation is indebted to them for the social security bill they have reported to the Senate and which we are considering today. It will truly be a great day in our Nation's history when the Social Security Amendments of 1967 are enacted into law.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967."

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$1,600,000,000, of which subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$667,500,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of such Act, \$776,500,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$14,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$25,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII.

#### TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

##### JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

##### "PART A—JOB CORPS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.

#### "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 102. There is hereby established within within the Office of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

#### "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

"(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age fourteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

"(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs, or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

"(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance.

"(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and

"(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

#### "SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including court, probation, parole, law enforcement, education, welfare, and medical authorities and advisers. They shall also provide for—

"(1) an interview with each applicant for the purpose of—

"(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

"(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and

"(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

"(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and



other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

"(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

#### "SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquents acts, narcotics addiction, or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.

"(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.

#### "ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

"(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

"(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

"(d) After the Director has determined whether an enrollee is to be assigned to a men's training center, a conservation center, or a women's training center, the center to which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the appropriate type which is closest to the enrollee's home, except that the Director, on an individual basis, may

waive this requirement when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the enrollee's home shall be carefully limited to situations in which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

#### "JOB CORPS CENTERS

"SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character and shall be designed and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling, and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's and women's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment.

"(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's training centers shall offer education and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a non-residential basis to participants in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

#### "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours a week. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

"(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

"(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concur-

rence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

"(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

#### "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

"SEC. 109. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months' service in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

#### "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

"SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher au-



thority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

#### "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION"

"SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Whenever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and co-operative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

#### "COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT"

"SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

"(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of trainees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.

"(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 611(d) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant

to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to—

"(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;

"(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;

"(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and

"(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.

If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Jobs Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.

#### "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS"

"SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of higher learning, boards of education, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

"(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research,

or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as described in part B of this title, in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

"(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of existing educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

"(1) a job survey be made of the area;

"(2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;

"(3) an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

"(4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and

"(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

#### "ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES"

"SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and



overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Jobs Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

#### "PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES"

"SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

"(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

"(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

#### "APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW"

"SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

"(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in sections 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

"(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

"(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

"(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States

Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

"(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.

"(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS"

"SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five thousand enrollees.

"(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women enrollees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

"(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that for the first year ending June 30, 1968, the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,500 per residential enrollee, or \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee.

"(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

#### "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY"

"SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, either partisan or nonpartisan, or in voter registration drives, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

"(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall,

after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions."

#### WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B of such title and amended to read as follows:

#### "PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS"

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

##### "COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

"(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to community action, manpower services, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and comprehensive work and training programs assisted under this title.

"(c) A comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant component programs authorized by this Act with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs and activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

##### "PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES"

"SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123(c)). This agency must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) The prime sponsor shall provide for the participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

"(c) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make use of public and private organizations as delegate agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work and training program, including without limitation agencies governed with the participa-



tion of the poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational institutions, the public employment service, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training institutions, and other capable public and private organizations.

"(d) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement.

"(e) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

#### "ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:

"(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school;

"(2) programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over) with useful work and training (which must include sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training) designed to assist those persons to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment;

"(3) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

"(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

"(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately focused to assure

that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

"(6) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

"(7) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

"(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: *Provided*, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

"(9) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

"(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this title. In the case of programs under subsection (a)(1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts.

#### "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"Sec. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in

accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in conjunction with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants;

"(5) no person charged in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party.

"(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

#### "PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"Sec. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

#### "ELDERLY

"Sec. 126. The Director shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

#### "PILOT PROJECTS

"Sec. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

"(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.



"(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

#### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

#### "ROLE OF THE STATES

"SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

"(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

"(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

"(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

"(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

#### "EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 223(c).

#### "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

"(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions

of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129."

#### COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

"(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

"(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

"(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

"(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

"It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

#### "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

##### "DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—

"(1) has power to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

"(2) is designated as a community action agency by the Director.

A community action program is a community based and operated program—

"(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

"(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

"(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

"(c) The community for which a community action agency is designated to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicounty, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision); but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

"(d) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency other than a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community



action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

"(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a State, or of any political subdivision or combination thereof, if the elected or duly appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

"(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.

#### "COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

"SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(d), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.

"(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations with respect to the character, extent, and administration of programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making such policy determinations affecting particular areas, such subsidiary board, council, or similar agency shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(d) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to

participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.

"(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

#### "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned

will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regulations governing matters relating to partisan or nonpartisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with



the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

**"EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 214. (a) In determining whether, in what amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assistance to a new community action program, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity to the purposes of this title. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on such a program, consistent with needs and with due allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific functions and duties to this end. The Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering: the number and incomes of persons or families served and seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the extent to which those persons and families have been aided in establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those goals; the extent to which resources have been committed which are over and above the contributions required by this title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor and area representatives, have actively participated in the formulation and implementation of the program in question; the extent and effectiveness of follow-through arrangements among agencies operating different components and related agencies in the community; and the extent to which activities or approaches initiated as part of the program have been incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

"(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by him or by community action agencies, the Director may provide for, or require community action agencies to provide for, independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

**"PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES**

**"DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

**"GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of community action programs, the Director may provide general financial assistance to those programs in accordance

with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be used, as approved by the Director, by community action agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning, coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsibilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be used for the development and operation of approved program components which are necessary for a fully effective program and for which assistance is not available, as needed, from other sources. These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment; to make better use of available income in connection with efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills needed for employment, family self-help, or successful participation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain housing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake family planning consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent and effective use of programs available to help in overcoming specific problems. Components providing these or other services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly, the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance, but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family participation and progress.

"(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community, and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

**"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE**

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs;

but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as 'Project Headstart' focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

"(2) A program to be known as 'Follow Through' focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential.

"(3) A 'Legal Services' program to provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information, as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded. No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this part) shall be utilized (A) to organize or assist in organizing any unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance, or (B) for the defense of any person charged with participating therein or with the commission of a crime committed in the course thereof, if such person organized, or assisted in organizing any such demonstration, or civil disturbance.

"(4) A 'Comprehensive Health Services' program to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and

"(B) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are com-



bined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.

"(5) A program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary education success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate.

"(6) A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services' designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange with other Federal and State agencies or officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.

"(7) A 'Day Care' program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise attain objectives related to the purposes of this Act. Projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed, together with necessary related facilities and services. Preference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under this Act and to other children whose parents have especially critical needs for day care service which could not be secured under any other program. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

"(8) A 'Family Planning' program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of dif-

ferent communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

"(9) A program to be known as 'Senior Opportunities and Services' designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 55 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) In developing programs under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs; public or private. The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under subsection (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

"(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include essential training, research, and technical assistance directly related to program development and implementation, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allocated and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

"(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this section, including their impact in terms of the needs or problems at which they are directed, and their relationship to and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director.

#### "ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to sections 220 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance

with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services, except that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution shall be in cash.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise to qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

#### "PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

##### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to



assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

#### "STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 604 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

#### "RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

"(d) No pilot or demonstration project under this section shall be commenced in any city, county, or other major political subdivision except with the approval of the local community action agency or, in the absence of a community action agency, the local governing body for that subdivision.

#### "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

##### "ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

"SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assist-

ing the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

#### "RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

"(b) In order to further implement the policy described in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eight-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title, and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

#### "COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE FUNDS

"SEC. 242. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice, information, or assistance, including the establishment of working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific problems of coordination arising under programs authorized in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range plans where justified by prior progress.

"(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

#### "SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 243. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

#### "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 244. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish.



The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

"(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

"(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"Sec. 245. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

"(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

"(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community

action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 223 have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

"(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

"(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"Sec. 246. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue such regulations, or impose such requirements, as may be necessary or appropriate to insure that programs assisted under this title are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with (1) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or any voter registration activity. Rules or regulations under this section shall provide for enforcement procedures, which shall in-

clude provision for summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"Sec. 247. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read "PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM", and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read "LOANS TO FAMILIES".

(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards."

(c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting the word "principal" after the word "aggregate", and (2) by inserting after "families" the following: ", and, in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions".

(d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking out "titles III of this Act" in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

SEC. 105. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "enterprises," and inserting in lieu thereof "enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals;".

(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "employment of the long-term unemployed" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals";

(2) striking out the period at the end of the next to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon; and

(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sentence, "Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency."

(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out the first subsection (b), and by adding at the end of the second subsection (b) the following: "To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary."

(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

(1) renumbering section 405 to read "407" and inserting in such section "and the Secretary of Commerce" immediately following the word "Administration";

(2) striking out section 404; and

(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to read as follows:



**"DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"**

"SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consideration of any recommendations of the Director, as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consideration of any recommendations of the Director, shall define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

**"LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"**

"SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

**"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING"**

"SEC. 406. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

"(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;

"(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities, and the stimulation of new private capital resources through the use of guarantees, pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

"(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

"(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

"(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

"(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

"(c) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unem-

ployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

"(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

"(e) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

"(f) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

**AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION**

SEC. 106. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "four" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

(b) Section 601 of such Act is amended by inserting a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Of the positions approved for the OEO and its field offices positions in the classification category of GS 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title V, U.S.C. shall not exceed one for every 100 employees."

(c) Subsections 602 (b) and (c) of such Act are repealed, and subsections 602 (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), and (n) are redesignated as subsections 602 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively.

(d) Section 603(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "authorized" and inserting in lieu thereof "directed", and (2) by inserting "or nonpartisan" after "partisan".

(e) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

**"DEFINITIONS"**

"SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in titles I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services; and

"(3) the term 'permanent resident of the United States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

(f) Section 610 of such Act is amended by striking out "carry out such investigations and studies, including consultation with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary" and inserting in lieu thereof "work in cooperation with the Director of the Administration on Aging".

(g) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is

amended by striking out "part A of title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II".

(h) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting after section 610-1 the following new sections:

**"LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE VOLUNTARILY POOR"**

"SEC. 610-2. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligibility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty, such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his health, age, education, and ability."

(i) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting, after section 610-2, the following new section:

"SEC. 610-3. (a) No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act shall, pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted by such community action agency or such other agency, plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any picketing, protest, demonstration, riot, or any similar group activities.

"(b) No part of the funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, to any individual who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activities resulting in material damage of property or injury to persons."

(j) Title VI of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new part C as follows:

**"PART C—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL"****"INVESTIGATION"**

"SEC. 631. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is directed to investigate and examine programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, and to evaluate to the extent practicable—

"(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

"(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

**"REPORTS"**

"SEC. 632. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit a report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1968, summarizing his findings and conclusions to date. Such report shall include also such recommendations, including legislative recommendations, as he deems advisable.

**"POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL"**

"SEC. 633. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer or employee of the General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General of such designated officer or employee.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish



to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

"(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

"(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

#### "ALLOCATION

"Sec. 634. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act, the Director shall transfer to the Comptroller General such sums as he may require, but not in excess of \$2,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the purposes of this part."

(k) Section 616 of such Act is repealed.

"Sec. 610-4. (a) The Director or the head of any other Federal agency administering a program under this Act shall make a public announcement concerning:

"(1) The title, purpose, intended completion date, identity of the contractor, and proposed cost of any contract with a private or non-Federal public agency or organization for any study, evaluation, demonstration, or research project; and

"(2) The results, findings, data, or recommendations made or reported as a result of such activities.

"(b) The public announcements required by subsection (a) shall be made within thirty days of entering into such contracts and thereafter within thirty days of the receipt of such results.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to assure that the requirements of this section are met, and he shall at once report to the Congress concerning any failure to comply with these requirements."

#### AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 107. Section 701(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out "July 1, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1968", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "With respect to any period after June 30, 1968, subsection (a) shall not apply."

#### VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 108. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

##### "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as vol-

unteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

#### "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

"(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities; and

"(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

##### "TERMS OF SERVICE

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

"(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

##### "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equip-

ment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 5582).

"(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

#### "PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

"(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

"(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

##### "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or



allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

#### "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS"

##### "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

##### "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS"

"SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons and older persons membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies in the various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

##### "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW"

"SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

"(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a)(2)(B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

##### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS"

"SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

"(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

"(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be directly or indirectly utilized to finance labor union or related activity.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM"

"SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

#### TITLE II—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 embezzles, willfully misapplies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds, assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or contract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal to renew a contract of employment in connection with a grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 induces any person to give up any money or thing of any value to any person (including such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

#### TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. The amendments made by this Act shall be in effect immediately upon its enactment, except as provided in this section. Until June 30, 1968, the provisions of section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act shall apply to community action agencies in existence and funded prior to the enactment of this Act, except that in any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency prior to June 30, 1968, adequate provision shall be made for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and funds to any community action agency designated pursuant to sections 210 or 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended by this Act.

And amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to S. 2388, that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT ON POSITIONS ON VOTES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on November 14 I was necessarily absent from the floor when three record votes were taken. At this time I should like to announce my official position on these three votes.

On No. 318—legislative—Senate Resolution 130, providing an additional \$35,000 for the Subcommittee on Admin-

istrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye."

On No. 320—legislative—a motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of proposing modified amendment No. 437 to continue fiscal year 1968 appropriations until November 30, 1967, had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye."

On No. 321—legislative—final passage of H.R. 13606, fiscal 1968 appropriations for military construction, had I been present and voting I would have voted "aye."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show my announcement of position on these votes.

#### DEATH OF BERNARD KILGORE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the passing late Tuesday night of Bernard Kilgore, chairman of the board of Dow Jones & Co., publisher of the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. President, Barney Kilgore was a friend of mine of many years standing. He was a man of great energy, a very exciting man, a man not afraid to become completely involved in whatever he then had underway. He built one of the country's greatest and most innovative newspapers. He was not only an innovator; he was also an activist and a businessman who built up the enterprise until it was a financial as well as a journalistic success. He founded the National Observer, and had simultaneous publication of the Wall Street Journal in many places in the country.

Barney Kilgore was a vibrant, modern man, and he was taken from us at a very early age, as things go today.

Mrs. Javits and I join in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife and to the three children he leaves. He will be missed by all of us. He made his mark, but he had an enormous life of useful service still to live. I can only hope that the knowledge of his great success and of his great value to our people, our time, and our Nation, may be of some comfort to his family in these difficult hours.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal, outlining Barney Kilgore's achievements, and editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 16, 1967]

BERNARD KILGORE DIES—MADE A NATIONAL DAILY OF WALL STREET JOURNAL—DOW JONES CHAIRMAN, 59, CREATED NATIONAL OBSERVER AND BUILT UP BARRON'S, DJ NEWS SERVICE

Bernard Kilgore, the man who changed The Wall Street Journal from a small financial newspaper into the nation's only national daily, died late Tuesday night at Princeton, N.J., after a long illness. He was 59 years old.

As the dominant figure in Dow Jones & Co. Inc., the parent corporation, for the past quarter of a century, he was also responsible for the creation of The National Observer,



the nation's first national weekly newspaper; for the growth of Barron's, a leading financial weekly; and for the expansion of the Dow Jones News Service into a world-wide supplier of business and financial news.

Although at his death Mr. Kilgore was chairman of the board of Dow Jones, he always proudly and accurately described his occupation as "newspaperman." In a career that spanned 38 years he had been a reporter, a copy-desk editor, Washington correspondent, political columnist, managing editor and general manager before he was named company president in 1945, at the age of 36.

He was also proud of his record as corporate president—Dow Jones earnings rose from \$211,201 in 1945 to more than \$13 million last year—because he was convinced that only a sound financial structure could support good journalistic enterprises. But he never forgot the purpose of his business management, and never ceased himself to be a shirt-sleeved newspaperman.

#### PIONEERED IN-DEPTH STORIES

Under his business leadership the company pioneered in technological advances. The Wall Street Journal is now published in eight plants from coast-to-coast to serve its million subscribers. Under his journalistic leadership, the newspaper pioneered the use of exhaustive stories-in-depth in daily journalism and led in the concept of delivering the same news and editorial content each morning to its subscribers, wherever located.

The unique enterprise that resulted marked him as one of the handful of men who have made a permanent impress on the journalism of this century. He perceived early that a new technology was necessary to gather the news, publish it and deliver it if there was ever to be a national newspaper. And he always saw that only the editorial content could make the paper useful to the reader, and therefore successful.

Thus "Barney," as he was known to his friends and colleagues, remained an untiring newspaperman, always in the thick of things. Even when his last illness kept him away from the office, his editors received frequent notes filled with ideas, suggestions—and an occasional criticism—that showed that his interest in the news and his newspapers never flagged.

#### SALVOS OF IDEAS

The only thing missing, these last days, was Barney Kilgore himself, necktie pulled down, sleeves rolled up, firing off salvos of ideas, praise for pieces he liked, censure for stories he found wanting; or equally probing with curious mind into other phases of the business—advertising, circulation and production.

Through it all he kept hammering at one credo: Simplify the complicated—and keep the reader interested. "The easiest thing in the world," he once said, "is to stop reading."

Barney Kilgore's major innovations in journalism began in the early 1940s when, as managing editor of The Wall Street Journal, he set about broadening the news coverage the Journal offered the business community and transforming its ways of reporting and writing the news. But these innovations sprang from long thought and a varied experience.

Bernard Kilgore, a heavy-set man with thinning dark hair, grew up in Indiana, and he never lost his Midwestern touch. He was born there Nov. 9, 1908, in the town of Albany, where his father, Tecumseh Kilgore, was superintendent of schools. His mother, the former Lavina Elizabeth Bodenhorn, was from a farm family in the area. He grew up in South Bend, Ind., his father having moved there to enter the life insurance business.

After graduation from South Bend High School—where he acquired top-flight grades, sharp skill as a debater and a ragtime jazz style on the piano—he entered DePauw Uni-

versity at Greencastle, Ind., where he majored in political science.

There he began working on the campus paper, The DePauw, and eventually became its editor. During his junior year he also served as editor of the college yearbook, The Mirage, a dual extra-curricular burden that won him an exemption from the college rule against owning a car, a privilege he exercised with a campus-renowned Model-T Ford.

In June 1929, armed with a Phi-Beta Kappa key, he set out to write prospective employers on the college newspaper letter-heads. The first of these went to Kenneth C. Hogate, a DePauw alumnus who was then general manager of The Wall Street Journal and later president of Dow Jones. "Casey" Hogate was impressed by his fellow Hoosier, and thus the Kilgore career had its beginning.

There was plenty of excitement that summer for a 20-year-old on The Wall Street Journal. Stocks were soaring and the Journal had a circulation of 50,000, a high number in that day for a financial newspaper. Plans were afoot for starting a San Francisco edition of the paper, the first issue of which was dated Oct. 21, 1929. The stock market crash came on Oct. 29.

Already the young Kilgore was demonstrating his ability to look through the surface of the news. While the Journal was proclaiming editorially on Nov. 1 "The sun is shining again, and we will go on record as saying good stocks are cheap," Barney was writing his family in a different vein. He warned his father, "Put up a storm door to keep the wolf out, and hang on to your shekels."

This quality of perception and the ability to put commonsense ideas succinctly was not lost on his superiors. After assignments on the Journal's New York and San Francisco copydesks, Barney Kilgore was made news editor in San Francisco in 1931. There he hit upon the idea of a column in letter form to an imaginary correspondent confused about such concepts as deflation and other economic problems. His "Dear George" series displayed his talent for reducing complex financial and economic problems to easy-to-understand English, and by late 1932 he was back in New York as a regular editorial page columnist, at the age of 24.

#### PAISED BY FDR

Two years later—in March 1934—he discovered that his reading public included President Franklin Roosevelt. At a Presidential press conference, when asked to explain a technical difference between two suggested ways of paying the soldiers' bonus, the President advised the reporters to "read Kilgore in The Wall Street Journal" because he had written "a good piece" on the subject.

And soon it happened again, when FDR was asked to explain a complicated Supreme Court decision on the National Industrial Recovery Act. The Journal tooted its own horn a bit with a story headlined: "President Tells Reporters To Read Kilgore Article."

That was an auspicious beginning for a new Washington bureau manager, which he became in early 1935, a post he was to hold until he became managing editor six years later.

It was as Washington bureau manager that many of Barney Kilgore's new ideas about The Wall Street Journal began to evolve, and that he developed his characteristic manner and method as an executive.

He was constantly urging his Washington reporters to avoid Governmental jargon, to simply what they meant to say and to treat any story in the depth and fullness required to tell it properly. And he was constantly urging the New York office both to give the space, when needed, and to publish the wider ranging stories on politics and Governmental trends that would make the "hard" news of a subsequent day.

#### PROBLEM FOR A NEW BOSS

As an executive, the young man had a special problem, since The Wall Street Journal bureau, even then one of the largest in the capital, contained a number of reporters older and more experienced than the new boss.

He succeeded in spite of—or perhaps because of—an essential shyness belied by his aggressiveness as a newspaperman. Those he worked with were never "summoned" to the manager's office. Instead, the young boss would seek out the man. If he had praise to deliver, it was given publicly in the news room. If it was a complaint, it would be given privately, and usually mildly.

But the mildness dealt only with the manner, not the substance. Barney Kilgore knew what he wanted, which was the best possible story, and in his quiet way he insisted on getting it. The men he respected had wide latitude, and often he would accept their judgment on an event even when he did not share it. But he had little patience with incompetence.

The Washington years were important ones for him in other ways. As the newspaper's chief political writer and columnist, and a frequent contributor to magazines as well, he came to know well most of the important officials of his day and gain an insight into both politics and government. He also had a chance to show by example the kind of story he wanted, first from the Washington bureau and later for the newspaper as a whole.

It was during his Washington period, too, that on Oct. 1, 1938, he married Mary Louise Throop of Greencastle, Ind., whom he had met on a visit back to DePauw. She survives him, as do their three children; a daughter Kathryn, 22, and two sons, James Bernard, 19, and John Harvey, 15.

#### RADICAL CHANGES FOR JOURNAL

The 1930s were a tough time for all newspapers, but especially so for a business publication. The circulation of the Journal shrank from a high of 50,000 to a low point of only 28,000. It seemed clear that some radical changes were needed. In early 1941 Mr. Kilgore was called back to New York and, as managing editor, given the job of making the newspaper more appealing for a wider audience.

Some articles about Mr. Kilgore's career have dated the major changes in The Wall Street Journal from 1945, when he was named president of Dow Jones, but the big changes began in 1941 when he took over as managing editor.

The story of this "revolution" in transforming the Journal has been told by Vermont Royster, the present editor, in the book. The World of The Wall Street Journal: Main Street and Beyond.

With William H. Grimes, then the Journal editor, "providing the leavening of experience and Kilgore the daring to 'do everything differently' the modern Wall Street Journal was created by building a new edifice atop the old foundations," Mr. Royster wrote. He went on to describe the transformation in some detail:

"Within the space of a few years the front page was completely revamped by developing a type of new story which, while dealing with current events, was not tied down by yesterday's developments. This permitted the staff to dig into a situation over a period of several days, write about it with care and then give the reader a comprehensive report.

"The 'What's News' column was strengthened in scope and manpower (it now takes sixteen man-hours daily to produce what it takes you six minutes to read) to cover all the 'spot' news of the day, with details, where necessary, carried in separate stories inside the paper.

"The concept of appropriate news for The Wall Street Journal was enlarged past its founder's wildest dreams. The hard core of the paper—accurate and full coverage of cor-











Nov 17, 1967

16. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Agriculture Committee an approval of work plans for several watersheds. p. H15497
17. POVERTY. Rep. Daniels was excused as a conferee on S. 2388, the poverty bill, and Rep. O'Hara was appointed to fill the vacancy. p. H15498
18. LANDS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 852, amended, to authorize cost-sharing for recreation and fish-wild life purposes in RC&D projects, and S. 974, amended, to authorize the conveyance of the ARS Southwest Poultry Experiment Station to Glendale, Ariz. p. D1048
19. TRANSPORTATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2419, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels. p. D1048
20. PARKS. Rep. Saylor inserted a speech by National Park Director Hartzog urging the preservation of our National Park System. pp. H15535-6
21. MODEL CITIES. Rep. Barrett inserted the statement of HUD Secretary Weaver on the selection of the cities to receive planning grants under the Model Cities program. pp. H15557-8
22. TAXATION; PRICES. Rep. Dorn discussed "the impact on all of us of an additional rise of 3 percent in consumer prices which...might result in the absence of the surcharge." p. H15534
23. MARKETING. Rep. Rosenthal inserted an article, "Food for Thought," which discusses the issue of truth in packaging. p. H15547
24. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following program for this week: Mon. and the balance of the week under suspension the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District compact bill and the flammable fabrics bill, also the Consent Calendar and Peace Corps bill. pp. H15529-30
25. ADJOURNED until Mon., Nov. 20. p. H15561

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. TAXATION. Rep. Brooks inserted Gardner Ackley's speech outlining the administration's income surtax proposal. pp. A5673-5  
Rep. Pickle inserted an article, "Tax Stall Clouds Economic Outlook." p. A5690
27. POVERTY. Speeches in the House by Reps. Keith and Daddario during debate on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. pp. A5681-2, A5692-3  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Tenzer opposing reductions in the poverty program. p. A5693
28. TEXTILE IMPORTS. Rep. Ashmore inserted several articles urging limitations on textile imports. pp. A5684-5
29. AIR POLLUTION. Speech in the House by Rep. Ashley expressing his support for the Air Quality Act of 1967. p. A5693



BILLS INTRODUCED

30. WEED CONTROL. S. 2671 by Sen. Carlson, to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author on 11-16-67, pp. S16558-9
31. TEXTILE IMPORTS. H. R. 14068 by Rep. Brotzman, to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to Ways and Means Committee.
32. NATIONAL PARK. H. R. 14074 by Rep. Taylor, to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

33. LANDS. S. 219, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo. Approved Nov. 16, 1967 (Public Law 90-139).
34. MILITARY MILK. H. R. 2179, to extend for three years the special milk program for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals. Approved Nov. 16, 1967 (Public Law 90-140).

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED BY THIS OFFICE

35. DISASTER RELIEF. S. 438, to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. S. Public Works Committee.
36. BUILDINGS. S. 1563, to amend the Act requiring contracts for the construction, etc. of any public building of the U. S., S. Public Works Committee.
37. POVERTY. H. R. 8311, Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. Part 5: appendix. H. Education and Labor Committee.
38. APPROPRIATIONS. Dist. of Columbia appropriations for 1968. Parts 1 and 2. S. Appropriations Committee.
39. POSTAL RATES. H. R. 7977, to adjust certain postage rates. S. Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
40. PAY. S. 1489 and H. R. 7977, Federal pay legislation. S. Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
41. INDIAN RESOURCES. H. R. 10560, Indian resources development. H. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
42. WILDLIFE. Fish and wildlife legislation. Part 1. H. Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
43. INTEREST RATES. S. 2565, interest rate ceilings on loans by the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives. S. Agriculture and Forestry Committee.





United States  
of America

Please return to  
Division of Legislative Reporting  
Office of Budget and Finance

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1967 No. 188

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:  
*I will hear what God the Lord will speak; for He will speak peace unto His people.—Psalm 85: 8.*

O Lord, our God, we are beginning to discover that without Thee we are never at our best. It has taken some of us a long time to realize it. We have been too proud, too stubborn, too determined to have our own way. Somehow Thou hast caught up with us and we know that with Thee alone is life and love. May Thy spirit so come to life in us that we may truly live and triumphantly love.

We pray for the people of our beloved land that they, too, may grow in spirit and by Thy grace be made more than a match for the mood of this day.

Help us to work together for peace in our world, for justice among our citizens, and for good will in the hearts of all.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1963. An act for the relief of employees of General Services Administration;

H.R. 2517. An act to amend sections 64a, 238, 378, and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act;

H.R. 2518. An act to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339;

H.R. 2519. An act to amend sections 334, 355, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 2834. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization;

H.R. 3408. An act for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimalcali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 3799. An act for the relief of the city of Pawtucket, R.I.;

H.R. 6324. An act for the relief of John A. Danisch;

H.R. 7599. An act for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus;

H.R. 7811. An act for the relief of Richard Alan White; and

H.R. 8632. An act to amend sections 402(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to re-allocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7427. An act for the relief of Maria Kjolmetroustis; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 687. An act for the relief of Tim Shik Chin;

S. 964. An act for the relief of Roberto Perdomo;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of the Ida group of mining claims in Josephine County, Oreg.;

S. 1652. An act for the relief of Anastasia D. Mpatziani;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.;

S. 1918. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Gomez del Rio;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Martinez Serrara;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of certain employees at the Naval Air Test Center, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.;

S. 2153. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Rafael Montalvo y Urrutibeascoa;

S. 2199. An act for the relief of Oscar Juan Enriquez-Santos;

S. 2206. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Bolando Guerra-Reyes;

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng;

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton;

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Guillermo Gomez-Inguanzo;

S. 2381. An act for the relief of Dr. Jesus Adalberto Quevedo-Avila;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Sanchez;

S. 2384. An act for the relief of Jorge A. Marrero;

S. 2386. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis F. Rodriguez Iznaga; and

S. 2468. An act for the relief of Dr. George S. Ioannides.

### WORK PLANS UNDER SECTION 2 OF WATERSHED AND PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication No. 1178, 90th Congress. The work plans involved are: Rancho Viejo, Tex.; Spring-Bull, S. Dak.; Main Street Canyon, Calif.; Big Running Water Ditch, Ark.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. POAGE,  
Chairman.

### THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to that portion of President Johnson's news conference where he was asked about his bill for a tax increase which is now



stalled in the House Ways and Means Committee. In the most pious and sorrowful tones the President lamented that he was having a very difficult time to get this Congress to "act with fiscal responsibility."

What sheer hypocrisy. This is the same President who not long ago was boasting that in the short time he had been President he had tripled expenditures in several different areas of the Government. This is the same President who this year submitted a budget so loose and irresponsible that when we complete action on the various appropriation bills, we will have reduced it by around \$6 billion.

No, Mr. President, any sermons delivered by you to Congress on the subject of fiscal responsibility are about as consistent with your past actions as it would be for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to get up here and tell us that he has consistently fought for bigger and expanded foreign aid programs.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 393]

Abbott	Farbstein	Mathias, Md.
Adams	Findley	Meeds
Andrews, Ala.	Fino	Morgan
Annunzio	Ford	Pike
Arends	William D.	Pucinski
Ashley	Fountain	Purcell
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Reid, Ill.
Bates	Fuqua	Resnick
Belcher	Gialmo	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Gilbert	Rivers
Berry	Green, Oreg.	Robison
Bevill	Gurney	Rodino
Broomfield	Hagan	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	St. Onge
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Schadeberg
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Schwengel
Clancy	Harrison	Scott
Clark	Hawkins	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Hays	Springer
Cowger	Heckler, Mass.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	Herlong	Stuckey
Dawson	Hicks	Thomson, Wis.
Denney	Howard	Utt
Derwinski	Hull	Walker
Devine	Johnson, Pa.	Watkins
Diggs	Jones, N.C.	Whitely
Dingell	Kee	Williams, Miss.
Edmondson	Kluczynski	Willis
Edwards, Ala.	Laird	Wilson, Bob
Ellberg	Landrum	Wright
Eshleman	McClory	Wydler
Everett	MacGregor	Zion
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may be excused as a conferee on the bill S. 2388, and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint a Member to fill the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] to fill the vacancy.

### FIVE FACTS STAND IN THE WAY OF A REPUBLICAN VICTORY IN 1968

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are trying desperately to claim victory in 1968. They are encouraging news stories that they have their best chance in years to capture the White House.

I hate to dash their hopes or shatter their morale, but there are a few facts worth considering before the victory celebrations begin.

Fact No. 1: 42 percent of the American electorate are Democrats, and 31 percent independents.

Fact No. 2: Only 27 percent are Republicans.

Fact No. 3: If every Republican voted for their candidate but he failed to win the votes of substantial numbers of Democrats and independents, the Republicans would lose.

Fact No. 4: The Republicans have yet to unearth a presidential candidate who can inspire confidence and trust among the American people.

Fact No. 5: The President will go to the American people in 1968 with more than 90 percent of his 1964 campaign pledges fulfilled—an unprecedented achievement.

In short, we Democrats will allow the Republicans to hold their victory celebrations this November; we will hold ours next November.

### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13893) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 13893, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed to an

amendment striking section 106, ending on page 8, line 11, from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, in addition to those items contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any other articles, materials, or supplies of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war or of strategic significance to the conduct of war, including petroleum products.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 8, line 12, strike out lines 12 through 25, inclusive, and strike out on page 9, lines 1 through 5, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the close of the debate yesterday I indicated that I had a total of eight amendments to offer. This amendment is the third of the eight. I would like to ask unanimous consent to offer for simultaneous consideration four other amendments which are also at the Clerk's desk.

Let me say, in consideration of whether the unanimous consent should be granted, that in every case my motivation is based on the fact that there already is legislation on the subject covered by the sections which I propose to delete. In my opinion the identical language already is on the books, or similar language, or stronger language. This fact more than justifies the deletion of legislation of this kind from an appropriation act.

I am contemplating one more amendment, I might say, which would propose the deletion of section 119.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is a unanimous-consent request pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this moment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. I think we ought to know what sections of this bill would be affected. The bill not having been read, we ought to know to what sections of the bill the gentleman proposes to offer amendments. I have an amendment I wish to offer to the bill, and I do not want to be ruled out.











# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 6, 1967  
For actions of December 5, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 198

## CONTENTS

Age discrimination.....10	Holiday.....26	PPB.....11
Bird conservation.....15	Information.....23	Research.....13
Civil rights.....3	Intergovernmental relations.....12	Spending.....5
Economy.....5	Legislative achievements.....4	Statistics.....25
Education.....8,22	Meat inspection.....1	Sugar.....9
Employment.....7	Opinion poll.....19	Taxation.....16
Farm Bureau.....20	Peace Corps.....27	Wheat.....21
Food.....24	Poverty.....2	Wilderness.....6
Foreign trade.....14		World trade.....14,17
Forest lands.....18,28		

HIGHLIGHTS: Conferees voted to report meat inspection and poverty bills. Senate considered sugar agreement and agreed to vote Dec. 6. Rep. Kleppe introduced and discussed bill to improve USDA's statistical reports.

## HOUSE

1. MEAT INSPECTION. Conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 12144, the meat inspection bill. The Daily Digest states: "As approved by the conferees (1) the House would agree to Senate provision to extend Federal inspection to particular intra-State plants found to be distributing adulterated products dangerous to public health; (2) Senate would agree to eliminate authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt retail butchers and retail dealers; and (3) Senate would agree to eliminate provisions whereby the Governor of a State could request and obtain immediate Federal inspection of intra-State operations." p. D1097
2. POVERTY. Conferees agreed to file a conference report on S. 2388, the poverty bill. p. D1097



3. CIVIL RIGHTS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10805, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H16296-7
4. LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS. Rep. Broomfield reported on the legislative achievements of the 90th Congress. pp. H16300-2
5. ECONOMY; SPENDING. Rep. Vander Jagt urged a cut in Federal spending before additional taxes are enacted. pp. H16307-8
6. WILDERNESS. Rep. Saylor urged that the conferees include a 2,200 acre section that the House added to S. 889, the San Rafael Wilderness bill. pp. H16309-10
7. EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Pepper spoke in favor of H. R. 13054, to prohibit age discrimination in employment. pp. H16315-6

SENATE

8. EDUCATION. Continued debate on H. R. 7819, the elementary and secondary education bill. pp. S17897-8, S17908-9, S17913-19, S17924-45, S17949
9. SUGAR. Considered the proposed extension of the international sugar agreement and agreed to vote on this matter today, Dec. 6. pp. S17947-9
10. AGE DISCRIMINATION. Agreed to a House amendment, with an amendment, to S. 830, to prohibit age discrimination in employment. pp. S17910-13
11. PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING. Sen. Mondale commended the PPB system, recommended his bill S. 843, the proposed Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, and inserted an article by HEW Assistant Secretary Gorham, "Sharpening the Knife that Cuts the Public Pie." pp. S17860-6
12. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Sen. Muskie reviewed the recent conference on legislative leadership, sponsored by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and inserted Vice President Humphrey's speech on what State legislatures can do to help make Federal programs more flexible and realistic. pp. S17871-3
13. RESEARCH. Sen. Hill inserted statements commending the work of the late Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the first Director of the National Science Foundation. pp. S17873-5
14. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Dominick inserted an "analysis of the fallacies of trade with Red China." pp. S17903-6
15. BIRD CONSERVATION. Concurred in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H. R. 480, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated for acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. S17908
16. TAXATION. Sen. Smathers inserted the Treasury Department's proposed tax bill and a summary of it. pp. S17885-8



**ELECTRIC POWER—RELIABILITY**

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Communications and Power held a hearing on H.R. 10727, H.R. 10721, and related bills, the Electric Power Reliability Act. Testimony was heard from Senator Edward Kennedy and Lee C. White, Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

**NOISE ABATEMENT**

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics continued hearings on H.R. 3400, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulations. Testimony was heard from a public witness. A statement for the record was submitted by Representative Pucinski.

**VESSEL EXEMPTION**

*Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:* Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation held a hearing on H.R. 13366, to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws. Testimony was heard from Representative Pelly; Adm. Charles P. Murphy, Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, U.S. Coast Guard; and Dr. J. L. McHugh, Deputy Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

**D.C. HIGHWAYS**

*Committee on Public Works:* Subcommittee on Roads met and held a hearing on major highway problems in the District of Columbia and vicinity. Testimony was heard from Alan Boyd, Secretary, Department of Transportation, Lowell Bridwell, Federal Highway Commissioner; T. F. Airis, Director, Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia; Jerome Wolff, chairman, Director, Maryland State Roads Commission.

**SMALL BUSINESS—GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT**

*Select Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Government Procurement and Economic Concentration continued hearings on Government procurement, and the expansion of the participation of small business in Government contracts and purchases. Testimony was heard from officials of NASA and GSA.

**Joint Committee Meetings****MUNICIPAL FINANCING**

*Joint Economic Committee:* Subcommittee on Economic Progress began hearings on municipal financing problems, having as its witnesses J. Clifton Hurlbert, mayor of Aberdeen, S. Dak.; and Roy M. Goodman, director of finance, New York City.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

**POVERTY**

*Conferees*, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

**MEAT INSPECTION**

*Conferees*, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 12144, to strengthen the laws pertaining to inspection and marking of meat for use for human consumption. As approved by the conferees (1) the House would agree to Senate provision to extend Federal inspection to particular intra-State plants found to be distributing adulterated products dangerous to public health; (2) Senate would agree to eliminate authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt retail butchers and retail dealers; and (3) Senate would agree to eliminate provisions whereby the Governor of a State could request and obtain immediate Federal inspection of intra-State operations.

**POSTAL RATES AND FEDERAL SALARIES**

*Conferees* continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 7977, to increase postal rates and salaries of Federal employees, but did not reach final agreement, and will meet again tomorrow.

**SOCIAL SECURITY**

*Conferees* met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 12080, proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, but did not reach final agreement, and will meet again tomorrow.

---

**BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT****New Laws**

(For last listing of public laws, see DIGEST, p. D1094, December 4, 1967)

H.R. 10442, to authorize the exchange of national forest lands with public school authorities. Signed December 4, 1967 (P.L. 90-171).

S. 764, eliminating the required oath in applications for motor vehicle titles and lien information. Signed December 4, 1967 (P.L. 90-172).

S. 770, to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the D.C. Signed December 4, 1967 (P.L. 90-173).

H.R. 6418, increasing authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and public health services. Signed December 5, 1967 (P.L. 90-174).

S. 1031, authorizing funds for operation of the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1968. Signed December 5, 1967 (P.L. 90-175).



## Next meeting of the SENATE

12:00 noon, Wednesday, December 6

## Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:00 noon, Wednesday, December 6

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY,  
DECEMBER 6

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

## Senate

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry*, executive, on S. 2511, re crude pine oil; H.R. 10864, re land conveyance in Arkansas; H.R. 11565, transfer of peanut acreage allotments, and other pending matters, 10 a.m., 324 Old Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Government Operations*, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to continue hearings on rioting in Plainfield, N.J., 10 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, executive, on committee business, 10:30 a.m., 2300 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*, executive, on the matter of request for additional supergrade positions, and on postmaster nominations, 10 a.m., 6200 New Senate Office Building.

*Special Committee on Aging*, to continue hearings on long-range program and research needs in aging and related fields, 10 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

## House

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*, Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, to continue hearings on H.R. 3400, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulations, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Communications and Power, to hold a hearing on H.R. 6551 and S. 1166, Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Judiciary*, Subcommittee No. 1, executive, to consider private immigration bills, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries*, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, to

hold a hearing on H.R. 2191, to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B* in the coastwise trade; H.R. 2192, to authorize the use of the vessel *Ocean Delight* in the coastwise trade; H.R. 9325, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling, of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastal privileges; H.R. 10931, to permit the vessel *Clar-Lo* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade; H.R. 12766, to permit the vessel *Marpole* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth House Office Building.

*Committee on Public Works*, Subcommittee on Roads, to continue hearings on major highway problems in the District of Columbia and vicinity, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Standards of Official Conduct*, executive, to continue consideration on a proposed code of standards for House Members and employees, 10 a.m., B-331 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs*, Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, executive, to continue consideration on bills regarding income limitation on pensions, 10 a.m., 362 Cannon House Office Building.

## Joint Committees

*Joint Economic Committee*, Subcommittee on Economic Progress, to continue hearings on municipal financing problems, 10 a.m., room AE-1, Capitol.

*Conferees*, executive, on H.R. 4765, establishing special rules for income tax treatment of distribution by companies which became bank holding companies under Public Law 89-485, 9 a.m., room H-208, Capitol.

*Conferees*, executive, on H.R. 12080, proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, 10 a.m., room H-208, Capitol.

*Conferees*, executive, on H.R. 7977, to increase postal rates and Federal employees' salaries, 2:30 p.m., room EF-100, Capitol.



## Congressional Record

appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.











House  
Dec. 7, 1967

The substitute as agreed upon in conference would establish a mandatory reduction in the obligations of each civilian department and agency of the Executive Branch in fiscal 1968 by an amount equal to 2 percent of obligations estimated in the budget for personnel compensation and benefits, plus an amount equal to 10 percent of estimated budget obligations for other controllable items. Where Congress has reduced the appropriations of a department or agency by more than the amounts specified in the 2% plus 10% formula, the more restrictive Congressional action would prevail.

The substitute as agreed upon in conference is specific as to amounts of reductions to be made at the department or agency level. The allocation of the reductions within the various departments and agencies would be determined by the officials of the departments and agencies, and would be subject to the approval of the President. Personnel reductions are not absolutely mandatory, although undoubtedly in many cases reductions will be made in civilian compensation costs. Departments and agencies may choose to cut other expenses an amount equal to 2 percent of personal services estimates and maintain personnel levels. Of course, no individual employee's salary will be reduced by the operation of this title.

12. POVERTY. Received the conference report on S. 2388, the poverty bill (H. Rept. 1012). pp. H16505-32
13. POSTAL RATES; PAY INCREASE. Received the conference report on H. R. 7977, to increase postal rates and salaries of Federal employees (H. Rept. 1013) (pp. H16532-48). The bill would increase salaries of Federal employees effective Oct. 1, 1967, increase postal rates effective Jan. 7, 1968, increase life insurance benefits for Federal employees, and establish a Presidential commission on salaries.
14. WILDERNESS. The conferees agreed to file a report on S. 889, the San Rafael Wilderness bill. The Daily Digest states that "the House would accept the Senate version of the bill." p. D1108
15. WHEAT ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 1722, to provide for adjustment of wheat allotments in counties where wheat is the principal grain crop and where allotments are low in relation to cropland because farmers shifted prior to 1951 from wheat to an alternative crop or crops which have proved unprofitable because of plant disease or sustained loss of markets and there is no alternative income-producing crop. p. D1107
16. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Blanton inserted a speech by Secretary Freeman on revitalizing rural America by reversing the migration from the farm to the city. pp. H16496-8  
Rep. Randall inserted a speech by Sen. Pearson urging increased rural development programs. pp. H16475-6
17. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Waldie urged improved use of water resources in Calif. pp. H16460-1
18. ECONOMY; SPENDING. Rep. Nelsen inserted the results of a Minn. opinion poll which favored a cut in Federal spending. p. H16482



19. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Rep. Multer inserted an article in favor of the proposed tax increase. p. H16490
20. FARM LABOR. Rep. Nelsen inserted an editorial critical of the Labor Department order relating to farm youth employment. p. H16483
21. NATIONAL GRANGE. Rep. Boland congratulated the National Grange on the celebration of its 100th anniversary. pp. H16493-4
22. FARM INCOME. Rep. Hamilton urged improved programs to increase farm income. pp. H16501-3
23. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the legislative program for next week which includes the following: Mon., conference report on H. J. Res. 888, to continue appropriations; H. R. 7977, postal rate and Federal salary increases; and S. 2388, the poverty bill. Tues. and balance of week; the supplemental appropriation bill; and conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. H16457-8
24. ADJOURNED until Mon., Dec. 11. p. H16549

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. OPINION POLL. Rep. Griffiths inserted the results of an opinion poll including items of interest to this Department. pp. A6038-9
26. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Gathings inserted an article, "The Farmer: A Vital Member of our Society." pp. A6040-1

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

27. COMMODITY RESERVES. S. 2743 by Sen. Monroney and H. R. 14329 by Rep. Purcell, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks of agricultural commodities by producers and the Commodity Credit Corporation for national security, public protection, meeting international commitments; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of Sen. Monroney, pp. S18049-50  
H. R. 14337 by Rep. Kleppe, to establish producer owned and controlled emergency reserves of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans; to Agriculture Committee.
28. DISASTER LOANS. H. R. 14339 by Rep. Nichols and others and H. R. 14342 by Rep. Whitten, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, in order to provide additional loan assistance under such act to farmers who have suffered severe production losses as the result of a national disaster; to Agriculture Committee.
29. TAXATION. H. R. 14340 by Rep. Talcott, to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of Federal Taxation; to Ways and Means Committee.
30. FOOD. S. 2749 by Sen. Eastland, to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of "food supplement,"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee.
31. FORESTRY. S. 2751 by Sen. Hatfield, to designate the Mount Jefferson Wilderness, Williamette Deschutes, and Mt. Hood National Forest, in the State of Oregon; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.



Section 5 of the bill as passed by the Senate amends this definition so that a distribution (made after 1966) of stock of a controlled corporation to which section 355 of the code applies will not be treated as a distribution (for purposes of the phase III tax), if (1) such distribution is made to another corporation which immediately after the distribution is in control of both the distributing corporation and the controlled corporation, and (2) the controlled corporation is a life insurance company of which the distributing corporation has been in control at all times since December 31, 1957. This amendment applies to taxable years beginning after 1966.

Under the conference agreement, this section is retained as section 4 of the bill.

W. D. MILLS,  
CECIL R. KING,  
HALE BOGGS,  
FRANK M. KARSTEN,  
A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr.,  
JOHN W. BYRNES,  
JAMES B. UTT,  
JACKSON E. BETTS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

## S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1012)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.'

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$1,980,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, \$476,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, \$60,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part D of title I, \$950,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, \$27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out section 406 of title IV, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title V, \$25,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title V, \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

#### "TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

##### "JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

"Sec. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

##### "PART A—JOB CORPS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential and or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.

##### "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

##### "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

"(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age fourteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

"(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular school-work, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs, or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

"(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;

"(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and

"(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe (including special standards for the enrollment on a residential basis of 14 and 15 year olds) and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

##### "SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations,

including court, probation, parole, law enforcement, education, welfare, and medical authorities and advisers. They shall also provide for—

"(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the purpose of—

"(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

"(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and

"(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

"(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

"(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such young in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

##### "SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.

"(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.

##### "ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

"(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations un-



der the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

"(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

"(d) After the Director has determined whether an enrollee is to be assigned to a men's training center, a conservation center, or a women's training center, the center to which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the appropriate type in which a vacancy exists which is closest to the enrollee's home, except that the Director, on an individual basis, may waive this requirement when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the enrollee's home shall be carefully limited to situations in which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

"(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions.

#### "JOB CORPS CENTERS

"SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character and shall be designed and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling, and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's and women's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment.

"(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's training centers shall offer education and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a non-residential basis to participants in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

#### "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

"(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

"(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

"(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

#### "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

"SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees with such personal, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the program and not to exceed \$50 per month thereafter, except that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not exceeding \$50 per month, may be provided from the beginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be of less than six months' duration, and the Director is authorized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates specified herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him. Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage continued participation in the program, achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their personal allowances.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjust-

ment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

#### "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

"SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

#### "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Whenever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforce-



ment agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and co-operative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

#### "COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

"SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

"(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of trainees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.

"(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 637(b) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to—

"(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;

"(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;

"(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and

"(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.

If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding

former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.

#### "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

"SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of higher education, boards of education, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

"(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as described in part B of this title, in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive

any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

"(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of existing educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

"(1) a job survey be made of the area;

"(2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;

"(3) an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

"(4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and

"(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

#### "ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

"SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

#### "PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

"SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

"(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regula-



tions, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

"(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

#### "APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

"(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

"(A) The term "performance of duty" shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

"(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

"(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

"(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

"(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.

"(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five thousand enrollees.

"(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women enrol-

lees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

"(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,900 per enrollee.

"(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

#### "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps shall be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

"(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions."

#### "WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 102. Part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

#### "COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

"(b) For the purpose of this part, a community may be a city, county, multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to community action, manpower services, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and comprehensive work and training programs assisted under this part.

"(c) A comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant component programs authorized by this Act with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs and activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

#### "PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123(c)). This agency must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

"(c) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make use of public and private organizations as delegate agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work and training program, including without limitation agencies governed with the participation of the poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational institutions, the public employment service, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training institutions, and other capable public and private organizations.

"(d) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement.

"(e) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

#### "ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:



"(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school;

"(2) programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over) with useful work and training (which must include sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training) designed to assist those persons to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment;

"(3) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

"(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

"(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

"(6) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

"(7) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

"(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into

urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed, or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to do from whom the cost of transportation is reimbursed such employees for such transportation: *Provided*, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

"(9) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

"(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one of more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this part. In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts.

#### "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant; and

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) The Director shall terminate financial assistance for any program under this part in any case in which he determines that any person charged, in whole or part, with the responsibility for the administration of the program is a member of the Communist Party.

"(c) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improve-

ments, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(d) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(e) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

#### "PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

#### "ELDERLY

"SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

#### "PILOT PROJECTS

"SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

"(b) The director shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

"(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

#### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part and part D of this title. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

#### "ROLE OF THE STATES

"SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

"(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

"(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;



"(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

"(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

#### "EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this part exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 225(c).

#### "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

"(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this part. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129."

#### "SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 103. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 150. The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are di-

rected to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to eligible urban areas, and (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

#### "ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies or private organizations for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part. Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact on the area served. Such programs may include—

"(1) economic and business development programs, including programs which provide financial and other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas served so as to provide employment opportunities for residents of those areas, and programs such as those described in title IV of this Act for small businesses in or owned by residents of such areas;

"(2) community development activities which create new training and employment opportunities and which contribute to an improved living environment; and

"(3) manpower training programs for unemployed or low-income persons which support and complement economic, business, and community development programs, including without limitation activities such as those described in part B of this title.

#### "REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 152. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program or component project under this part unless he determines that—

"(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

"(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the development of entrepreneurial and management skills and the ownership or participation in ownership of assisted businesses by residents of the area served;

"(3) projects will be planned and carried out with the maximum participation of local businessmen by their inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory councils, or through other appropriate means;

"(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and with other relevant plans for physical and human resources of the areas served;

"(5) the requirements of subsections 122 (e) and 124(a) of this Act have been met;

"(6) preference will be given to the residents of the areas served in filling jobs and training opportunities; and

"(7) training programs financed under this part shall be designed wherever feasible to provide those persons who successfully complete such training with skills which are also in demand in communities or neighborhoods other than those for which programs are established under this part.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from one location to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

"(c) The level of financial assistance for related purposes under this Act to the area served by a special impact program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this part.

"(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not less than 7 per centum for the purpose of carrying out this part.

#### "APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

"SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for business location and expansion purposes is made available as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

"(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall be deemed "redevelopment areas" within the meaning of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the provisions of title II of that Act.

"(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this part.

#### "EVALUATION

"SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Director may designate, and up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the Director's findings and recommendations concerning the program, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

#### "FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

"SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above."

#### "COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 104. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. (a) This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote,



as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

“(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be made more responsive to local needs and conditions;

“(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

“(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

“(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

“(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

“(b) It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

#### “PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

##### “DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

“SEC. 210. (a) A community action agency shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—

“(1) has the power and authority and will perform the functions set forth in section 212, including the power to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

“(2) is determined to be capable of planning, conducting, administering and evaluating a community action program and is currently designated as a community action agency by the Director.

A community action program is a community based and operated program—

“(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

“(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

“(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the purposes and provisions of this title.

“(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

“(c) For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicounty, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a community action program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to work and training programs, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and community action programs assisted under this title.

“(d) The Director may designate and provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency in lieu of a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines (1) that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or to carry out such plan in a satisfactory manner, or (2) that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

“(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a community action agency designated under section 210(a) if the elected or duly appointed governing officials of such political subdivision do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

“(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.

#### “COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

“SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of sub-

section (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(d), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

“(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available or willing to serve is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.

“(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to the character, funding, extent, and administration of and budgeting for programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, such board, council, or agency shall be broadly representative of such area, subject to regulations of the director which assure adequate opportunity for membership of elected public officials on such board, council, or agency. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to make use of neighborhood-based organizations composed of residents of the area or members of the groups served to assist such agency in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of components of the community action program.

“(d) (1) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group, which shall not be less than 50 percent of the membership, shall be established by the board.

“(2) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the community action board or governing board may petition for adequate representation.

“(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.



"(f) Each community action board referred to in the first sentence of subsection (a) shall—

"(1) have a full opportunity to participate in the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries;

"(2) have at least one-third of its members chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served;

"(3) be so established and organized that the poor and residents of the area concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests and regularly participate in the planning and implementation of those programs; and

"(4) be a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad community involvement in the programs assisted under this title.

#### "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, how-

ever, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan or nonpartisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

#### "HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 214. Each community action agency shall encourage the establishment of housing development and services organizations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is required to help low-income families and individuals more effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs. Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit housing development corporations. Such corporations may themselves become sponsors of housing under existing programs of specialized housing agencies, but under no circumstances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs now administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing development and service organizations shall coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts so that any programs undertaken under authority of this section shall be closely related to other community action programs.

#### "PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

##### "GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 221. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies for the planning, conduct, administration and evaluation of community action programs and components. Those components may involve, without limitation, other activities and supporting facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly poor—

"(1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;

"(2) to attain an adequate education;

"(3) to make better use of available income;

"(4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and a suitable living environment;

"(5) to undertake family planning, consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions;

"(6) to obtain services for the prevention of narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics;

"(7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, including the need for health services, nutritious food, housing, and employment-related assistance;

"(8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and family problems which block the achievement of self-sufficiency;

"(9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs of the community; and

"(10) to make more frequent and effective use of other programs related to the purposes of this title.

He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency.



"(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

"(d) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as a condition of assistance, that each community action agency has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds provided under this part. Such systematic approach shall encompass a planning and implementation process which seeks to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the community, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and private resources, establishes program priorities, links program components with one another and with other relevant programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may, however, extend the time for such requirement to take into account the length of time a program has been in operation. He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation of other Federal agencies in support of the development and implementation of plans under this subsection.

"(e) In order to promote local responsibility and initiative, the Director shall not establish binding national priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall review each application for financial assistance on its merits. Before extending financial assistance to a new community action agency under this section, and in determining the amount of and conditions on which such assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the extent and nature of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance to a previously existing community action agency, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such agency.

#### "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under section 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (A) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (B) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, or (C) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and ef-

fectively promote the purposes of this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as "Project Headstart" focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

"(2) A program to be known as "Follow Through" focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential. Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements.

"(3) A "Legal Services" program to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall make arrangements under which the State bar association and the principal local bar associations in the community to be served by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the proposed project before such project is approved or funded, and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the operations of such project, if approved and funded. No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this part) shall be utilized for the defense of any person indicted (or proceeded against by information) for the commission of a crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director has determined that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available.

"(4) A "Comprehensive Health Services" program which shall include—

"(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of poverty and marked in-

adequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, such as preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and followup services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and

"(ii) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to low-income residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served: *Provided, however*, That such services may be made available on an emergency basis or pending a determination of eligibility to all residents of such areas.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit and consider the comments and recommendations of the local medical associations in the area and shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services; and

"(B) programs to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both prospective and practicing health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or arrange for training and study in the field of health services for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, the Director may arrange for the payment of stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for persons undergoing such training and study and for their dependents. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall achieve effective coordination of programs and projects authorized under this section with other related activities.

"(5) A program to be known as "Upward Bound" designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary educational success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assistance for such projects may be provided directly to institutions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely coordinated with activities of community action agencies and activities carried on under the Higher Education Act of 1965.



"(6) A program to be known as "Emergency Food and Medical Services" designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange to carry out his functions through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a manner that will insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or other agencies or organizations if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects, such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, which will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve and make available not less than \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not less than \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out this paragraph.

"(7) A "Family Planning" program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

"(8) A program to be known as "Senior Opportunities and Services" designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Consistent with, and subject to, the provisions of sections 230 and 232 (a), (b), and (c), programs under this section may include related training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

#### "RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

"Sec. 223. In the conduct of all component programs under this part, residents of the area and members of the groups served shall be provided maximum employment opportunity, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement. The Director shall encourage the employment of persons fifty-five years and older

as regular, part-time and short-term staff in component programs.

#### "NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

"Sec. 224. The Director shall encourage the development of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in such fields as health, education, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services, and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate framework) as to promote maximum participation of neighborhood residents in center planning, policymaking, administration, and operation. In addition to providing such services as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available, such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs, such as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community development activities, as may be necessary or appropriate to best assure a system under which existing programs are extended to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are responsive and relevant to the range of community, family, and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighborhood needs and conditions.

#### "ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 225. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to section 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 221 and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regula-

tions establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 131.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 221 and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c). The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

#### "PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

##### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"Sec. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

##### "STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which



they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

#### "RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

"(c) Not more than 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of this section. One-third of the sums so appropriated or allocated shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (f) of this section.

"(d) No pilot or demonstration project under this section shall be commenced in any city, county, or other major political subdivision, unless a plan setting forth such proposed pilot or demonstration project has been submitted to the appropriate community action agency, or, if there is no such agency, to the local governing officials of the political subdivision, and such plan has not been disapproved by the community action agency or governing body, as the case may be, within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

"(e) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot projects which (1) aid elderly persons to achieve greater self-sufficiency, (2) focus upon the problems of rural poverty, (3) are designed to develop new techniques and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, or (4) are designed to encourage the participation of private organizations, other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this title.

"(f) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

#### "EVALUATION

"SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this title, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services and including, where appropriate, comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of those programs or individual projects. He may require community action agencies to provide for independent evaluations, and where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis. He shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. He shall also arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. The reports of studies undertaken under this section, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, shall be public records, and the results shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

"(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 221, 222, 230, and 231.

"(c) The Director shall provide by contract for the conduct of an independent study and evaluation of the action taken under sections 210 and 211 of this Act and the effects thereof, with particular reference to (1) the exercise of their authorities under the provisions of title II of this Act by States and political subdivisions, (2) the participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, public officials and others and (3) the administrative and program advantages and disadvantages, if any, encountered or foreseen in implementing such sections. He shall transmit such study and evaluation to the Congress before April 1, 1969.

#### "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

##### "ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

"SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

##### "RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly respon-

sive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232, of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

"(b) The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative number in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service; and (7) poor persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places as determined by the latest reports of the Bureau of the Census.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

##### "SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 242. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

##### "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 243. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have es-



established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in subsection (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

"(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

"(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 244. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

"(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for pay-

ment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

"(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 225(c) have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases (particularly in large metropolitan areas) where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local salary levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

"(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates are inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

"(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

"(7) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all of the programs assisted under this title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency exceed 15 per centum of the total costs, including non-Federal contributions to such costs, of such programs. The Director, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation, criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs of such programs. In any case in which the Di-

rector determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 per centum of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 245. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

#### "AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

"SEC. 105. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read 'PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM', and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read 'LOANS TO FAMILIES'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards."

"(c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting the word 'principal' after the word 'aggregate', and (2) by inserting after 'families' the following: ', and, in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions'.

"(d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking out 'titles III of this Act' in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'this part'.

"(e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.

#### "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

"(b) Programs assisted under this part may include projects or activities—

"(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation (including the provision and maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling;

"(2) to promote increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families; and

"(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farmworkers and members of their families as appropriate through education



and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment brought about by technological advancement and to take advantage of opportunities available to improve their well-being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent employment or by participating in available Government training programs.

#### "LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under this part unless the Director determines that the applicant will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

"(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures or requirements to assure that programs under this part are carried on in coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

#### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such technical assistance or training of personnel as may be required to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evaluation of projects under this title and may, through grants or contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608."

#### "AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

"SEC. 106. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'enterprises;' and inserting in lieu thereof 'enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals;'

"(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'employment of the long-term unemployed' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals;'

"(2) striking out the period at the end of the next to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon; and

"(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sentence, 'Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency.'

"(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ', and shall seek to stimulate new private lending activities to such concerns through the use of the loan guaranties, participations in loans, and pooling arrangements authorized by this section';

"(2) by striking out the first subsection (b);

"(3) by adding at the end of the second subsection (b) the following: 'To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary;'; and

"(4) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Administrator shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section, including full information on the location, income characteristics, and types of businesses and individuals assisted,

and on new private lending activity stimulated, and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

"(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

"(1) renumbering section 405 to read '407' and inserting in such section 'and the Secretary of Commerce' immediately following the word 'Administration';

"(2) striking out section 404; and

"(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, 406 and 407 to read as follows:

#### "DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director, after consideration of any recommendations of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consideration of any recommendations of the Director, shall define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

#### "LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

#### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

"SEC. 406. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

"(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;

"(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities;

"(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

"(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

"(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provisions of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

"(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in exist-

ing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

"(c) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

"(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

"(e) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall, in carrying out programs under this section, consult with and take into consideration the views of the Secretary of Commerce with a view to coordinating activities and avoiding duplication of effort.

"(f) The President may, if he determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, transfer any of the functions under this section to the Secretary of Commerce.

"(g) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide for an independent and continuing evaluation of programs under this section, including full information on and analysis of the character and impact of managerial assistance provided, the location, income characteristics and types of businesses and individuals assisted, and the extent to which private resources and skills have been involved in these programs. Such evaluation together with any recommendations as he deems advisable shall be included in the report required by section 608.

#### "GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 407. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

#### "DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 107. (a) Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part at the end thereof:

#### "PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day care for children from families which need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise to obtain objectives related to the purposes of this Act, with particular emphasis upon enabling the parents or relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to continue basic education, vocational training, or gainful employment.

##### "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 522 (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to appropriate public agencies and private organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or pro-



portions of low-income persons may receive day care. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment and services. Such day care projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Financial assistance under this section may be provided to employers, labor unions, or to joint employer-union organizations, for day care projects established at or in association with a place of employment or training where such projects are financed in major part through private funds. Project costs payable under this part may include costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.

"(b) The Director may require a family which is not a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in part, for the day care services provided under this program where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

"(c) The Director may provide, directly or through contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance and training necessary for the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part.

"(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. In approving applications for assistance under this part, the Director shall take into consideration (1) the extent to which applicants show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas which they will serve, and (2) the extent to which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed, including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

"(e) Each project to which payments are made hereunder shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evaluation shall be conducted by such agency or independent public or private organization as the Director shall designate, with a view to determining, among other things, the extent to which the day care provided may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, the extent to which such day care may have reduced the costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities in the area served. Up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this part, except that where such evaluation is carried on by the assisted agency itself, he may pay only 90 per centum of such costs. Such evaluations, together with a report on the program described in this part, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 523. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years."

"(b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND DAY CARE PROGRAMS"

"(c) Title V of such Act is further amended by inserting after the heading thereof the following:

#### "PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS"

"(d) Sections 501, 502, 503, 504, and 505 of such Act are amended by striking out 'this title' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'this part'."

#### "AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

"SEC. 108. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'four' in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'."

"(b) Section 602(b) of such Act is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(b)', by inserting before 'compensate' the following: 'except that no individual may be employed under the authority of this subsection for more than 100 days in any fiscal year; (2)', and by striking out ', and' after 'travel time' and inserting in lieu thereof '; and (3)'."

"(c) Section 603(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Programs assisted under this Act shall not be carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with (1) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office, (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or (3) any voter registration activity. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue rules and regulations to provide for the enforcement of this section, which shall include provisions for summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis."

"(d) Section 604 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

"SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to assure that—

"(1) special notice of and an opportunity for a timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided for an agency or organization which would like to serve as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose application to the prime sponsor or community action agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed reasonable by the Director;

"(2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency situations, nor shall an application for refunding under sections 123, 221, 222, or 312 be denied, unless the recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and opportunity to show cause why such action should not be taken; and

"(3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient agency has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing."

"(e) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting, after section 605, the following new section:

#### "ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESEARCH OR DEMONSTRATION CONTRACTS

"SEC. 606. (a) The Director or the head of any other Federal agency administering a program under this Act shall make a public announcement concerning:

"(1) The title, purpose, intended completion date, identity of the contractor, and proposed cost of any contract with a private or non-Federal public agency or organization for any demonstration or research project; and

"(2) The results, findings, data, or recommendations made or reported as a result of such activities."

"(b) The public announcements required by subsection (a) shall be made within thirty days of entering into such contracts and thereafter within thirty days of the receipt of such results."

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to assure that the requirements of this section are met, and he shall at once report to the Congress concerning any failure to comply with these requirements."

"(f) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and title II the meaning of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 225 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in titles I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services;

"(3) the term 'permanent resident of the United States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

"(4) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity."

"(g) Section 610 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

"SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, education and other services and activities which assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) maintain a constant review of all programs under this Act to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration; (3) initiate and maintain inter-agency liaison with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority. In exercising his responsibilities under this section, the Director shall cooperate with the Commissioner on Aging. The Director shall describe the ways in which this section has been implemented in the annual report required by section 608."

"(h) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'part A of title II' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II', and (2) by inserting the words 'a substantial



number of the' immediately before the word 'persons' the second and third time that word appears.

"(i) Section 611 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

**"LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE VOLUNTARILY POOR**

"SEC. 611. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligibility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty, such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his health, age, education, and ability."

"(j) Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

**"JOINT FUNDING**

"SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose."

"(k) Section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

**"LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES**

"SEC. 613. No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act shall, pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted under this Act by such community action agency or such other agency, plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance."

"(l) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

**"TRANSFER OF FUNDS**

"SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations for any program or activity under this Act or any Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity, not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out any such program or activity under the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 per centum."

"(m) Title VI of such Act is amended by—  
"(1) adding the following new section after section 620:

**"RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 621. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 222(a) (2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

"(2) striking out the heading 'PART B—COORDINATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS' and  
"(3) inserting at the end of such title a new part B to read as follows:

**"PART B—COORDINATION**

**"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

"SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, provides for an

information center, and prescribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to promote better coordination among all programs related to this Act, with a view to making those programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal resources in the solution of specific problems, and generally improving cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of this Act.

**"ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL**

"SEC. 631. (a) There is established, in the Executive Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall be composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and such other officials of the Federal Government as the President may from time to time designate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council to serve as chairman. Each member shall designate an alternate to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to assist the President in—

"(1) providing for the coordination of Federal programs and activities related to this Act;

"(2) developing basic policies and setting priorities with respect to such programs and activities;

"(3) resolving differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities; and

"(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of this Act.

"(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties. Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide temporary assistance.

"(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a separate report to the Congress.

"(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall reserve such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

**"RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR**

"SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

"(1) undertake special studies of specific coordination problems at the request of the President or the Council, or on his own initiative;

"(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities under this Act, and consult with interested agencies and groups, including State agencies described in section 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council, with a view to identifying coordination problems that may warrant consideration by the Council or the President and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action for overcoming those problems, either through the Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other Federal, State, or local agencies; and

"(3) prepare a five-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of Federal and other governmental expenditures, and, where feasible, the contributions of the private sector, needed to eliminate poverty in this

country within alternative periods of time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized by this and other Acts, and any new programs which may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country, and it shall include recommendations for such new programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress and updated on an annual basis.

**"COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES**

"SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering programs related to this Act shall—

"(1) cooperate with the Director and with the Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities; and

"(2) carry out their programs and exercise their functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted by other applicable law.

"(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their responsibilities under this Act.

"(c) The President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

**"COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS**

"SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effective administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where appropriate other related programs or projects, and be included within or otherwise carried on in combination with community action programs. In the case of other programs related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies responsible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in a manner which encourages combinations with other related projects and activities where appropriate, and with community action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make a continuing review of the operation of this section with a view to (1) determining particular groups of programs which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and making recommendations accordingly to the President or appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or recommending additional or common procedures, as appropriate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent, consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and making recommendations respecting such consolidations to the Director and the President.

**"INFORMATION CENTER**

"SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and operate an information center for the purpose of insuring that maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this Act and that information concerning those programs and other relevant information is readily available to public officials and other interested persons. The Director shall collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute information as described above, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In connection with operation of the center, the Direc-



tor may carry on research or studies concerning the improvement of information systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal information systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials or used to further coordination objectives.

"(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. He may also make grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

"(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to State and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required by those agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.

#### "PROHIBITION

"SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

#### "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through such procedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

"(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (a); and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 638. As used in this part, "programs related to this Act" and "coordination" shall include the programs and actions described in this section:

"(1) "Programs related to this Act" include programs under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted programs which have objectives which are, in whole or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of this Act, or which provide resources which may be used in combination with resources under this Act to assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

"(2) "Coordination" includes, but is not limited to—

"(A) actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serv-

ing the poor, such as actions: to extend services to new areas, provide them in a common place, or structure them so that they are more readily accepted or widely utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited education or other special handicaps; to establish common eligibility standards among programs serving substantially similar groups or operating in the same areas; or to develop methods of operation or administration that will provide new employment incentives or opportunities for the poor;

"(B) actions to promote better use at the State or local level of Federal assistance available under diverse programs, such as actions to establish procedures for cooperation among State or local agencies seeking assistance from different Federal sources with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication and service gaps and promoting common or complementary priorities; or to modify or improve technical or administrative requirements imposed by different Federal agencies that may operate to increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imaginative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their cooperation with one another;

"(C) actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources, such as actions to develop new methods of processing requests for assistance or granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies more generally to use resources jointly in support of common objectives; to establish common priorities for purposes of program planning, research and demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

"(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legislation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively."

#### "AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

"SEC. 109. Section 701(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out 'July 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1968', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'With respect to any period after June 30, 1969, subsection (a) shall not apply.'

#### "VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 110. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

##### "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as vol-

unteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

#### "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private non-profit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

"(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities; and

"(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor. The assignment of such a volunteer in any State shall be terminated by the Director when so requested by the Governor of such State not later than thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Governor and Director after such request has been made by the Governor to the Director.

##### "TERMS OF SERVICE

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

"(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

##### "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to



exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

#### "PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than are required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

"(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

"(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

#### "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

#### "DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

"SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for, the conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and in not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, under which—

"(1) volunteers under part A, and members of the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section, provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-five with intensive education, training, and counseling for at least a six-month period prior to their release from confinement and for at least a six-month period thereafter;

"(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hundred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

"(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section, members of the Teacher Corps who have been recruited and trained by one or more institutions of higher education; and

"(4) not more than forty such members are furnished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such members are so furnished during each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for purposes of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per week for each dependent. Such members who are experienced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without regard to the provisions of section 513(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

#### "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B, and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

##### "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

"SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including

the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons and older persons membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies in the various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

#### "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

"(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a) (2) (B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

#### "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

"(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

"(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be directly or indirectly utilized to finance labor or anti-labor organization or related activity.

"(e) Persons serving as volunteers under this title shall provide such information concerning their qualifications, including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to such procedures, for selection and approval as the Director may require. The Director may fix such special procedures for the selection and approval of low-income residents of the area to be served by a program who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

#### "TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 111. (a) Sections 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (and all references to such sections) are redesignated as 141, 142, 143, 144, and 145, respectively.

"(b) Section 141 of such Act (and all references to such section) is redesignated as 161.

"(c) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by inserting after 'Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council,' the following: 'of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council.'



# "TITLE II—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL"

## "INVESTIGATION"

"SEC. 201. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is authorized and directed to make an investigation in sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, in order to determine—

"(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

"(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

## "REPORTS"

"SEC. 202. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit his final report to the Congress not later than December 1, 1968. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation as he deems advisable.

## "POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL"

"SEC. 203. (a) The Comptroller General, or on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated officer.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

"(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

"(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

## "AUTHORIZATION"

"SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

## "TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS"

"SEC. 301. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 embezzles, willfully misapplies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds, assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or contract

of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal to renew a contract of employment in connection with a grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 induces any person to give up any money or thing of any value to any person (including such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

## "TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE"

"SEC. 401. The amendments made by this Act shall be in effect immediately upon its enactment, except as provided in this section. Until June 30, 1968, the provisions of section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act shall apply to community action agencies in existence and funded prior to the enactment of this Act, except that in any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency prior to June 30, 1968, adequate provision shall be made for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and funds to any community action agency designated pursuant to sections 210 or 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended by this Act: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall require the termination before February 1, 1969 of an existing community action agency or any program assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 prior to the designation of, and provision of financial assistance to, a community action agency or other agency established under sections 210 and 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended by this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
EDITH GREEN,  
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.  
JOHN H. DENT,  
ROMAN PUCINSKI,  
JAMES G. O'HARA,  
CARL ALBERT,  
SAM M. GIBBONS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOSEPH S. CLARK,  
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
EDWARD KENNEDY,  
GAYLORD NELSON,  
ROBERT KENNEDY,  
WINSTON L. PROUTY,  
GEORGE MURPHY,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The accompanying conference report recommends a new text which would be a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The other House amendment was to the title.

This statement describes the conference action with respect to the differences between the Senate bill and House amendments, except for minor, technical, and conforming changes.

## AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

The authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year 1968 in the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the conference substitute are set forth in the following table:

(In millions)

	Conference substitute	Conference reductions in Senate amounts	Senate bill	House amendment
Title I:				
Part A.....	\$295	-----	\$295	-----
Part B.....	476	-----	567	-----
Part D.....	60	-----	105	-----
Total, title I.....	831	-\$136	967	\$667.5
Title II.....	950	-112	1,062	776.5
Title III:				
Part A.....	20	-----	20	-----
Part B.....	27	-3	30	-----
Total, title III.....	47	-3	50	47
Sec. 406 of title IV.....	10	-15	25	-----
Title V:				
Part A.....	70	-----	70	-----
Part B.....	25	-10	35	-----
Total, title V.....	95	-10	105	70
Title VI.....	16	-----	16	14
Title VIII.....	31	-2	33	25
Total.....	1,980	-291	2,258	1,600

The House amendment did not authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1969. The Senate bill authorizes \$2,400,000,000 for that year. The conference substitute authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 in the amount of \$2,180,000,000.

## REVISION OF JOB CORPS PROVISIONS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment completely rewrite part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") which contains the authority for the Job Corps program. Section references herein are to the sections of the new part A as they appear in the substitute recommended in the conference report.

### Section 103.—Individuals Eligible for the Job Corps

The Senate bill provides that to be eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps, an individual must have reached age 16. The House amendment lowers this age limit to 14. The conference substitute adopts the House age limit, but with an amendment which requires prospective enrollees who are 14 or 15 years of age to meet such special standards as the Director may prescribe for their enrollment on a residential basis.

### Section 104.—Screening and Selection of Applicants—General Provisions

The Senate bill provides that the rules for screening and selecting persons for enrollment in the Job Corps must include provisions for interviewing applicants. The House amendment is similar except that it seems to imply there should be only one interview. The House recedes.

### Section 105.—Screening and Selection—Special Limitations

Both the Senate bill and House amendment place special restrictions on the enrollment of persons with a history of serious antisocial behavior. The House amendment permits the enrollment of such a person upon the finding of a professionally qualified person that his enrollment will not be inimical to the Job Corps and that the Job Corps



will help him overcome his problem. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 106.—Enrollment and Assignment

The House amendment waives, in the case of permanent residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the requirement that enrollees take an oath of allegiance to the United States. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill provides that each enrollee shall be assigned to the appropriate type center which (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for efficient program operation) is nearest his home. The House amendment requires the assignment of each enrollee to the appropriate type center nearest his home, but permits exceptions, on an individual basis, when there are overriding considerations. Assignments to remoter centers is limited to cases where the action is necessary to provide equitable opportunities to enrollees from various geographical areas, to prevent delay, to meet the needs of the enrollee, or in the interest of efficiency and economy. The conference substitute accepts the House amendment, with a qualification that the requirement for assignment to the center nearest the enrollee's home refers to the nearest center which has a vacancy.

The Senate bill requires that at least 40 percent of the male enrollees in the Job Corps be assigned to conservation centers. The House amendment does not contain this provision. The House recedes.

#### Section 107.—Job Corps Centers

Under the Senate bill training in the Job Corps would be primarily on a residential basis. The House bill provides that the training will be provided in centers which are residential or nonresidential in character or which are conducted on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Senate recedes on this point.

The House amendment provides that the conservation centers of the Job Corps shall be known as "Civilian Conservation Centers." The Senate bill does not contain this provision. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill provides that training centers shall be divided into men's training centers and women's training centers. The women's training centers are required to provide education, training, and other activities appropriate to the special needs and potentialities of young women. The House amendment contains no special provision dealing with the type of training to be provided in women's training centers. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 108.—Program Activities

The House amendment provides that the required program of an enrollee in the Job Corps shall aggregate at least 60 hours a week. The Senate bill does not contain this provision. The House recedes.

#### Section 109.—Allowance and Support

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorize the Director to pay personal allowances, as well as other allowances, to enrollees, but the House amendment does not specify the amounts thereof. The Senate bill limits an enrollee's personal allowances to \$35 per month during the first 6 months of his enrollment and to \$65 per month thereafter; however, he may be paid over \$35 per month (but under \$65) from the beginning if his enrollment is expected to be for less than 6 months. The Director may also pay allowances in greater amounts in unusual circumstances. The Senate bill requires the personal allowances to be graduated upward to provide encouragement to enrollees, and to be subject to reduction as a disciplinary measure. The conference substitute accepts the provisions of the Senate bill, but limits the maximum personal allowance to \$50 a month.

Subsection (c) of section 109 of both versions deals with the payment of readjustment allowances to enrollees. The Senate bill

makes the payments mandatory, while the House amendment makes such payments permissive. The Senate bill requires enrollees to have been in the Job Corps for 6 months before becoming entitled to a readjustment allowance, subject to certain exceptions, while the House version permits payment of such allowances to enrollees who have served 90 days. Under the House version, but not the Senate, readjustment allowances may be reduced as a penalty for misconduct. The Senate recedes to the House position on each of these matters.

#### Section 111.—Community Participation

The House amendment requires the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for the joint discussion of problems common to the community and to the Job Corps Center, and for planning programs of mutual interest. When possible, these advisory councils will be formed under the local community action agency. Youth participation is encouraged and, where feasible, youth councils may be established. The Director is required to establish rules and regulations and to take the necessary action to ensure that each Job Corps center is so operated as to achieve continuing coordination of its activities with the community activities. The conference substitute includes these provisions of the House amendment.

#### Section 113.—Evaluation; Experimental and Developmental Projects

The Senate bill provides for an evaluation of the relative costs and benefits resulting from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, universities, and private organizations. The House amendment adds boards of education to the list and substitutes "institutions of higher education" for "universities." The Senate recedes.

#### Section 114.—Advisory Boards and Committees

The House amendment requires the Director to make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the Job Corps centers, where he determines that availability of outside advice on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit. This authority does not limit the functions of the National Advisory Council appointed under section 605. The Senate bill contains no comparable provision. It is included in the substitute agreed upon in conference.

#### Section 117.—Special Limitations

The Senate bill requires the Director to take the action necessary to assure that, by June 30, 1968, 25 percent of the Job Corps enrollees receiving training on a residential basis are women. The House amendment requires that by such date 25 percent of the total number of Job Corps enrollees shall be women. It also requires the Director to take steps immediately to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 percent women in the Job Corps, consistent with efficiency and economy in program operation, sound administrative practice, and the socio-economic, education, and training needs of the population to be served. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill limited the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers to 45,000. The House amendment made the limitation applicable only to the residential capacity of Job Corps centers. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill requires the Director to take action necessary to assure that, for any fiscal year, the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than 9 months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee. The House amendment places a similar limit for the fiscal year 1968, of \$6,500 per residential enrollee and \$2,500 per nonresidential enrollee. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, except that the \$7,300 per year limit is changed to \$6,900 per year.

#### Section 118.—Political Discrimination and Political Activity

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment prohibits any Job Corps officer, employee, or enrollee from taking an active part in the political management or political campaigns. The House amendment states that the prohibition applies with respect to both partisan and nonpartisan political campaigns. It also extends the prohibition to the taking of an active part in voter registration drives. The House recedes in conformity with the conference agreement to place partisan and nonpartisan political activity and voter registration restrictions in title VI of the Act so as to extend their application to all programs, including the Job Corps.

#### WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment completely rewrite part B of title I of the act. Section references are to the new part B.

#### Section 122.—Prime Sponsors and Delegate Agencies

The Senate bill requires that for each community program area, the prime sponsor to receive funds under this part shall be the community action agency unless the Director determines that an alternative prime sponsor is likely to have a greater capability in planning and implementing a comprehensive work and training program. The House amendment does not contain this provision. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 123.—Eligible Activities

The House amendment provides that concentrated work and training programs shall be carried on, not only in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low income, unemployed persons, but also in those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas. The Senate bill does not contain this provision. The Senate recedes.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low income persons. Among the incentives permitted by the Senate bill are reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive. Under the House amendment reimbursements are limited to reimbursements for unusual training costs for such a period. The House recedes; however, the conferees expect that appropriate regulations will be issued to safeguard against abuses of any of these incentive programs, including but not limited to safeguards against the use of such incentives by any employer in order to transfer any enterprise from one area to another and safeguards designed to prevent the incentives from being used as a subsidy for normal operations. The incentive program should, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants. It is not intended that these programs should provide assistance which would be supportive of firms or industries which have high rates of turnover of labor because of low wages, seasonality, or other factors, or which would lead to displacement of their currently employed work force by persons newly trained through these programs. Nor is it intended that the various incentive programs under this act lead to the disruption of an industry's existing patterns of competition or stimulate labor turnover by encouraging replacement of the existing work force by newly trained workers. It would not be in keeping with the purposes of this provision, as it is not in keeping with the purposes of the MDTA, to make available financial assistance or other incentives for work, training and related programs for industries which are highly mobile, labor intensive, and vigorously competitive on a na-



tional basis, which have high labor turnover, and in which the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for employment. In order to prevent abuse it is expected that appropriate administrative steps shall be taken to assure that reimbursements paid to an employer under section 123(a)(8) should cover only such costs as are incurred because the particular worker or workers are not able to perform on the job in the manner the employer previously expected of his new hires for the same or a similar occupation.

#### Section 124.—Special Conditions

The House amendment prohibits financial assistance to any program unless the Director determines that no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for its administration is, or has been, a member of the Communist Party. The Senate bill contains no similar provision. The conference substitute adopts a revision of the requirement which provides that the Director shall terminate financial assistance to a program under this part where he determines that any person charged, in whole or in part, with the responsibility for the administration of the program is a member of the Communist Party.

#### Section 125.—Program Participants

The House amendment would make persons who are permanent residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands eligible to participate in programs under this part. The Senate recedes.

#### SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

The Senate bill completely rewrites part D of title I of the act, relating to special impact programs. Under the House amendment the separate treatment of special impact programs is not continued. The substitute agreed upon in conference retains the provisions of the Senate bill with two changes. The following is a description of this provision of the Senate bill. Section references are to the provisions of the new part D as they appear in the conference report.

#### Section 150.—Statement of Purpose

This section provides that the purpose of part D is to establish special programs directed to the solution of critical problems existing in particular communities or neighborhoods within urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons and rural areas having substantial outmigration to eligible urban areas and which are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

#### Section 151.—Establishment of Programs

Authorizes financial assistance to public or private agencies for programs which must be restricted in number so that each is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact on the areas served. Programs may include economic and business development programs including those which provide financial and other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas served so as to provide employment opportunities for residents of such areas, community development activities which create new training and employment activities and contribute to an improved living environment, and manpower training programs which support and complement economic, business, and community development programs, including activities described in part B of title I. This latter provision was not contained in the Senate bill.

#### Section 152.—Requirements for Financial Assistance

Subsection (a) requires that before providing financial assistance the Director determines that projects and facilities to the maximum feasible extent be located in the

area served; that projects will promote the development of entrepreneurial and management skills and the ownership or participation in ownership of assisted business by residents of the area served; that projects be planned and carried out with the maximum participation of local businessmen by their inclusion on programs, boards of directors, advisory councils, or other means; that the program be coordinated with local planning under this act, the Model Cities Act, and other relevant plans for physical and human resources; that the requirements of subsections 122(e) and 124(a) of the act are met; that preference be given to the residents of the areas served in filling jobs and training opportunities, and that training programs, where feasible, train for jobs outside the area for which the program was established.

Subsection (b) prohibits the extension of financial assistance to assist in the relocation of establishments from one location to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

Subsection (c) provides that the level of financial assistance to areas served by the special impact program for related purposes under this act not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by part D.

Subsection (d) requires that the Director reserve not less than 7 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for title I for the purpose of carrying out part D. The Senate bill provided for reserving not less than 8 percent.

#### Section 153.—Application of Other Federal Resources

Subsection (a) requires that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development take steps under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure the availability of land for business location and expansion.

Subsection (b) provides that assisted areas be deemed redevelopment areas within the meaning of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and that such areas qualify for assistance under the provisions of title II of that act.

Subsection (c) requires the Director to take steps to assure that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of part D.

#### Section 154.—Evaluation

This section requires a thorough evaluation of program effectiveness to be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Director may designate and permits the payment of up to 100 percent of the costs of such evaluation.

#### Section 155.—Federal Share of Program Costs

This section provides that Federal grants for programs not exceed 90 percent of the cost unless the Director determines that grants in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of part B. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind. Where capital investment is required under contract with a private profit-making organization the Federal share of such capital investment shall not exceed 90 percent of the cost.

#### REVISION OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM PROVISIONS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment completely rewrite title II of the act, which provides for community action programs. Section references herein are to the sections of the new title II as they appear in the substitute recommended in the conference report.

#### Section 201.—Statement of Purpose

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain a statement of purpose. The Senate provision is short, merely stating it to be the purpose of the title to assist communities in opening opportunities which

enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency. The comparable House provision is very detailed. It states the purpose of the title to be to provide for community action agencies and programs and to prescribe their structure and functions. It states that the basic purpose of the title is to stimulate a better focusing of all available resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages to obtain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. The House amendment then goes on to list a number of specific purposes for which the title is enacted. The section further declares it to be the purpose of the title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor who live there to remain in such areas and to become self-sufficient therein. It also states that it is not the policy of the title or the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage rural poor to migrate to urban areas. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

#### Part A—Community action agencies; community action programs

#### Section 210.—Designation of community action agencies; community action programs

The Senate bill requires the Director to encourage the formation of community action agencies, which may be either public or private nonprofit in character. However, in order to merit assistance, such an agency must be responsible, and must be capable of carrying on a community action program, and of mobilizing public resources, as well as available private resources. It will serve as a prime sponsor for financial assistance provided under the title. It must have adequate authority to administer the funds received by it, to transfer and delegate those funds to other agencies, and to contract with public or private organizations.

The House amendment contains provisions on this subject which differ in major respects from those contained in the Senate bill. Under the House amendment a community action agency must be a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency designated by the State or a political subdivision or combination thereof, so long as it has the power to enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of the title, and is designated as a community action agency by the Director. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment, with certain clarifying amendments. These clarifying amendments require the community action agency to have the power and authority to, and be one which will, perform all of the requirements imposed on community action agencies by section 212; and, also, it must be determined to be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program, and, also, it is currently designated as a community action agency by the Director. These clarifying amendments are not in any way intended to confer on the Director any authority to make subjective judgments respecting the qualifications of a community action agency.

The House amendment also describes a community action program. It is a community based and operated program which (1) will include a sufficient number of projects to provide a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community; (2) is developed and organized in a manner appropriate to carry out the purposes of the title; and (3) conforms to supplementary criteria prescribed by the Director.



Both the Senate bill and the House amendment define what is meant by "community" for purposes of community action programs. These provisions are very similar except that the Senate bill requires the Director to consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for work and training programs, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes. The conference substitute, in subsection (c) of section 210, adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

The House amendment authorizes the Director to provide financial assistance directly to public or private nonprofit agencies (as community action agencies) which are not community action agencies designated under subsection (a) where he determines that the community action agency serving the community had failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in the title, or that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts these provisions, but with two additions. The first is to require the Director, when he exercises the authority given in this subsection, to designate the public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency, thus requiring it to meet the criteria in the bill applicable to community action agencies. The second is to permit the Director to exercise such authority where a community action agency serving a community has failed to carry out its plan in a satisfactory manner.

Subsection (e) of this section in the House amendment provides that a political subdivision cannot be included in the community action program of a State or of any political subdivision or subdivisions, if the elected or duly appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so included. It also provides that such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it will be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees. This provision is retained in the conference substitute. The conference committee expects that the Director will establish procedures which assure that appropriate political subdivisions have adequate prior notification of their inclusion in an application for an agency's designation as a community action agency.

#### Section 211.—Community Action Agencies and Boards

This section of the House amendment requires community action agencies which are States or political subdivisions of States to administer programs through a community action board and other community action agencies designated by States or political subdivisions to have a governing board. In each case, the House provided that the board be limited to 51 members and be constituted one-third public officials, at least one-third representatives of the poor and the remainder representatives of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education or other major groups and interests in the community. The Senate bill did not contain these elaborate requirements for composition of boards. The conference agreement follows the provision of the House amendment, except as specified herein.

The House amendment provides that public official membership on the board could be less than one-third of the board membership only where the number of public offi-

cials reasonably available for such service was less than one-third of the membership. The conference agreement clarifies this provision by changing the words "reasonably available for such service" to "reasonably available or willing to serve". The requirement in the House amendment that at least one-third of the members be persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served has been retained, but it is the understanding of the conferees that this language is sufficiently broad to encompass a variety of procedures for selecting representatives of the poor in different types of communities and areas. These might include nominations and elections on a neighborhood or communitywide basis, use of neighborhood meetings to which the poor are especially invited, indirect selection of communitywide board representatives by area boards which are themselves chosen by neighborhood residents, or other democratic selection techniques that may be developed to meet local conditions.

The House amendment provides that where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations with respect to programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making policy determinations affecting particular areas, such subsidiary agency is required to meet the provisions of subsection (b) relating to the maximum number of members on the board and to representation on the board of the poor, public officials, and representatives of major groups and interest in the community. The conference substitute modifies this requirement to provide that where a community action agency places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to the character, funding, extent, and administration of and budgeting for programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within a community in a subsidiary agency its membership must be broadly representative of such area, subject to regulations of the Director which assure adequate opportunity for membership of elected public officials. Community action agencies are also encouraged to make use of neighborhood-based organizations composed of residents of the area or members of the groups served, to assist in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of components of the community action program.

The House amendment permits community action boards and community action governing boards to appoint executive committees or similar groups, and to prescribe their quorum requirements. The conference substitute adopts this provision, but with the restriction that a quorum may not be less than 50 percent of the membership of such committee or group. The conference substitute also adds to this subsection a provision from the Senate bill which requires community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the community action board or governing board may petition for adequate representation.

The conference substitute includes a provision designed to clarify the right of the poor and the residents of the areas concerned to participate meaningfully in the community action programs. This provision states that each community action board established to administer the community action program of the State or of a political subdivision or subdivisions shall (1) have a full opportunity to participate in the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve poor or low-income areas with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capa-

bilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are meaningful and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries, (2) have at least one-third of its members chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the areas served, (3) be so established and organized that the poor and residents of the area concerned will be able to influence the character of programs affecting their interests and regularly participate in the planning and implementation of those programs, (4) be a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad community involvement in the programs assisted. Provisions in the House amendment also containing the requirements mentioned in (1), (2), (3) and (4) above were retained in the conference substitute and are to be found in sections 201, 211, and 212.

#### Section 214.—Housing Development and Service Organizations

The Senate bill, in section 215(b), requires each community action agency to encourage the establishment of housing development and service organizations to focus on the housing needs of low-income persons. These organizations will provide technical, administrative, and financial assistance required to help those persons to utilize existing programs and to enable sponsors to take advantage of existing mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs. While these corporations may themselves become sponsors of housing under existing programs, under no circumstances may they insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs administered by the specialized housing agencies. They will coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts. The conference substitute includes this provision.

#### Part B—Financial assistance to community action programs and related activities

#### Section 221.—General Provisions for Financial Assistance

The Senate bill in section 220(a), and the House bill in section 220 and section 221(a), prescribe the nature of community action programs which are eligible to receive general financial assistance under the title. While somewhat different in form, the provisions are substantially the same, except that in the list of examples of types of community action activities, the Senate bill refers to activities and supporting facilities designed to assist participants to obtain services for the prevention of narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics, to obtain emergency assistance through loans or grants to meet immediate or urgent individual and family needs including the need for health services, nutritious food, housing, and employment-related assistance, to remove obstacles and solve personal and family problems blocking the achievement of self-sufficiency, and to achieve greater participation in community affairs. The conference substitute adopts these provisions of the Senate bill, except for a conforming amendment recognizing the inclusion of a special program for health services and nutritious food. The Senate bill in section 220(b) provides that after July 1, 1968, the Director must require community action agencies to use a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of the title and the utilization of funds provided it. The Director may, however, extend the time for such requirement to take into account the length of time a program has been in operation. He is also required to take steps to assure the participation of other Federal agencies in support of the development and implementation of these systematic approaches. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. It is included in the conference substitute.

The House amendment in section 221(b)



permits the Director to fund limited purpose projects of public or private nonprofit agencies where there is no community action agency for the community or where the community action agency has given its approval. This provision is retained in the conference substitute.

The House amendment requires the Director to take action to assure that every reasonable effort is made by applicants to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in affected communities, and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to the submission of applications. This provision is retained in the conference substitute.

The Senate bill requires that at least 50 percent of the funds appropriated for this title must be used to finance programs locally selected to respond to particular community needs. This provision is not retained in the conference substitute.

The House amendment provides that in determining whether, in what amount, and on what conditions to extend financial assistance to new community action programs, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity with the purposes of title II. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance he is required to consider the progress made in carrying out such a program, consistent with the needs, and with due allowance for special problems of, rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific functions and duties to this end. The Senate bill, in section 220(e), contains a comparable provision which, in addition, prohibits the Director from establishing binding national priorities on funds authorized for community action programs, and instead requires him to review each application for financial assistance on its merits. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

#### Section 222.—Special Programs and Assistance

The Senate bill, in section 221, authorizes the Director to reserve funds and provide assistance for "national emphasis" programs which deal with the needs of the poor which are common to a number of communities. Except in the case of Follow Through programs and Upward Bound programs, this assistance would be provided through community action agencies, unless the community action agency does not wish to undertake the responsibility, fails to demonstrate its capability, or there is no such agency in the area. The House amendment authorizes the Director to develop and carry on special programs in order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities. This authority could be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of the authority granted to conduct community action programs. Also it could only be used with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which could be incorporated into or be coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significantly new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that, within the limits of the type of assistance contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of the act. The Director could provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under special programs, but wherever feasible the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs would be encouraged, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiency in the use of community facilities and services, better assisting persons having a variety of needs, and otherwise se-

curing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment on these matters, except that to be eligible for such assistance a program need not meet all of the criteria contained in the numbered clauses above, as long as it meets one of those criteria.

The special programs carried on under this section include those described in the following paragraphs:

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for carrying on Headstart projects as special programs. The Senate bill requires that these programs include appropriate activities to encourage parent participation and permit effective use of parent services. The House amendment requires direct participation of parents of the children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level. The Senate recedes.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain substantially the same provisions for Follow Through programs, but the Senate bill requires that the funds for these programs be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance would be provided by the Secretary, on the basis of agreements reached with the Director, directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements. A related provision adds a new section 621 to the Act which requires the Director to delegate his functions under this provision to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and requires that such functions be carried on through the Office of Education. The House amendment does not contain this provision. The House recedes.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain provisions relating to Legal Services programs. The Senate bill provides that these programs must further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services. The comparable provision of the House amendment requires that legal services programs provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in the furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. On this difference the House recedes. The Senate bill requires the Director to make arrangements under which State and local bar associations would be consulted and afforded an opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the project before it is approved and funded and to submit comments and recommendations on the operation of the project after it is approved and funded. The comparable provision of the House bill requires the Director to establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar association is afforded ample opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded. The conference report adopts the Senate language, but with the addition of the word "principal". The House amendment also contains a provision, which has no counterpart in the Senate bill, which provides that no funds or personnel made available for the legal services program under whatever provision of the act it is conducted, shall be utilized to organize or assist in organizing any unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance, or for the defense of any person charged with participating therein, or with the commission of a crime committed in the course thereof, if such person organized or assisted in organizing such demonstration or civil disturbance. The conference substitute con-

tains a modification of this provision. As modified, it would prohibit the use of funds or personnel made available for this program for the defense of any person charged with crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director determines that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available. The portion of this provision dealing with use of program funds and personnel to organize or assist in organizing unlawful demonstrations or civil disturbances is treated in the new section 613.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for a Comprehensive Health Services program to be carried out under this section. The differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment are the following: The Senate bill provides a list of examples of types of comprehensive health services which might be provided. The House amendment requires that the comprehensive health services include some of the listed types of services, but provides an exception in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simple, less comprehensive services to be established first. The Senate bill, but not the House amendment, lists family planning, narcotic addiction, and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation among the comprehensive health services which might appropriately be included in a program. The Senate bill provides that the services must be made readily accessible to low-income residents of the area, but provides that they may be available on an emergency basis or pending the determination of eligibility to all residents of the area served. The comparable provision of the House amendment requires that the services be made readily accessible to the residents of the area. The Senate bill requires the Director to solicit and consider the comments and recommendations of the principal local medical associations in the area before approving any project. There is no comparable provision in the House amendment. The conference substitute contains the above provisions of the Senate amendment with the following changes: (1) the House amendment's exception for rural areas is included, and (2) the requirement that the principal local medical association be consulted is modified by deleting "principal".

The Senate bill requires that comprehensive health services programs include programs to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. These projects would encourage health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor. In carrying out this provision, the Director would be authorized to provide or arrange for training and study in the field of health services for the poor. Under this authority the Director could arrange for the payment of stipends and allowances for persons undergoing this training and for their dependents. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are directed to achieve effective coordination of programs and projects authorized under this provision with other related activities. The House amendment does not contain this provision. It is retained in the substitute agreed upon in conference.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for Upward Bound programs. They differ only in that the Senate bill authorizes financial assistance for Upward Bound programs to be provided directly to institutions of higher education instead of through community action agencies. The House recedes.

The House amendment provides for a special program to be known as "Emergency Food and Medical Services" designed to provide on a temporary, emergency basis food-



stuffs, and medical services needed to counteract conditions of starvation and malnutrition among the poor. It provides that the program should be carried out through arrangements with other Federal and State agencies or officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency is available. It encourages community action agencies to develop projects to assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet. The Senate bill contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains a modification of the House provision. As modified, the Director would arrange to carry out these functions through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The conference substitute also requires the Director to reserve and make available from the funds appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under the title, not less than \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and not less than \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969 for purposes of this program.

It is the view of the managers that to require a community action agency or other agency or organization to satisfy matching requirements imposed by section 225, when it is competent and willing to administer an emergency food and medical services program but unable to raise the necessary non-Federal cash or services, would render it difficult to meet the objectives of this emergency program authority. Therefore it is expected that the Director, in every such instance, will use his authority under section 225(c) to waive such matching requirements in favor of full Federal funding of such a program.

The House amendment authorizes financial assistance for day care programs to be carried on as national emphasis programs. The Senate bill adds a new part B to title V of the Act providing Federal assistance for a day care program, which is described later in this statement. However, it is not the intention of the conferees that the deletion of this special emphasis program from the community action title should discourage community action agencies from including day care projects in their community action programs.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for programs to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons to be carried out as a special program. Under the Senate bill this program would be known as Project Find, while under the House amendment it would be known as Senior Opportunities and Services. The Senate bill intends the program to be for the benefit of persons over the age of 60 while the House amendment uses 55 as the eligibility age. The conference report adopts the Senate age limit. Both the Senate bill and House amendment list the development of certain all-season centers as one of the areas of activities to be included in the program. The House amendment, unlike the Senate bill, requires that these centers be controlled by the older persons themselves. The House amendment also provides that in administering this program, the Director must utilize to the maximum feasible extent the services of the Administration on Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Senate recedes on both of these points.

The House amendment provides that in developing special programs the Director must give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private. It also requires him to cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing programs which will supplement and improve programs for which those

agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he is required to provide for the operation of these programs by other Federal or State agencies pursuant to delegation of authority or suitable agreements. The Senate amendment has no comparable provision, and it is not included in the conference report.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment permit the use of funds allocated for national emphasis programs for training, research, and technical assistance. The House amendment requires it to be directly related to program development and implementation. The Senate amendment requires that assistance for such purposes be consistent with, and subject to, the provisions which relate to training; technical assistance, research, and pilot programs generally. The House recedes.

The House amendment, in section 222(d), requires the Director to provide for the continuing evaluation of the national emphasis programs. For this purpose he is required to consult with other Federal agencies or where appropriate with State agencies. The reports of these studies shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director. The Senate provisions on program evaluation are contained in section 233, and are dealt with in that section in the conference report. All provisions of the conference substitute relating to program evaluation are contained in section 233.

#### Section 223.—Resident Employment

The Senate bill requires that in the conduct of all component programs of community action programs, residents of the area and members of the groups served shall be provided maximum employment opportunity, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement. The Director is also required to encourage the employment of persons 55 years and older as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute retains this provision.

#### Section 224.—Neighborhood Centers

The Senate bill requires the Director to encourage the development of neighborhood centers designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in fields particularly relevant to the needs of the poor, and so organized as to promote the maximum participation of neighborhood residents in center planning, policymaking, administration, and operation. Such centers would be responsive to such neighborhood needs, including counseling, referral, followthrough, and community development activities, as may be necessary or appropriate to best assure a system under which existing programs are extended to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are responsive to the range of community, family, and individual problems, and are fully adopted to neighborhood needs and conditions. The House amendment does not contain this provision. It is included in the substitute agreed upon in conference.

#### Section 225.—Allotment of Funds; Limitations on Assistance

Both the Senate bill and House amendment permit separate allotments for national emphasis programs, except that the Senate amendment does not make this provision applicable to the Headstart program. The Senate recedes.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment require matching with respect to programs carried on under title II. Under the Senate bill the required matching is 10 percent of the approved cost of the assisted program. Under the House amendment the required matching is 20 percent of such cost. The House amendment provides that not more than one-half of the non-Federal contribution may be made in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services. Under the Senate bill 100 percent of the non-Federal contribu-

tion may be made in kind. Under the Senate bill if a community provides excessive non-Federal contributions the excess amount may be used to meet its matching requirements under the work-training programs. The conference substitute adopts the provisions which require non-Federal matching equal to 20 percent of the approved cost of assisted programs, and it also provides that all the non-Federal contribution may be made in kind. It also retains the provision of the Senate bill providing that excessive non-Federal contributions may be used to meet matching requirements under work-training programs.

The Senate bill contains a provision, not found in the House amendment, under which the Director may not approve a program for assistance under title II until he has satisfied himself that, to the extent in-school educational services previously provided can be expanded and adopted to meet more effectively the needs of the poor and the purposes of the assistance to be extended under the title, the agency providing such services will be utilized. The Senate recedes with the understanding that the March 5, 1966, agreement between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education as revised and currently implemented (in the light of the 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) with respect to coordination of community action programs with programs carried out under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be observed.

#### Section 231.—State Agency Assistance

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment, in section 231, authorize the Director to provide financial assistance to State agencies. In the case of the Senate bill it is provided to the appropriate State agency, and in the case of the House amendment it is provided to the State agency designated in accordance with State law. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 232.—Research and Pilot Programs

The Senate bill provides that before approving any grant or contract for a pilot project in a community which has a community action agency, the Director must solicit and consider the views of that agency on the proposed project. The comparable provision of the House amendment provides that no pilot or demonstration project may be commenced in any major political subdivision except with the approval of the local community action agency, or in the absence of a community action agency, the local governing body of that subdivision. The conference agreement contains a substitute for this provision which requires a plan for a proposed pilot or demonstration project to be submitted to the appropriate community action agency or local governing officials of the political subdivision. The plan could then be carried out if not disapproved by such agency or officials within 30 days. If it is disapproved, the plan may be carried out only if it has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of the title.

The Senate bill requires the Director to develop and carry out pilot projects which aid elderly persons to achieve greater self-sufficiency, focus upon the problems of rural poverty, are designed to develop new techniques and community based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, or are designed to encourage the participation of private organizations, other than nonprofit organizations, in community action programs. The Senate bill also contains a provision requiring the Director to conduct research and pilot projects designed to assure the more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the out-migration from rural areas. These projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally



assisted programs. The House amendment contains no provisions comparable to those of the Senate bill. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill provides that not more than 15 percent of the funds available for carrying out title II in any fiscal year may be used for the purpose of making grants for research and pilot projects. The House amendment provides that not more than 10 percent of such sums may be so used. The Senate amendment also requires that of the sums appropriated for carrying out the act for the fiscal year 1968, \$50,000,000 shall be available only for research and pilot projects provided for in subsection (d), that is, those designed to assure the more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity. The conference substitute revises this restriction so as to provide that one-third of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for such projects.

#### Section 233.—Evaluation

The Senate bill requires the Director to provide continuing evaluation of technical assistance and training programs and of research and pilot projects. For this purpose he is authorized to contract for independent evaluations of these programs or individual projects. He is also required to arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. Results would be included in the annual report required by section 608. The House amendment contains generally comparable provisions in section 214 and in section 222(d). The conference agreement includes a provision which is a substitute for the provisions of both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Under this provision, the Director is required to provide for continuing evaluation of programs carried on under title II. He is authorized, for this purpose, to contract for independent evaluations. The Director is authorized to require community action agencies to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services. He is also required to consult with other Federal and State agencies to provide, where feasible, for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a national or State basis. The opinions of program participants would also be obtained. The reports of these studies are made public records, and a summary of them is to be included in the Director's annual report. The Director is required to develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness. These standards would be considered in deciding whether to fund programs.

This section of the conference substitute also includes a requirement that the Director contract for an independent study and evaluation with a report to Congress before April 1, 1969, on the action taken under sections 210 and 211 and the effects thereof.

#### Section 240.—Assistant Directors for Community Action

The House amendment requires the Director to appoint an Assistant Director to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas who shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs and projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. He will also appoint an Assistant Director to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas who shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to the urban poor are so expended. The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 241.—Rural Areas

Under the Senate bill, the Director is required to make special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural community action

programs in order to assure that rural areas are able to utilize their full and equitable share of assistance. The House amendment provides that the Director, in carrying out title II, must take necessary steps to further extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among those residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and special competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include to the maximum extent feasible (1) the development of national emphasis programs particularly responsive to needs of rural areas, (2) establishment of research and pilot project activities specifically focused on problems of rural poverty, (3) the provision of technical assistance to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies in securing assistance under Federal programs and for the development of special or simplified procedures for use in rural areas. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill and House amendment contain provisions designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under title II between urban and rural areas. These provisions are substantially the same, except that the Senate bill requires the Director to consider the relative number of persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places. The conference substitute adopts a modified version of the Senate provision. As modified, the Director would consider relative numbers of poor persons living in urban places compared with the number of poor persons living in rural places.

The House amendment authorizes the Director to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for community action type projects if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. This assistance would be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of the title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area. The Senate amendment does not contain this provision. The Senate recedes.

The House amendment requires the Director to encourage the development of programs for interchange of personnel and the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities. Special emphasis is to be given on cooperation to create new employment opportunities. The Senate bill contains no comparable provisions. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 242.—Submission of Plans of Governors

The Senate bill provides that the provisions requiring submission of plans to Governors should include plans for carrying out part B of title I. The House did not require such plans to be submitted to the Governors. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 243.—Fiscal Responsibility and Audit

The Senate bill, in section 241, requires the Director to prescribe regulations to assure that programs under title II are carried on subject to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be deemed necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and effective use of funds. The comparable provision of the House amendment is more detailed. It provides that no funds may be released to any agency until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies have established an accounting system and internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operating efficiency, and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies, and such additional fiscal responsibilities and accounting requirements as the Secre-

tary may establish. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

The Senate bill and the House amendment both require a preliminary audit survey within three months after the first grant or contract of assistance with an agency or organization to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls. The House amendment goes on to require the Director to determine from such audit survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet his standards, and, if not, whether to suspend the assistance. If assistance is suspended, the assisted agency is given six months to come into compliance, and thereafter the assistance is terminated. The Senate recedes.

The House amendment contains a provision, not included in the Senate bill, requiring the Director to establish additional requirements, not included in the Act, as may be necessary to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under the title. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 244.—Special Limitations

The House amendment provides that the Director shall issue rules and regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per year and that any amount paid in excess of \$15,000 a year should not be considered in determining whether the requirements for matching have been complied with. The Director is, however, authorized to provide for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved. The Senate bill contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains the House provision with a minor change accentuating the need for exceptions in large metropolitan areas.

The Senate bill contains a provision not found in the House amendment under which the Director could not approve a program for assistance under title II until he has satisfied himself that, to the extent in-school educational services previously provided could be expanded and adapted to meet more effectively the needs of the poor and the purposes of the assistance to be extended under the title, the agency providing such services would be utilized. The Senate bill also contains a provision not included in the House amendment which requires the Director to use, to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Commissioner of Education and the State and local educational agencies in extending assistance for supplemental educational services which are not prohibited under the foregoing provisions. The House amendment continues provisions of existing law, prohibiting financial assistance to provide general aid to elementary and secondary education other than the provisions of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance. The comparable provision of the Senate bill provides that financial assistance should not be extended to provide general "or curricular aid" to education in any school system other than for special health, welfare, remedial and other noncurricular services designed to encourage successful participation in school. The Senate recedes with the understanding that the March 5, 1966, agreement between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education as revised and currently implemented (in the light of the 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) with respect to coordination of community action programs



with programs carried out under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be observed.

The Senate bill adds a new prohibition which barred the extension of financial assistance in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all the programs assisted under the title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency, exceed 15 percent of the total costs of carrying on such program. The Director is required, after consultation with the Bureau of the Budget, to establish criteria for determining the costs of developing and administering such programs and the total costs of such programs. If he determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 percent of the total cost but is, in his judgment, excessive, he will require the agency to eliminate such excessive administrative costs. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time, not in excess of 6 months, if he determines that the waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the title. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, but in receding and accepting the Senate language limiting administrative costs of community action agencies for title II programs to 15 percent, the House conferees clearly intend that (1) the costs directly attributable to the operation of specific component programs such as Head Start, and (2) payments to any trainees or to those employees who fall within the poverty classification as determined by the Director, shall not be counted as administrative expenses. Moreover, they recognize that in certain cases where reorganizations of local community action agencies become necessary or where the initial planning and developing of programs for new community action agencies proves difficult, it may be necessary for the Director to waive the 15-percent limitation for a second period of 6 months.

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

Section 104(c) of the House amendment contains a provision, not in the Senate bill, which would authorize loans to the elderly where it will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions. The Senate recedes.

Section 105(e) of the Senate bill completely rewrites the provisions of part B of title III which relates to assistance for migrant, and other seasonally employed, farmworkers and their families. The House amendment did not change the migratory worker provisions of the existing law. The House recedes. The following is a description of the new part B:

#### Section 311.—Statement of Purpose

This section states it to be the purpose of the part to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life.

#### Section 312.—Financial Assistance

Subsection (a) authorizes financial assistance to State and local agencies and non-profit institutions and cooperatives to carry out migrant assistance programs.

Subsection (b) authorizes such programs to include projects or activities in the fields of day-care for children, education, health, improved housing and sanitation, including the provision and maintenance of emergency and temporary housing, legal advice and representation, consumer training and counseling, the promotion of increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families, and equipping of unskilled migrant workers through education and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment

brought about by technological advancement.

#### Section 313.—Limitations on Assistance

Subsection (a) requires maintenance of effort as a condition of financial assistance.

Subsection (b) requires coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to migrants and other persons served under part B.

#### Section 314.—Technical Assistance, Training, Evaluation

Subsection (a) authorizes the Director to provide technical assistance or training of personnel as required to implement rural loan and migrant assistance programs.

Subsection (b) requires the Director to evaluate rural loan and migrant worker projects and publish the results of such evaluations in his annual report.

The conference committee wishes to emphasize the concern on the part of the Senate as expressed in the Senate Committee report that programs and projects to provide temporary housing for migrant families be continued as part of the migrant program. In this connection, the fact that the conference substitute reduced the authorization for migrant programs for fiscal year 1968 from \$30 million to \$27 million is not intended in any way by the conferees and should not be interpreted to result in a reduction of financial assistance for temporary housing for migrant workers and their families.

#### INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

The Senate bill contained an amendment relating to indemnity payments to dairy farmers. This amendment has been enacted heretofore, and therefore, is not included here.

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment make a number of substantial changes in title IV of the Act. In most instances the Senate and House changes are the same. The differences and their resolution are as follows:

(1) The House amendment of the statement of purpose requires that special attention be given to small business concerns in urban and rural areas of high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals. The Senate bill, in the comparable provisions, limits special attention to small business concerns in urban areas of high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals. The Senate recedes on this point.

(2) The House amendment authorizes the Director to use the agencies, agreements, and obligations developed under title III to insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000. The Senate recedes on this point.

(3) The Senate bill authorizes the Director to identify areas of high concentrations of unemployed or low-income persons, and, jointly with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to define the meaning of "low-income". The House amendment imposes this duty in the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, but requires him to consider recommendations of the Director. The conference substitute provides that the Director, after consultation with the Administrator, will identify the areas; but that the Administrator will define "low-income" after consultation with the Director.

(4) The Senate bill places responsibility for technical assistance and management training in the Secretary of Commerce. The House amendment puts this responsibility in the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The Senate recedes with amendments (a) requiring the Administrator to consult with the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out these provisions, (b) authorizing the President to transfer the Ad-

ministrator's technical assistance and management training functions to the Secretary of Commerce, and (c) providing for evaluations.

#### Day care projects

The Senate bill, in section 107, amends title B of the act to add a new part B which provides a new day care program. There is no comparable provision in the existing act, but the House amendment authorizes the Director to carry out a day care program as a special program under section 221. The substitute agreed upon in conference follows generally the Senate bill but differs in several particulars. Following is a description, section by section, of the day care provisions agreed to in conference:

#### Section 521.—Statement of Purpose

This section states that the purpose of the part is to provide day care for children from families which need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or to obtain objectives related to the purpose of this act. Particular emphasis is placed upon enabling the relatives of the children to undertake basic education, vocational training, or gainful employment.

#### Section 522.—Financial Assistance for Day Care Projects

Subsection (a) authorizes the financial assistance to public and private agencies and organizations to pay not more than 90 percent of the cost of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons may receive day care. Non-Federal contributions may be made in cash or in kind. These projects will provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as the children may need. Under this program, financial assistance may be provided employers, labor unions, or joint employer-union organizations, for projects at or associated with a place of employment or training where such project will be financed in major part through private funds. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under other statutes.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Director to require families which are not low-income families to make payments in whole or in part for day care services where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Director to provide technical assistance and training necessary for these programs.

Subsection (d) directs the Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate programs under their jurisdiction which provide day care so as to attain, if possible, a common set of program standards and regulations and mechanisms for coordination at the State and the local levels. In approving applications for assistance to this part of the Director is required to take into consideration the extent to which applicants attain coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas they serve and the extent to which unemployed or low-income individuals are employed in carrying out the projects.

Subsection (e) requires the thorough evaluation of each project with a view toward determining the extent to which day care may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, may have reduced the cost of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities. The Director may pay up to 100 percent of the costs of such evaluations, except that he may pay only 90 percent of



such costs when the agency itself carries on the evaluation and a report on the program must be included in the Director's annual report.

#### Section 523.—Duration of Programs

This section authorizes the carrying out of programs under this part through fiscal year 1970.

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

#### Section 601.—Office of Economic Opportunity

The Senate bill increases the number of Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity from four to five. The House amendment adds a sixth Assistant Director. The House recedes.

The House amendment adds a new subsection to section 601 which provides that the number of supergrade positions approved for the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices shall not exceed one for every 100 employees. The Senate bill contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute does not include the House provision.

#### Section 602.—Authority of the Director

The Senate bill retains, but the House amendment repeals, subsections (b) and (c) of section 602 of the act. These subsections permit the Director to employ experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, and to compensate them at a rate not in excess of \$100 per day, and to appoint, without regard to civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of private citizens and governmental officials. The conference substitute retains the provisions of existing law, except that it limits the number of days in a fiscal year during which a person may be a consultant to 100.

#### Section 603.—Political Activities

The Senate bill does not change the provision of existing law authorizing the Director to impose such requirements as may be necessary to insure that programs are not carried on in a manner supporting, or resulting in identification of such programs with, partisan political activity or activity designed to further the election or defeat of a candidate. The House amendment modifies this provision by requiring the Director to impose such requirements, and by extending the prohibition to nonpartisan political activity. The conference substitute retains all of the provisions of the House amendment, and in addition consolidates in this provision the additional prohibitions contained in new section 246 of the Act as amended by the House amendment which broaden its application beyond activity designed to influence the election or defeat of a candidate, to include (1) all partisan and nonpartisan political activity associated with a candidate or political faction or group, (2) voter assistance activities, and (3) voter registration activities. A conforming amendment is made in section 213 to consolidate in one place provisions placing restrictions on political activities.

This section is intended only to preclude the use of funds provided under the authority of the Act, directly or indirectly, to support programs of partisan or nonpartisan political activity. Where a State or political subdivision, or a public or private nonprofit agency, carries on programs assisted, in whole or in part, under this Act, the limitation of section 603(b) does not apply to any other activities they may carry on with funds not provided under the authority of the Act. Similarly, officials and personnel of such agencies are subject to the limitations of this section only as to that portion of their time for which they receive compensation provided directly or indirectly under the authority of the Act.

#### Section 604.—Appeals, Notice and Hearing

The Senate bill, in conformity with a related amendment concerning coordination, strikes out the existing provisions of section 604 (relating to the Economic Opportunity Council) and inserts a new provision which requires the Director to prescribe procedures to assure that (1) notice and opportunity for appeal to the Director will be provided for an agency or organization which would like to serve as a delegate agency under title I-B or title II and whose application to its prime sponsor or community action agency has been rejected or not acted on within a reasonable period; (2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, III-B will not be suspended for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency situations, nor will applications thereunder for refunding be denied unless the recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and opportunity to show cause why such action should not be taken; and (3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, III-B will not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient agency has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing. The House amendment contains no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes this provision.

#### Section 606.—Public Announcement of Demonstration and Research Projects

The House amendment adds a provision not contained in the Senate bill, which requires the Director or the head of any agency administering a program under the act to make a public announcement of any contract for a study, evaluation, research, or demonstration project and of the results of any such project. The announcement must be made within 30 days of entering into the contract or receiving the results, as the case may be. The Comptroller General is directed to report to Congress any failure to comply with these requirements. The conference substitute includes this provision of the House amendment, but modifies it so as to make it applicable only to research or demonstration projects.

#### Section 610.—Programs for the Elderly Poor

Section 610 of existing law declares it to be the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under the act. The Senate bill revises this section to require the Director (1) to carry out investigations and studies to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in programs under the act, (2) to maintain a constant review of all programs under the act to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration, (3) to initiate and maintain interagency liaison with appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly poor, and (4) to determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and necessary legislation to provide such authority.

The House amendment does not revise section 610, but merely amends it to require the Director to work in cooperation with the Director of the Administration on Aging in carrying out the section.

The conference substitute incorporates the provisions of the Senate bill with an additional requirement that the Director cooperate with the Director of the Administration on Aging in exercising his responsibilities under this section.

#### Section 610-1.—Comparability of Wages

Section 610-1 of existing law limits compensation of persons employed in Job Corps and community action programs to a maximum rate based on the rate of compensation

of persons providing certain substantially comparable services. The Senate bill amends this provision to base the maximum rate on the rate of compensation received by a substantial number of the persons providing such services. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. The House recedes.

#### Section 611.—Limitation on Benefits for Those Voluntarily Poor

The House amendment adds a provision, not contained in the Senate bill, requiring the Director to take necessary action to assure that no one meets the poverty criteria under the act "if his lack of income results from his refusal without good cause to seek or accept employment commensurate with his age, health, education, and ability." The Senate recedes.

#### Section 612.—Joint Funding

The Senate bill provides a new section of the act which authorizes joint Federal agency funding of programs whereby any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced to a community action or other agency assisted under the act. In such cases the local matching requirement would be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency.

The House amendment contains a comparable provision applicable only to funds advanced to community action or other agencies assisted under title II. The conference substitute incorporates the provisions of the Senate bill.

#### Section 613.—Limitations With Respect To Rioting

The House amendment adds a new section to the act which was not contained in the Senate bill. The new section would (1) prohibit employees of agencies funded under the act from participating, or assisting in any picketing, protests, demonstrations, riot or similar group activities in the course of their duties, and (2) prohibit the use of funds appropriated to carry out the act to provide assistance in any form to an individual convicted of inciting, promoting, or carrying on any riot or group activity resulting in material damage to persons or property.

The conference substitute contains a provision which provides that no person employed or assigned by an agency funded under the act shall, pursuant to or during performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted under the act by such agency, plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance.

#### Section 616.—Transfer of Funds

The Senate bill reenacts with technical changes section 616 of the act, relating to the transfer of funds, to provide authority for the Director to transfer not to exceed 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated for any program or activity to other programs or activities under the act provided that no such transfer will increase the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 percent. The House bill repeals section 616. The House recedes.

#### Section 621.—Responsibility for Follow Through Programs

The Senate bill adds a new section 621 to the act to require the Director to delegate the Follow Through program to the Office of Education. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. The House recedes.

#### Part B—Coordination

The Senate bill extensively revises part B of title VI which relates to coordination of antipoverty programs. The House bill makes no comparable changes in existing law (other



than a provision relating to coordination among Federal agencies in carrying out title II). The conference substitute incorporates the provisions of the Senate bill. The revised part B provides as follows:

#### Section 630.—Statement of Purpose

This section states the purpose of part B of title VI to be to establish an Economic Opportunity Council, provide for an information center, promote better coordination among all programs related to the act, and to improve cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of the act.

#### Section 631.—Economic Opportunity Council

Subsection (a) of this section establishes the Economic Opportunity Council in the Executive Office of the President. The Council is to be composed of the Director of OEO and the heads of such Federal departments and agencies and such Presidential assistants and other Federal officials as the President may from time to time designate. The President would designate one Council member to serve as Chairman and each member may designate an alternate to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

Subsection (b) of the section defines the responsibilities of the Council as providing for the coordination of programs and activities related to the act, developing basic policies and setting priorities with respect to such programs and activities, resolving differences among Federal departments and agencies, and initiating and arranging for the carrying out of specific actions and projects designed to achieve the objectives of the act.

Subsection (c) requires that the President appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council who in turn would appoint and fix the compensation of personnel to assist him in performance of his duties. It also authorizes employees of other Federal departments and agencies to be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide temporary assistance.

Under subsection (d) the Council's activities would, to the extent appropriate, be described in the Director's annual report to the Congress.

Subsection (e) requires the reservation of sums authorized to carry out title VI in order to carry out the purposes of section 631.

#### Section 632.—Responsibilities of the Director

This section defines the coordination responsibilities of the Director as including special studies of specific coordination problems, the continuing evaluation of all activities under the act with a view toward identifying coordination problems, and the preparation of a 5-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of Federal and other governmental expenditures needed, to eliminate poverty in the Nation within alternative periods of time. Such a plan would include estimates of the funds necessary to finance relevant programs authorized by this and other acts and any new programs which may be necessary to eliminate poverty. The plan would be presented to the Congress and updated on an annual basis.

#### Section 633.—Cooperation of Federal Agencies

Subsection (a) requires that other Federal agencies cooperate with the Director and carry out their programs so as to assist him in carrying out the programs and provisions of the act.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Economic Opportunity Council and the Director to call upon other Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials.

Subsection (c) authorizes the President to direct that programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds of Federal agencies, be carried out in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under the act.

#### Section 634.—Combinations Among Projects and Programs

This section states Federal agencies' responsibilities in terms of encouraging appropriate combinations among related projects and activities and charges the Economic Opportunity Council with responsibility for carrying on a continuing review of the operation of this section including identifying programs which may be especially appropriate for closely coordinated operations at the State or local level and evaluating and making recommendations concerning implementing procedures of various Federal agencies.

#### Section 635.—Information Center

This section sets forth provisions of the current law covering the information center, with one amendment, to specifically authorize the Director, in connection with the operation of the center, to study ways of improving existing information systems, the adequacy of data, ways in which data generated at the State or local level may be incorporated into Federal systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials, agencies, and organizations and used to further coordination objectives.

#### Section 636.—Prohibition

This section restates, with no change, a provision in the current law that prohibits use of funds to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

#### Section 637.—Special Responsibilities; Training Programs

This section restates a provision in current law setting forth certain responsibilities of the Director, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and other Federal agency heads with respect to the coordination of training programs. One technical modification deletes the specific reference to the President's Committee on Manpower, which was created by Executive order rather than by statute, in favor of a more general reference to "mechanisms prescribed by the President."

#### Section 638.—Definitions

This section defines the terms "programs related to this Act" and "coordination" as used in part B. The definition of coordination is designed to focus upon four types of actions—actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor; actions to promote better use of Federal assistance under diverse programs at the State or local level; actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources; and actions to improve communication and general cooperation.

#### AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

The Senate bill extensively revises title VII of the act which deals with special treatment of income for purposes of determining the eligibility of persons for certain public-assistance payments. The House amendment makes only two amendments to title VII of existing law. The first of these is to extend until July 1, 1968, a period within which States must act to come into compliance with the requirements of the title. The second amendment provides that the title should not apply with respect to any period after June 30, 1968. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the House provision with an amendment extending until June 30, 1969, the period during which title VII will be in effect.

#### REVISION OF VISTA PROVISIONS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment completely rewrite title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which contains the authority for the VISTA program. Section references herein are to the sections

of the new title VIII as they appear in the substitute recommended in the conference report.

#### Part A—Full-time volunteer programs

#### Section 810.—Authority To Establish Full-time Programs

The Senate bill, in describing programs and activities to which VISTA volunteers could be assigned, provides that volunteers can be assigned to mental health and mental retardation facilities only if the facilities are federally assisted. The House amendment and conference substitute do not contain this restriction.

The House amendment adds a provision not contained in the Senate bill giving the Director specific authority to give volunteers work assignments in their own or nearby communities. This provision of the House bill is included in the conference substitute.

The Senate bill provides that the assignment of any volunteer in a State can be terminated when requested by the Governor of that State within 30 days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Governor and the Director. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. This provision of the Senate bill is retained in the conference substitute.

#### Section 811.—Terms of Service

The Senate bill requires a full-time personal commitment on the part of the volunteer to the extent practicable to live among and at the economic level of the poor and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours. The House amendment omits the words "to the extent practicable". The conference substitute restores the provisions of the Senate bill.

#### Part B—Auxiliary and special volunteer programs

#### Section 822.—Demonstration Projects To Help Young Adult Criminal Offenders

The Senate bill contains a provision authorizing the Director to provide for demonstration projects in not more than four areas during the fiscal year 1968, and not more than six areas during each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years, under which VISTA volunteers and members of the Teacher Corps provide youthful criminal offenders, aged 16 to 25, with intensive education, training, and counseling for at least a 6-month period prior to their release from confinement and for at least 6 months thereafter. Not more than 100 VISTA volunteers may be employed under this section during fiscal year 1968, and not more than 150 during the 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Commissioner of Education would furnish on a reimbursable basis members of the Teacher Corps. Not more than 40 Teacher Corps members would be used during fiscal year 1968 and not more than 60 such members during the 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Teacher Corps members participating in the program who are not experienced teachers would be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per week for each dependent. Experienced teachers would be compensated at a rate set by the Commissioner of Education. The House bill does not contain this provision. The conference substitute retains it.

#### Part C—General provisions

#### Section 832.—Participation of Older Persons

The Senate bill provides that the Director shall encourage the participation of older persons as volunteers under title VIII. The House amendment provides that he shall encourage older persons and older person membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies under title VIII. The Senate recedes.

#### Section 834.—Special Limitations

The House amendment adds a provision not contained in the Senate bill prohibiting the use of funds authorized herein to finance labor union or related activity. The confer-



ence substitute further limits the authority by extending this provision to cover financing of "anti-labor" as well as "labor" organizations.

The Senate bill provides that volunteers shall be required to provide such information concerning their qualifications (including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity) and would be subject to such selection procedures as the Director shall prescribe, and authorizes the Director to fix special procedures for the selection as volunteers of low-income residents of the area to be served. The conference substitute incorporates these provisions of the Senate bill with a number of technical changes.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

The Senate bill, in section 112, amends section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to change the rate of training allowances paid thereunder in certain cases so that they would not exceed unemployment compensation payable in the State. The House amendment contains no comparable provisions. The Senate recedes.

#### TITLE II—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The Senate bill, in title II, and the House amendment, as an amendment adding a new part C to title VI, contains provisions which are comparable in most respects, relating to an investigation and evaluation by the Comptroller General of programs and activities carried on under the act.

Under the Senate bill the Comptroller General would transmit his final report to the Congress by February 1, 1969. The House amendment requires a report to Congress not later than May 1, 1968. The conference substitute requires a report to Congress not later than December 1, 1968.

The House amendment permits employees, as well as officers, to hold hearings. The conference substitute, like the Senate bill, permits only officers to hold hearings.

The Senate bill permits payment of \$50 a day per diem. The House amendment fixes the figure at \$100 a day. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the investigation and evaluation. The House amendment requires the Director to transfer to the Comptroller General from the funds available to carry out the act, such sums as might be required, but not in excess of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The House recedes.

#### TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

The House amendment makes it a felony for any officer, director, agent, or employee connected with an agency receiving financial assistance under the act to embezzle, willfully misapply, steal, or obtain by fraud any funds or property granted or paid under the act. The Senate bill did not contain this provision. It is retained in the conference substitute.

#### TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 301 of the House amendment provides that, while the bulk of the amendments will take effect immediately, the provisions of section 202 of the act as in effect heretofore would continue, until June 30, 1968, to apply to community action agencies in existence and funded prior to the enactment of these amendments, except that any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency before that date must provide for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and funds to any successor agency. The Senate bill contained no comparable provisions. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the House provision but with a proviso which is designed to provide for orderly transition and

to preclude premature termination of existing programs. This provision would permit continued funding between June 30, 1968, and February 1, 1969, of the existing community action program of an existing community action agency which does not meet the requirements of the first sentence of section 210(a) but only if no other agency has been (1) designated by the Director under section 210 as the community action agency for that community and (2) funded under the authority of section 221 or 222(a). This provision is not intended to relieve any community action agency of its obligation to meet by July 1, 1968, the provisions (including the new board requirement of a 51 member limit and one-third public official representation) of section 211(b).

The second House amendment changes the title of the bill. The Senate recedes.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
EDITH GREEN,  
FRANK THOMPSON,  
JOHN H. DENT,  
ROMAN PUCINSKI,  
JAMES G. O'HARA,  
CARL ALBERT,  
SAM M. GIBBONS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### H.R. 7977, TO ADJUST CERTAIN POSTAGE RATES AND RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DULSKI submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1013)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967'.

##### "TITLE I—POSTAL RATES

###### "FIRST-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 101. (a) Sections 4252 and 4253 of

title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 4252. Size and weight limits

"The maximum size of first-class mail is one hundred inches in length and girth combined and the maximum weight is seventy pounds.

"§ 4253. Postage rates on first-class mail

"(a) Postage on first-class mail is computed separately on each letter or piece of mail. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the rate of postage on first-class mail weighing thirteen ounces or less is 6 cents for each ounce or fraction of an ounce.

"(b) First-class mail weighing more than thirteen ounces shall be mailed at the rates of postage established by section 4303(d) of this title and shall be entitled to the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable.

"(c) The rate of postage for each single postal card and for each portion of a double postal card, including the cost of manufacture, and for each post card and the initial portion of each double post card conforming to section 4251(c) of this title is 5 cents.

"(d) The rate of postage on business reply mail is the regular rate prescribed in this section, together with an additional charge thereon of 2 cents for each piece weighing two ounces or less and 5 cents for each piece weighing more than two ounces. The postage and charge shall be collected on delivery."

"(b) Section 4251(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and (4)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(4) bills and statements of account, and (5)'.

"(c) Subsection (d) of section 4251 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the definition of drop letters, is repealed.

"(d) The table of contents of chapter 59 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"'4252. Weight limit.'"

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"'4252. Size and weight limits.'"

###### "AIRMAIL

"SEC. 102. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in section 4304 of this title and subsection (b) of this section, the rate of postage on domestic airmail weighing not more than 7 ounces is 10 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof.

"(b) The rate of postage on each postal card and post card sent as domestic airmail is 3 cents."

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The rates of postage on air parcel post are based on the eight zones described in section 4558, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title in accordance with the following tables:

	"Zones					
	Local 1, 2, and 3	4	5	6	7	8
Not over 1 lb.	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80
Over 1 lb. but not over 1½ lbs.	.98	1.02	1.07	1.14	1.18	1.24
Over 1½ lbs. but not over 2 lbs.	1.16	1.23	1.34	1.47	1.55	1.68
Over 2 lbs. but not over 2½ lbs.	1.40	1.48	1.62	1.79	1.91	2.08
Over 2½ lbs. but not over 3 lbs.	1.64	1.73	1.90	2.11	2.27	2.48
Over 3 lbs. but not over 3½ lbs.	1.88	1.98	2.18	2.43	2.63	2.88
Over 3½ lbs. but not over 4 lbs.	2.12	2.23	2.46	2.75	2.99	3.28
Over 4 lbs. but not over 4½ lbs.	2.36	2.48	2.74	3.07	3.35	3.68
Over 4½ lbs. but not over 5 lbs.	2.60	2.73	3.02	3.39	3.71	4.08











# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 11, 1967  
For actions of December 8, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 201

## CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....5	Extension service.....3	Poverty.....1
Adjournment.....10	Foreign trade.....7,17	Price supports.....4
Budget.....15	Job Corps.....16	Reclamation.....6
Dairy.....11	Meat inspection.....18	Research.....3
Economy.....13	Minerals.....19	Rural development.....8
Education.....2,14	Peanuts.....5	Social security.....9
Electrification.....12	Pine gum.....4	Taxes.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills to stabilize crude pine production and to authorize transfer of peanut acreage allotments. Senate agreed to conference report on poverty bill. Senate passed bill to provide extension service to D. C.

## SENATE

1. **POVERTY.** Agreed, 62-16, to the conference report on S. 2388, the poverty bill (pp. S18222-34). The bill would continue the anti-poverty program for two years and would authorize \$1.98 billion for the first year and \$2.18 billion for the second.
2. **EDUCATION.** Continued debate on H. R. 7819, the elementary and secondary education bill. pp. S18215-22, S18258-60, S18262-71, S18273-6
3. **EXTENSION SERVICE RESEARCH.** Passed as reported S. 1999, to make the Federal City College a land-grant college for the purpose of extending to the District of Columbia the extension service, marketing research, and agricultural college endowment programs. pp. S18243-5



4. PINE GUM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2511, to provide for price supports on crude pine gum (S. Rept. 907). p. S18182
5. PEANUTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11565, to authorize the sale or lease of peanut acreage allotments (S. Rept. 908). p. S18182
6. RECLAMATION. Passed as reported S. 51, to authorize the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Ore. pp. S18257-8
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Long, Mo., discussed foreign agricultural markets and inserted an article, "A Look Ahead at Agricultural Trade Policy." pp. S18191-3
8. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Mundt urged the House to consider as early as possible next year S. J. Res. 64, to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development, and inserted several articles on urban-rural economic balance. pp. S18193-5
9. SOCIAL SECURITY. Several Senators spoke in opposition to the proposed conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. S18260-2
10. ADJOURNED until Mon., Dec. 11. p. S18280

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. DAIRY. Sen. Javits inserted the speech of a member of the National Milk Producers Federation, "What Dairymen Can Do," dealing with the "problems" of the dairy industry. pp. A6043-4
12. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bow stating that the proposed Electric Reliability Act is an "unwise attempt to extend Federal control...into areas...better served by...private enterprise," and insertion of excerpts of a supporting statement by an Ohio Power Co. vice president. p. A6047
13. TAXES; ECONOMY. Extension of remarks by Rep. Colmer on the "problems" of spending and taxes and the insertion of excerpts of his remarks on this subject pp. A6048-9, A6064-5  
Rep. Robison inserted an article by a Budget Bureau consultant, "A New Road to a Stable Economy." pp. A6067-8
14. EDUCATION. Reps. Bow and Pucinski inserted articles praising the vocational education program. pp. A6052-3, A6072-3
15. BUDGET. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell expressing concern for the "impact which an across-the-board budget cut might have," and insertion of supporting statements from the various regulatory agencies. pp. A6058-61
16. JOB CORPS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Udall praising the Job Corps and insertion of an article, "One of the Nation's Best Camps." pp. A6062-3
17. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Reuss inserted a statement by the State Dept. and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, "Progress Achieved in the Reduction of Nontariff Barriers to Trade." pp. A6071-2



for providing the necessary authority for interstate project funding and for regional projects. Through the special projects and conferences approved to date, the willingness and desire of State education agencies to cross their territorial boundaries in pursuing solutions to pressing education problems has been unmistakably clear.

The special projects, funded on the basis of a 15-percent set-aside, have launched significant interstate approaches to common educational problems, including personnel administration, comprehensive planning, and urban education. Such projects will encourage the States to gain strength and to learn from each other rather than to exist in isolation.

#### COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AMENDMENT

The comprehensive planning amendment is another vital proposal submitted to the Congress this year. There has never been a greater need for educational planning at all levels—local, State, and Federal. This amendment would enable States, local school districts, and metropolitan areas to strengthen their educational planning capabilities.

The comprehensive planning proposal would authorize \$15 million, the major portion of which would be allotted to State educational planning agencies. Since the States have proved willing and able to tackle common educational problems under section 505, the new proposal for comprehensive planning includes a set-aside to authorize discretionary support for interstate groupings and interstate projects solely in the areas of planning.

#### REGIONAL ACTION

The comprehensive planning proposal could support projects on a regional basis similar to the following one funded under section 505:

A project to be administered by the New York State Department of Education will survey the 50 States to identify those interested in, and legally able to, participate in a reciprocity compact for teacher certification. The goal is to have States with appropriate statutory power come to an agreement on common standards for approving teacher education programs. This would establish a new basis for reciprocity whereby a teacher who graduated from any State-approved educational institution could be immediately certified in any one of the cooperating States.

We think that there is a great need for more projects similar to this one. It would be impossible for the States to encourage an increased number of such projects under the House version of title V which eliminates both section 505 and the proposal for comprehensive planning. This deletion of programs would require voluntary and simultaneous agreements and contracts between all participating States if they wish to continue similar projects—at best, a complicated and slow procedure.

Here again, I believe there is an important role for the U.S. Office of Education in utilizing scarce resources to the greatest advantage by application of a national perspective through a simple administrative mechanism. I would, therefore, encourage you to retain the present authority of section 505 and to adopt the comprehensive planning proposals included in S. 1125.

Thank you for the opportunity to reopen the discussion of amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say, in part reply to the Senator from South Carolina that, of course, we can find some schoolmen—the testimony is in the Record—who would like to get funds with those funds being earmarked for

planning. However, we have a responsibility as a Congress to see to it that Federal money is wisely spent, for such purposes as we feel to be in the national interest, so long as we do not dictate educational policy.

There is a basic difference between requiring what shall be taught and funding programs of determining what in the best judgment of the competent authority in the teaching profession needs to be taught.

There is a difference between the mandatory act and the optional or permissive act. What we say is that if a State wants to apply for funds for this purpose it should not be precluded from doing so.

The pending bill is full of authorizations for specific projects. When we authorize in the pending bill \$1 million the first year, \$3 million the second year, and \$9 million before the authorization runs out, for institutes to help what I have said before are those most tragic little boys and girls in this country that are both blind and deaf, are we dictating State educational policy?

Mr. President, when we have another authority that seeks to strengthen vocational education in the States at the secondary and postsecondary schools levels, are we dictating State educational policy? Not at all. We are leaving the administration of those programs and projects to the States, but we are affording an opportunity to those States which wish to avail themselves of this source of funding for these purposes.

The Senator cites the testimony of one witness for one organization. Many witnesses testified at our hearings and pointed out that we are not going to give protection to the rural areas in which there has been no planning assistance to those school districts or to the metropolitan areas that I referred to earlier unless we have a comprehensive planning provision.

Fifteen million dollars is involved in the pending bill for authorizations for the whole country for the first year.

The record is replete with testimony from school superintendents from some of the rural areas and from some of the metropolitan areas to the effect that they have to have some help in working out the planning program that this section of the bill seeks to provide.

We find on page 976 the testimony that we need this program in order to prevent the crippling in the big cities and the rural areas in the several States of their cooperative ability to meet their aggregate educational needs which call for planning at the State level.

The Federal Government does not do the planning for them. It provides the money for them to do the planning for themselves. That \$15 million of the taxpayers' money must be devoted to the problems that we call educational planning, to help the State educational agencies raise their standards and provide greater assistance to the local school districts.

That is the thrust of the whole proposal.

Mr. President, we will be in conference. If we take this proposal out of

the bill, we will not have anything in conference. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpted material from the hearing record to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### III

The Congress recognized staffing shortages and other problems occasioned by the rapid growth in responsibility of State departments of education, when it included Title V in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This title authorized grants to State education agencies for projects, programs and activities designed to "make a significant contribution to strengthening the leadership resources . . . or . . . ability to participate in meeting the educational needs of the State." These grants have been used to plan, develop, improve and expand the capability of State educational agencies to identify educational problems and needs; to evaluate educational programs; to provide support or services for collecting, analyzing and reporting State and local educational data; to disseminate information relating to the overall status of education in the State; and to develop and provide leadership, administrative, or specialist services throughout the State.

During the first year, the States applied for funds to support 1,800 new positions—1,000 of them at the professional level—for their understaffed personnel structures. These new positions have begun to alleviate the personnel needs of State educational agencies.

In addition to the general provision, 15 percent of Title V funds are earmarked for special project grants. Under section 505, grants are made to "State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which . . . hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States."

Fifteen special projects and 10 special area workshop conferences were funded under the FY 1966 Section 505 allocation. Virtually all the States and territories were involved in varying combination in these special projects.

The States widely endorse the Section 505 concept as providing the necessary authority for utilization of their resources on an interstate basis. Through the special projects and conferences funded to date, the willingness and desire of State education agencies to cross their territorial boundaries in pursuing solutions to pressing education problems has been unmistakably clear.

The special projects have also launched significant interstate approaches to common educational problems, including personnel administration, comprehensive planning, educational information, school district organization, teacher education, information systems, curriculum reform, teacher certification, and urban education.

Indeed, those special projects which dealt with regional cooperative activities among the States were of such high caliber that they led to the proposal for the Comprehensive Planning program which has already been explained by Secretary Gardner.

The willingness of the States to tackle common educational problems indicated a readiness to assume the major role in comprehensive planning. The new proposal would authorize discretionary support for interstate groupings such as the Southern Regional Educational Board, the Compact of the Western States and the New England Board of Higher Education.



It could also support interstate projects similar to the following one funded under Section 505:

A three-year project, administered by Maryland, with Florida, Michigan, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia participating, on Statewide teacher education programs, is designed to strengthen the role of the State agencies in teacher preparation. Joint responsibility between local educational agencies and teacher education institutions will be developed and special emphasis will be given to laboratory experiences in elementary and secondary schools as a part of teacher training.

If States are to gain strength from each other rather than to exist in isolation, we need more projects like this. They will not be developed under the House version of Title V.

In addition, the administration version of Title V would authorize \$15 million—most of which would go to State educational planning agencies—to help States and local school districts strengthen, or initiate educational planning capabilities. Higher education planning could be included at the discretion of the State. A portion of the funds would be allotted at the discretion of the Commissioner to encourage metropolitan and regional planning. In the first year of Title V, States originally requested 25 percent of the funds and 27 percent of their personnel to work in the planning and evaluation areas. However, by the end of the fiscal year, the States had amended their applications to reduce the planning function to 19 percent of the funds and 20 percent of the positions.

For Fiscal Year 1967, the applications have reduced this function still further: less than 18 percent of the funds requested, and 14 percent of the positions budgeted are to be used for planning.

The State departments of education have not lost interest in planning. Far from it. Other concerns were more pressing. In order to secure funds authorized by some 15 pieces of new Federal legislation before the end of the fiscal year, they had to mount new programs immediately. There were other pressures as well. Local education agencies had urgent needs for the improvement of instruction. The State agency had to improve its general administrative capacity. Capacity to deal with the masses of educational data emanating from all sources had to be developed.

The growing responsibilities thrust on them by the growing Federal programs of aid to education require all their existing resources, and more. They cannot afford to plan. Yet, they cannot afford not to.

The House-passed bill would eliminate both this new proposal and Section 505 of ESEA, thereby, crippling the big cities, rural areas, and the several States in their cooperative ability to meet their aggregate educational needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senator apparently believes that my amendment—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment?

Mr. THURMOND. I was going to accept a voice vote.

Mr. MORSE. The manager of the bill wants a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the time not run against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. THURMOND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued to call the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 379 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Pearson
Beggs	Hill	Pell
Brooke	Javits	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Spong
Carlson	Lausche	Stennis
Case	Mansfield	Symington
Clark	Metcalf	Thurmond
Cooper	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	Morse	Williams, Del.
Harris	Mundt	Yarborough

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Anderson	Gore	McIntyre
Baker	Griffin	Miller
Bartlett	Gruening	Mondale
Bayh	Hansen	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Morton
Brewster	Hatfield	Nelson
Burdick	Hayden	Pastore
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Percy
Church	Holland	Proxmire
Cotton	Jackson	Randolph
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Dodd	Kennedy, N.J.	Smith
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Eastland	Long, La.	Tower
Ervin	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	McGee	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGovern	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, just 1 minute.

As I understand, the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would just remind Senators that the Chief State school officers in the Nation, the State superintendents of education, have asked for these two amendments. I have no particular interest in them, except I think they are good amendments.

This is what the educators want—not the politicians—and the people who administer the law. That is the reason I have offered them.

I have before me a letter explaining the amendments, and we have placed a copy of this letter on the desk of each Senator. This is what they want. I offered the amendments because they do want them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I have 30 seconds remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has cited the leader of one educational lobby. Great educators from the great metropolitan areas and many urban centers do not want the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time now yielded back?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 493 of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The amendment was rejected.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference



on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes. I move the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of December 7, 1967, pp. H16505-H16522, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be notified—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CLARK (continuing). That the Senate is now considering this conference report, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator moved awfully fast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania moved that the Senate take up the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Well, that is another matter, of course.

Mr. CLARK. I was moving not because I was in a hurry—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania requested a call for the quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his call for the quorum?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I am glad to extend that courtesy to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Let us understand the practice we are following. I do not say that I am going to oppose the conference report, but I should like to know what we are doing.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, I understand, has moved to take up the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. And that motion is not debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The Chair stated that it was decided in the affirmative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not object. I just wanted to be sure of the practice.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I renew my request. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield momentarily so that I may ask for the yeas and nays, unless the Senator has something else in mind?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the conference report on S. 2388 is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order. The Senator from Pennsylvania will suspend until the Senate is in order, so that the conference report may be considered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate attachés either seat themselves or leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate attachés are requested to take their seats or leave the Chamber. The Senate will be in order before the Senator proceeds further.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I note that some of the Senate attachés are still on their feet. They probably have nothing else to do. They are evidently in here only out of curiosity. I ask that they be ordered to leave the Chamber, or that they be seated in the rear of the Chamber and remain seated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's request is in order. Let there be order in the Senate. The Senator will not proceed until it is in order, so that the Senate can consider the conference report and Senators may be heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are 196 differences, most of them of some substance, between the poverty bill which passed the Senate and the poverty bill which passed the House.

Necessarily, the report which is now brought before this body is a compromise—as are all hotly contested conferences.

I believe that this is a good bill. There are many things in it I do not like. However, I have no hesitation in recommending its approval to the Senate, as do seven of my eight colleagues, all of the Democrats on the conference committee, and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] among the Republicans.

The major differences between the two bills were, first, with respect to the so-called Green amendment, on which the House insisted very vigorously. The amendment was and is most controversial. It provides authority for States and local governmental units to become com-

munity action agencies if they choose and are designated by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to run the community action programs which are set forth in title II of the bill.

The Senate labored arduously to assure that there were strong and adequate bypass provisions related to the Green amendment under which, in the event the Director was dissatisfied with the manner in which the local government units or their designees were conducting the community action programs, they could be bypassed under certain conditions.

Another important difference between the two Houses was money. The House limited the amount for 1968 to \$1.6 billion. We in the Senate went to conference with a 2-year bill. The House bill was a 1-year measure. We went to conference with an authorization for the first year of \$2.258 billion, and for the second year of \$2.4 billion.

The conference resolved that difference by accepting the 2-year bill. We were able to persuade our House colleagues, who will act on the bill Monday, to authorize \$1.980 billion for the first year and \$2.180 billion for the second year. I believe that resolution of the money question was, on the whole, favorable to the position of the Senate conferees.

The sums authorized may be substantially in excess of what the two Appropriations Committees will allow. However, the money authorized is not adequate to do an appropriate job. But with the war in Vietnam continuing at the present pace, it is, in my opinion, unrealistic to expect that we can get for a whole year of the poverty program as much as is being spent in 1 month in Vietnam. That is the condition which confronts us, and not a theory.

A third important difference between the two Houses dealt with the proposition that when a program is funded which requires a local contribution, that local contribution must be made, in part at least, in cash. The House provided it should; the Senate that it should not. I am glad to say the Senate prevailed in that regard, and what is included in the bill is provision that 80 percent of the funding is to be by the Federal Government and 20 percent of the funding by the localities, which may be in cash or in kind.

There are a great many other important matters which were in dispute between the two Houses but, in my opinion, they need not be explained to the Senate in detail at this time, although I am prepared to answer any questions which Senators may have with respect to them.

It is my understanding that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] desires to address the Chamber at some length with respect to the conference report, and I now yield the floor in order that he may do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we can notify Members of the Senate that I shall be addressing myself to what I consider to be some very critical difficulties with this report. As the Senator



from Pennsylvania has said, I did not sign it. I did not sign it advisedly.

Mr. President, I shall now suggest the absence of a quorum. Before doing so, I urge the attachés to advise Senators who may be interested in the conference report that I intend to address myself to its merits. I do not know that I shall insist on a live quorum. Perhaps I shall. But I do think more Senators should be in attendance to hear what is taking place. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is for me a very sad day. It is an especially sad day in view of the conclusion to which I have come that it would be counterproductive to seek to have the conference report recommitment or to seek to defeat it. That makes it especially unfortunate, as I think the report has within it a confession of bankruptcy in so critical and important an element of the antipoverty program as to make me weep for my country and its creativity.

Nonetheless, I am a responsible legislator, and as responsible legislators we have to keep our eye on the main point of helping the poor. So notwithstanding the deep feeling I have upon his subject, I have regretfully come to the conclusion that, rather than oppose, I must support the conference report in order to get something done and to get some stability into the program, which is now operating on literally a day-to-day basis. But that does not make it right. What is being done is completely wrong. However, the balance of practicality, to which I am myself yielding, makes it desirable to take the action we are taking. I am sure that Senators can understand, therefore, why there is this very clear lack of joy in my heart today.

The essence of the antipoverty program—what made it a gifted idea—was that not only would it give relief to the poor, it would also enable the poor to escape from endemic poverty by dint of their own efforts and responsibility. If not, it would be merely another welfare program. We have lots of welfare programs; and we shall have a big welfare bill before us next week. All it will do will be to deal with welfare programs—constructively, I hope, but nonetheless with a welfare program approach not involving any real participation by the poor.

This was a creative hope that by giving people personal dignity and responsibility, giving them training and opportunity not only to get a job but even to go into business for themselves, we could break the cycle of poverty.

But beyond everything else in respect to the program was the fact that the poor would acquire personal dignity and responsibility.

Indeed, the dominant concept of the antipoverty program was that the poor

themselves would have the creative role in the development of the program; and, because this would be a program of self-help, they would profit far beyond the expenditure of moneys and the mechanical arrangements involved. They would be building themselves up to be people who could be entrusted with responsibility, and to feel that they were not just the poor—to wit, ostracized members of the community—but that they were creative human beings, who had the capacity for running a show to some extent themselves. This would bring about, in those to whom it happened, a pride and dignity in achievement which would serve as an example to all the others, and be one of the most important aspects of the antipoverty program.

Mr. President, with all respect to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and to every other member of the conference who signed the report, that concept is now swept right out of the room, and there has been substituted for it the concept that, just as welfare is run by municipalities, so the antipoverty program is to be run by municipalities.

The form remains; that is, the poor are to be consulted, the poor are to have an advisory role, the poor are to have an administrative role, with one-third of every administering community action board is to be composed of the poor. All of that remains, Mr. President, but the substance is gone. I repeat: The form of mass participation by the poor remains, but the substance is gone. And the substance is gone, Mr. President, because any political subdivision that chooses to do so may become itself the policy-setting agency, the programing agency, and the allocator of the money.

Mr. President, we must realize that in the whole conduct of the program up to now only 41 out of 1,050 of these community action agencies are political subdivisions, but the overwhelming majority are not. And under the new bill, they all will be, or will all be capable of being. How many will be, of course, we do not know as yet. But in any case, the political subdivisions have the first call. And if there is a political subdivision that wants to be a community action agency, it must be made one. And this is all in the name of efficiency and accountability. That is what it is for. That is what the other body dug in its heels about on this very proposition.

A deal was made. Everybody knows that. And what I am saying is nothing that is necessarily to the discredit of anybody. A deal was made to get the votes for this program, and the votes had to be gotten from people who allegedly felt that they could not vote for it unless this were done.

A price was paid not only in the House, but also in the conference. It is as blunt and as naked as that. And the price is a price to the country. And all the good will in the world does not wipe it out.

In a very real sense, this is a test of me, not just of the conference. If I were simply an idealist, with no other considerations, I would fight this provision tooth and nail here and everywhere else in the country and make it a major public issue.

Mr. President, I believe that this effort is more important than that.

Instead, I am going to lend myself to try to make the program work even with this albatross around its neck.

Mr. President, the matter is by no means irremediable. If it becomes a shocking disgrace to the United States of America, as it easily could, with every city hall having a brandnew barrel of pork to use for patronage, and for buying votes, then as the Presiding Officer knows, and as I know, it will be dismantled.

Mr. President, what a sad thing that we must accept this in the last week of the session of Congress because in a most ill-advised way a deal was made in the other body which was honored in the conference. I am not imputing any fault to them. It is another philosophy, another point of view.

Because we are in the last week of the session of Congress and because the program in total is in grave danger, and if dismantled it may never be resurrected, we now have to take the measure as it is. That does not make it right. And it does not remove the danger.

It is sad that we may have to work through a time of disgrace and tribulation with 30 million poor in the country in order to get some good out of the measure.

I hope and pray only one thing, that I am wrong and that they may be right, and that the city halls may administer this measure with a sense of decency, very much as it is being run today in terms of the participation by the poor.

This is possible. The pending bill does not say that they must use the money for patronage or for political purposes. Not at all. On the contrary, it says the opposite. However, it does not require that in terms of organization.

The law can be administered so as to be a shining credit to our whole country. We have had laws in effect before that have involved great risk of danger and inequity. And those laws have been well administered and have turned out to be a blessing to the country.

I can only hope and pray fervently that some of the things I will say and some of the material I will put in the *Record* will be proven to be wrong.

The fact that I am not signing the conference report may have some influence in that respect. I hope that others will join with me.

I am not by any means the only one who feels this way. I am sure that a majority of the Members of the Senate feel precisely as I do. But I am fairly sure that if I had moved to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees to insist upon the Senate version on this policymaking part of the bill, I would have perhaps received 10 votes since many would fear that a recommitment would kill the program. That effort would have been completely counterproductive, because then it could have been argued—although it would have been untrue—that the Senate, too, has approved of this inequitable arrangement.

I hope that perhaps what I am doing this afternoon may have some meaning and some influence in the days ahead



which will be so rough for the antipoverty program by spotlighting and discouraging the possible abuses.

Mr. President, to get down to the nuts and bolts, let me first say that before I start with my prepared text, I hold no criticism of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] or any other conferee.

We could not have had more honorable men or men of greater skill or devotion than my colleagues on the conference committee.

Nobody worked harder than did the Senator from Pennsylvania. He felt he had to get a bill. And I am not going to say anything about that. The Senator expressed himself on the matter very eloquently in conference.

Nobody sympathizes more with the chairman than do I, because I have had to take a lot of things during conferences. I have been in that position on many occasions, and I know how it feels to leave with that empty feeling in one's heart because you know that you have not gotten the result which you were sent there to accomplish.

The Senator from Pennsylvania fought with great skill. He got excellent results in many things.

But the fundamental cancer in this thing remains. This is the matter which we are discussing here today.

I think that the money item was fairly settled. I think that insofar as we could—being unwilling to break up the conference over the matter of the city hall or so-called Green amendment—we got some concessions.

Indeed, my chairman said at the press conference—and I hope he will not reiterate it here—that he thought we had not gotten concessions that were meaningful.

Although I am a member of the other party, I was the one who said that I thought we had gotten some meaningful concessions. Let me say again that the program could be run properly, even with this provision in the bill. However, the inclusion of this provision gives it the capability of being run so improperly that it must be shown to the country how improperly it could be run.

Every politician—and I use that word not in its best sense—can use this provision to his advantage. It is wide open and ready made to be ridden by them in their control of the program.

Control of the program is turned over to city hall. That is provided for in section 210(a) of the bill, which clearly says that a community action agency shall be the State or political subdivision itself or, at the option of the politicians, some other agency chosen by them. So, wherever the city hall wants to take over the poverty program, it can do so and has the ability to do so.

That is a major change from the present situation where the control over what group shall be the local agency is held by the Director of the OEO, and the initiative in organizing a program has most typically been taken by private citizens rather than by public officials.

Let me digress from my prepared remarks at this point to say there is a provision in the bill which requires that all

agency boards be split one-third, one-third, one-third: one-third public officials, one-third the poor, one-third citizens of high caliber generally. I was always ready to accept that. When you get below that level, to the neighborhood boards, there we leave them free of the requirement of having one-third public officials—and I contended for that for very important reasons which relate to neighborhood forms of organization. I never had any objection to the House insisting that in the program and policy level, one-third of the board would be public officials. But they went far beyond that. Any political subdivision can be the community action agency itself, and when it is, that locks it in, and that is that.

As I said earlier, at the present time only 41 of 1,050 community action agencies are public bodies.

Under the new bill, the Director can refuse to designate a political subdivision as the official community action agency only under extremely restrictive requirements. He must find that the applicant does not have the "power," the "authority," or the "will" to perform the functions of a community action agency, or that it is not "capable" of doing so. Any city council, in my judgment, as I read this amendment, can probably give itself the power and authority to run such a program, if it does not have them already, and can take over its policy directions and programming. That is the essence of the basic, deep objection I have to what has been done.

Whenever a political subdivision takes over as the community action agency, the representatives of the poor and of other private groups are excluded from participation in the determination of policy.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that. When a political subdivision itself becomes the community action agency—which is completely, for practical purposes, within its power to do—the poor and other private groups are excluded from participating in the determination of policy. They can administer; but the policy is firmly in the hands of the political agency and its officials. Under the present act, policy at the local level is set by boards of which one-third are representatives of the poor.

Under the Green amendment, as accepted by the conferees, the board on which sit representatives of the poor as well as representatives of the community generally—business, industry, labor, religion, and welfare organizations—only "administers" the program. This board "participates in development and implementation" of programs but it is essentially advisory with respect to policy.

Let us understand that we fought this battle for days on end, uphill and down, and I stood very actively with my Senate colleagues in the fight; and we got nowhere.

The limitation of board power in respect of policy was deliberate on the part of the other body—at least, the majority Members of the other body—since the proponents of the Green amendment sought to make clear that where a city hall became the community action agency, its governing officials—to

wit, the city council—could call the shots, without the poor participating in the actual decisionmaking process.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Can the Senator cite some practical examples of the application of the provisions he has just identified?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

A community action agency, for example, must submit a program. Such a program covers the items in the fields of education, daycare, manpower training, provisions for the elderly, youth recreation, community workers—that is, people who might do work that is needed in the community which is not susceptible to private employment—helping in hospitals, and so forth. They would decide on a program including these elements, and they would stipulate what they sought for each in terms of the priorities and in terms of the total resources which would be made available to them.

That function now will be strictly in the hands of the politicians. They are required to consult with the public and the poor, but the decisionmaking power is in their hands. And that differs 180 degrees from the situation today. That is where everything starts. Beyond that, you may administer—you may have much of the responsibility in that regard; you might break down a particular type of program into different neighborhood, smaller units, and so forth. But the basic program—the priorities and the allocation of resources—is policymaking, and that is in the hands of the political people, if they choose to assert their power to take it.

One of the most troublesome aspects of the situation is that a good part of this antipoverty program has been so stimulating and exciting because it has been a sort of burr under the saddle of the public officials themselves. In many communities, for example—we saw it in the testimony, I believe, with respect to a city in the South, but it is quite typical—you had tremendous shantytowns right in the center of town. It was alleged that the reason for that was the failure to enforce the building code, and it would take some form of community action to stimulate the municipal officials to enforce it.

Community action can be engendered by citizens, in an orderly way, having a meeting, appointing a committee, and drawing up their grievances in an intelligent manner, or by sending a committee to the city hall to testify before the council.

Yet you can hardly conceive of public officials who would be so broadminded that they would countenance such activities criticizing of their own effort as part of the poverty program. You can be sure that any type of work of that type will be suffocated in such a setup. The people who are for this type of setup do not want such activity. They are against it. That is why they backed the Green amendment. And this suits them to a "t." But that does not necessarily suit the



majority of us, and that is the essence of this argument.

Mr. President, the limited powers of the "community action board," which is the term used when a city hall is itself the policymaking agency, are made particularly apparent when you compare them with those of what is called the "governing board," the term used when the agency is not the political entity itself but is a group designated by the political subdivision. In that case, the "governing board" is given the power to "determine program policies." It is that catechism, to determine program policies, which accounts for the 180° difference I have described.

I have just stated that I have never felt that the proposition of having public officials compose one-third of such boards was objectionable at all. But I do object very strongly—though not enough to make me turn against the entire report, as I have explained—to turning this literally over to the political people and thus breaking its entire concept, the purity of its concept, which has been so promising for the poor. Indeed, in my judgment, it radically changes the present structure on the element of key psychological importance for the poor. It breaks a promise held out to the poor to have a voice in their own destiny. It will increase their alienation by showing that once again they are rejected by society generally; it will play into the hands of the extremists, who can say to them, "You see, we told you so, violent revolt is the only answer."

The next point is this. Let us assume that there is a city hall, or any political subdivision, that does not decide to take up its opportunity to become the dominant agency in respect of the antipoverty program. One would think that would free the other public and private organizations. Not at all, because under the bill as it is written, that political subdivision could come in and take over at any time at its option. Therefore, the threat hangs over the heads even of the private agencies that if they do not behave themselves, the politicians will move in and take over. Hence, it would operate under that threat that, "If you want to avoid being put out of business, you had better not ruffle the feathers at city hall."

And whether or not city hall should take over could undoubtedly become a hotly contested election issue in many communities.

The fourth point is that the new bill will be a nightmare to administer. We saw that in conference, and it is one of the things we tried hard to make our House colleagues see—but unhappily they did not. The Director will be faced with multiple applications or designations from overlapping political jurisdictions which may be controlled by different political jurisdictions which may be controlled by different political parties, for example, a Republican Governor and a Democratic mayor, or vice versa.

Moreover, any political subdivision can opt out of a program of which it is a part, but then a part of that subdivision could opt back into the larger program—for example, a county opts out of a statewide program, but a township in the county wants to participate in the State

program. The Director would be faced with all of these conflicts. Finally, the bill most unwisely, I think, limits the size of the administering boards to 51. There are 60 programs throughout the country which have larger boards, many put together only after the most torturous negotiation. Why the House dug its heels in on the number 51, I do not know.

Now I come to the question of the bypass. That is the way in which the director may, notwithstanding the political control of the program, bypass the political agency concerned. In that regard, I think we won some concessions and I think they were meaningful concessions.

Again, I repeat that I hope our chairman will himself tend to recognize that as we get into this discussion, rather than to feel, as he did in the beginning, that we got no concessions.

But these concessions on the bypass are somewhat less important because they are based on the proposition that the director of OEO shall be a titan. It will take a man of titanic courage and job security to take on many mayors, city councils, and Governors, in such a frontal way as bypass their own plans and programs.

The grave doubt about the political ability of the director effectively to use this bypass, where he has it—and I shall give conditions where he may have it in some cases—is confirmed by the fact that under the present law the Director has overridden the veto by State Governors in only about 15 percent of the cases, or four out of 28 cases. That is a little less than 15 percent. He has been very reluctant to do even that, and that is without the added factor of the political subdivision itself being the community action agency.

The specific bypasses are these:

Under section 210(d), the director can bypass city hall only where the political subdivision has already been designated or where no relevant subdivision wishes either to become the community action agency or to designate one. Hence, even if he can possibly find under section 210(a) that the political subdivision does not have the power, authority, will, or capability to run a program, he cannot then appoint a group of his own choice since the section 210(d) bypass can only be used where a designated agency is already in place. Thus, wherever the city hall wants to be the community action agency, the director has no real alternative but to designate it.

Then, and only after a "reasonable opportunity" has passed, he can find that the political subdivision has "failed to submit a satisfactory plan" or "to carry out such plan in a satisfactory manner." That is a long haul and it will take a director who is a titan to deal with a political agency in that way.

Even if the city hall does fail to perform properly, and the administrator bypasses them, the politicians can later reapply to become the community action agency, and he must then go through the entire matter again.

Second, there is a provision in the bill which relates to bypassing the community action agency for limited-purpose or component programs. The director must

first find that the objectives of the program he wishes to fund could not be "effectively achieved" by funding it through the community action agency. That again makes him confront the political people in a politically difficult way.

Finally, I deal with the very vexing issue of the effective date. It is claimed that the deferral of the effective date on which the Green amendment shall take effect represents a major concession to the views of the Senate, contrasted with the views of the House.

Mr. President, I do not think so at all. It is claimed that the effective date is deferred until February 1, 1969. I do not find any such comfort in the bill. The conference report states no existing program may be terminated before February 1, 1969, unless—and that is a big unless—a new agency has been designated and funded to take its place. This only means that the Green amendment will not produce interruptions in ongoing programs until February 1, 1969.

If city halls wish to, they are at liberty to take over beginning July 1, 1968, and that is less than 7 months away. Moreover, as the program periods of most community action agencies will have run out in 7 or 8 months, negotiations will have to begin almost immediately within each community, before new applications are submitted, to determine what group will be running the program in the future.

It is very interesting to me to find that this whole matter is dismissed in a few paragraphs in the report of the managers on the part of the House. I can understand why. This is their "baby." They have brought it through the conference. In my judgment, it is a sad survival indeed. Now they will not make too much talk about it, let me assure the Senate. They dismiss our "clarifying amendments," as they are euphemistically called. In the report, the House managers include the following sentence:

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly tell us on what page that is?

Mr. JAVITS. Page 67. The sentence is:

These clarifying amendments are not in any way intended to confer on the Director any authority to make subjective judgments respecting the qualifications of a community action agency.

It is my deep judgment that no director even on the rack would concede that he is making subjective judgments. He would be making objective judgments as a public official according to the letter and policy of the law which he is duty bound to enforce. We still have to—as I have just explained in considerable detail—look for the words of law in order to determine what is to happen.

I have taken pains today to explain the Green amendment, notwithstanding the fact, as I said when I began, that it would be fruitless and harmful to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate which might give a false impression of what the Senate's real view is on this particular matter and to move as the rules would properly permit me to move to recommit the conference report. The facts still remain undeniable on the



merits of the situation. I felt it my duty to lay them out starkly and nakedly—as they should be—before the country.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad that I can hear the comprehensive statement of the senior Senator from New York, who has so much interest in the antipoverty program, and who has worked so hard and given such fine leadership in its behalf. I have followed the progress of the bill in the House and particularly the reports regarding the so-called Green amendment.

I am glad to see in the Chamber today a colleague of mine from the State of Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor in the House, Representative CARL D. PERKINS, who has provided outstanding leadership in the other body for this bill.

I ask whether the Senator intends to address himself to the arguments which have been made for the amendments. The Senator has made an eloquent and moving plea for full participation of the poor in the program designed for their betterment on which I agree. He believes that the change in structure of the Community Action Committees will remove the poor, and the independent citizens from determination of policy, and I would say, to a degree its administration. But there are many—and I happen to be one of them—who have supported the poverty program from its inception in the Senate, and who have voted to continue to provide funds for it, not to see it whittled down, then broken down, and finally eliminated.

But many of us have wondered about its effectiveness, about the use of the money, not alone its waste—although that is an important element—but the ultimate question of whether the program will accomplish its purpose to lift our fellow citizens out of poverty and into full life and opportunity.

A second question is whether a political subdivision, on which responsibility can be fixed cannot more effectively operate the community action programs, with the participation of private citizens, and the poor—than the present agencies, which are responsible to no one.

These are questions, I remember, which were raised in debate in the Senate this year and in prior years. They have addressed themselves with great force to Members of the House and to some of us in the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator would respond to the argument as to the effectiveness of the program presently administered, and to the question of whether the fixing of responsibility upon political subdivisions as proposed in the conference report will not result in a more effective program.

Mr. CLARK. Before he does so, would the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to say to my good friend from Kentucky that I yield to no man in my enormous admiration for the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator will have to yield to me a little bit because I have even greater admiration.

Mr. CLARK. Not only is the able Senator from New York a most astute Member of this body but throughout consideration of the poverty bill he was most helpful.

However, I think it important to point out that he was one of nine conferees and the only one who did not sign the conference report.

If the Senator from Kentucky is thinking in terms of making legislative history through colloquy with the Senator from New York, I am sure that, as a former judge and lawyer, he will understand that the conference report speaks for itself, and that the language in the bill speaks for itself. If anyone is going to make legislative history—and I doubt if anyone does—it should and will be the chairman of the Senate conferees on behalf of the eight Senate conferees, including the ranking minority member [Mr. PROUTY], who signed the conference report and not one minority member who did not sign the report.

Mr. JAVITS. Well, Mr. President, after that very gracious statement [laughter] there is not too much that needs to be said, especially the way the conference report finally eventuated.

It seems to me that the Senator from Pennsylvania cannot be overly happy about the way this thing has worked out—perhaps somewhat for the same reasons I am not happy about it. Be that as it may, I do not understand that the Senator from Kentucky is seeking to make legislative history with me, although that is not necessarily out of the question, as I intend to vote for the conference report, as I was the senior Senator conferee present on the minority side throughout, and as I participated in every conceivable aspect and argument during the conference.

If I am as astute as the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks I am, perhaps the courts would have the idea that I had a pretty good idea as to the intention of the conferees if I answered the question directly.

I might tell the Senator directly that if I do, if I do answer the question as a lawyer, I will give it the best I have. That is the way I think I am looking at it, because I am not going to let the Senate down today.

In answer to the Senator from Kentucky, and not to make legislative history, I should like to say that I think there was some validity to the idea that the maximum participation of the poor had been pursued too far in some areas with the effect that we had to prop up the poor so that they could run a program which they were incapable of running. But maximum feasible participation of the poor was the concept of the program. This did not say that they should run it. It certainly did not say maximum participation of the politicians.

However, what has happened is exactly that. We have substituted for the maximum feasible participation of the poor the maximum participation of politicians.

Mr. President, under these circumstances, I would prefer the possible ineptitude of the poor, rather than the grave dangers of pork barreling and ineffectiveness which inure in having maximum participation of the politicians.

Again, I repeat, no one prays more fervently than I that the program be run—and it could be run that way, and I hope and pray it will, and I shall do everything I can to see that it does—that it be run with effective and maximum participation by the poor and without maximum participation by the politicians.

As I say, we may have gone overboard in some areas on that question, but in reversing the trend, we have been thrown into a totally new area which is far worse than anything before.

And now it will be difficult to correct any mistakes or faults in local programs. The agency can now deny funds; it can call the people into the office and shake them up; or can take up whatever other alternatives it has. But in the present bill, with mayors, county executives, boards of supervisors, and all the political apparatus which represents them in the Congress. The director would have a mountainous job to take on and correct faults in the program.

I look with dismay what is going to happen. I am deeply saddened and regret that the practical situation we face indicates that we have to let it happen before we are going to be able—and I use those words advisedly—to do anything about it. I hope and pray it does not happen, but it is going to have to happen before it is corrected. That is a sad price for the country to pay, and a sad price for the poor to pay.

I would like to comment on one or two aspects of the program. Then I shall again ask for a quorum call, and, hopefully, if there are any other Members present, I shall reserve the summing up of my argument for as many Members as possible, so I may state in their presence what I propose to do about it, which is critically important, in view of what I have said.

I now wish to refer to one other aspect of the bill that relates to small business. I have always considered small business to be critically important in the anti-poverty program, because, again, like the maximum feasible participation of the poor, small business represents an opportunity of entrepreneurship and the building of responsibility and dignity on the part of the poor.

There are some among the poor who are able, by training and aptitude, to become small businessmen and go into business for themselves. It will be remembered that one of the most striking manifestations of the riots and violence of the last three summers has been the fact that in Negro poverty areas, Negro businesses were spared. There was a certain pride among the poor themselves and in those who could go into business for themselves, whereas white establishments were objects of assault.

It is a terrible thing. It is insurrection. I am the first to condemn it and demand that it be punished and restrained. But



it is a sociological fact which we cannot fail to notice.

Because we did notice it, we sought to encourage small business in the anti-poverty program. The way we sought to encourage it is by financing development agencies which would go to the neighborhoods themselves and seek to develop small business opportunities and find entrepreneurs in the small business field, and then, not merely lend them money—which is one-third of the job, or even less—but to give them managerial assistance and technical assistance, training and guidance, on a continuing basis, in order to bring them along and see if these small businesses could be successful.

In New York's Harlem, for example, small business development centers, assisted by the Department of Commerce, were fantastically successful and useful. I personally visited a galaxy of small businesses which had been established with small loans of about \$15,000. Where the right person had been picked by the United States public officials, where he was assisted with advice, training, and service, a measurable number of small businesses were founded that way.

Then along come our brethren in the House and decide that goes right out the window because, they say, this is small business and the Small Business Administration has to run it, and we are not going to tolerate any other placement of that function. Again, they dug in their heels upon that in a manner which one would really have to be there and see it to believe it, upon something that was not of dominant importance in the poverty program. The whole thing was going out the window because a Congressman who was not even on the conference said that unless he got this, "there ain't going to be no bill."

The Small Business Administration is essentially a white color agency. One has to do downtown to it to get assistance for a small business. It is not geared to or made for the kind of effort and detail where management training services are 90 percent of the job, which is what is required in the slums and ghettos of America.

One of the administrators of the Small Business Administration himself testified they did not want the Small Business Development Center program. That, he said, would be "mixing gasoline with matches." But our colleagues in the House were dug in and insisted and they would not hear of anything else. So the Senate conferees capitulated again, on the ground that they wanted a bill that could be even remotely acceptable, and they felt this one would be.

The only thing we kept in the bill was a provision which I fought for and insisted on, and which my colleagues helped me to get, which gave the President the power to transfer these functions out of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce, which is working in this area now, if the President felt that it would do the job better.

The point of the legislative history—may I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]—that I would like to make, as this was my amendment and

was agreed to, is that I feel the President has that power to transfer immediately. In other words, as soon as the bill is signed, if he feels that a change ought to be made in that respect, in my judgment the bill gives him the authority to make it. He can make it at any time from the time the bill is signed.

I hope the President will use that power, and not see it as a dead letter on the books. As another element of legislative history I would like to add that we were assured by the SBA that it would continue the Small Business Development Center program if it got this authority.

Now, Mr. President, I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think I have now adequately analyzed the disastrous way in which the Green or city hall amendment could work out.

Mr. President, we come now to what to do about it. Normally the city hall amendment would have created for me an insuperable obstacle to approval of the conference report on the antipoverty authorization because of its gravely damaging consequences.

But, these are not usual circumstances. We are at the end of the session. The program, the conduct of which is so vital to the tension-ridden areas of the country, is being operated on the most tenuous continuing basis, literally day to day. Indeed, we had a lapse of a few days during which people could not even be paid for their services.

So, the program could get hopelessly deadlocked now, as it has plenty of opponents. I would rather have a resolution continuing the present program which, at the present rate of funding, is about \$1.8 billion a year in round figures, than the bill embodied in the conference report.

I think it is greatly to the credit of the conferees on the Republican side in the other body that, while some of them did not support the program in the House, they were willing to go along in the conference and on the House floor for a continuing resolution approach.

However, even a continuing resolution—and I have really checked this out very carefully—would have a 50-50 chance of getting snarled in the cross-currents of this coming last week of the session. There are just too many who oppose the program altogether to justify this risk as far as the poor are concerned.

These reasons, in my judgment, must regrettably and deplorably be persuasive to all friends of the program, and rather than risk a vote which could give the impression that the Senate is for the city hall amendment—an amendment which never passed the Senate and which was not included in the Senate bill, and which prevailed in the confer-

ence only because of the absolutely irreconcilable insistence of the majority of the House conferees—I have decided on the following course.

I say again parenthetically, as I said when I began, Mr. President, that I have checked this out very thoroughly. It is very unlikely that I would have gotten more than 10 votes for a motion to recommit with instructions to turn down the Green, city hall amendment on the part of the Senate conferees.

It could then have been argued—and that would have been really disastrous—that the Senate had approved the Green amendment because it refused to instruct its conferees to hold out against it.

Rather than run that risk, which I know does not represent the view of a majority of the Senate, I have decided on the following course of action:

First, I shall join in asking the Senate to approve the conference report in a rollcall vote, which I have already called for, after laying out for the Senate and the country the grave perils involved in the program which are involved in the city hall amendment. I thing I have done that quite thoroughly so far.

Second, I shall offer legislation next year on some key measure coming out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where I am the ranking minority member, to deal with the worst features of this provision, as I shall undoubtedly be a conferee on such legislation after it gets passed by the Senate and the committee. We will have a chance to retain the good part of what we are doing today.

Third, and more importantly, I shall do my utmost as a ranking minority member of the committee to see that in the exercise of our authority and legislative oversight, which is expressly provided for us by the Legislative Reorganization Act, we keep a close watch in our committee on what is happening under this amendment so that we will be in a position to act in a timely way to curb any excesses that may develop by appropriate legislation or by other action.

Also, at my request, the Director of the OEO, in an effort to give me some concept of the policy which they would pursue, has addressed a letter to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. President, I read the letter:

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Before the 1967 Economic Opportunity Amendments are signed into law—which I hope will be soon—I want to let you know how much we appreciate the consistent and constructive leadership role you and Senator Javits have played in the development of this legislation.

The national effort to combat poverty must be bipartisan, and the bipartisan support the program enjoys today is an important factor in our overall success. Your strong advocacy of a genuine effort to help the poor has been a tremendous source of encouragement.

While I understand the reservations expressed by some about certain provisions in the Conference bill, I am hopeful that they will not cause undue administrative or programmatic difficulties. Because of the concern expressed by some as to the impact of these provisions, we will supply an interim progress report to the Committee in the late



summer or early fall on the operation of the amendments as they are implemented around the country.

We have always attempted to carry on our program in a manner consistent with the intention of the Congress and in a nonpartisan way. In the implementation of the new guidelines established by the Congress, we will continue that policy. Where a conflict develops with respect to the designation of a community action agency, I intend to seek a solution that is thoroughly nonpolitical and nonpartisan and which fully respects the role of the poor.

I believe that the Act permits, and, in fact, demands that our first program concern is substance, not form. Let me assure you again that partisan political considerations will not color our judgments in the implementation of the legislation.

Because of his strong interest and ranking position on the Committee, I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator Javits.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,

Director.

Mr. President, the pending bill also contains a report provision which was put in at my request, which is now contained in section 233(c), and reads as follows:

(c) The Director shall provide by contract for the conduct of an independent study and evaluation of the action taken under sections 210 and 211 of this Act and the effects thereof, with particular reference to (1) the exercise of their authorities under the provisions of title II of this act by States and political subdivisions, (2) the participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, public officials and others and (3) the administrative and program advantages and disadvantages, if any, encountered or foreseen in implementing such sections. He shall transmit such study and evaluation to the Congress before April 1, 1969.

The date of April 1, 1969 is based on the February 1, 1969 date in the bill, when all existing agencies must be phased out and replaced by the new agencies to be organized under this bill—or their successor agencies.

By this letter, in which Mr. Shriver agrees to give us a report in the late summer or early fall on the operation of the amendments, we are assured by the Director, as he is a man of good faith, of an interim report in general accord with the type of information sought by 233(c), around early August or early September next, which will again enable us to exercise some authority over this program after the Director himself has had experience in carrying it out.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to refer to a part of the bill as contained in the conference report of the two Houses. This is subsection 6 of section 222(a) of the bill, and has reference to "A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services,' designed to provide, on a temporary, emergency basis, such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract condition of starvation or malnutrition among the poor."

Senators will recall that some months ago, on the initiative of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] a bill which he introduced was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was

passed unanimously by the Senate, and was sent to the House. That bill was a result of investigations in April into conditions of hunger and malnutrition in Mississippi which were made by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which I have the honor to chair.

We discovered widespread malnutrition and hunger not only in that State but also in many other places in the United States, including among the Eskimos in Alaska, the poor whites in Appalachia, and among Negroes in a number of States in the deep South and in urban areas in the North. The bill, which was passed by the Senate, called for an authorized appropriation of \$25 million the first year and \$50 million the second year, to be used to feed the hungry and to give them adequate medical services. The program was to be administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill was tabled in the House Agriculture Committee, despite the favorable votes of 7 Democrats, 2 of them from the State of Mississippi.

Representative QUIE, of Minnesota, a Republican and a member of the House conferees on the poverty bill, succeeded in having inserted in the poverty bill a provision somewhat similar to the Senate-passed Stennis bill. In conference, we adjusted the Quie amendment so as to incorporate the more important provisions of the Stennis bill, and it appears in the conference report, as part of the text of the act, on page 30.

I am most grateful to Senator STENNIS for the cooperation he gave the Senate subcommittee in pressing the Senate bill to enactment in this body. I am even more grateful to him for his valiant but unsuccessful efforts to get the House Agriculture Committee to report the Stennis bill. I am happy to say that he has advised me that he is in accord with the action taken by the conferees on the poverty bill in incorporating the major features of his bill into this measure. At his request, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to him on December 8 by Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, explaining what he intends to do to assure the effective operation of this program through the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—even though the appropriation will go to him—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, D.C., December 8, 1967.

HON. JOHN STENNIS,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: As you know, S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, was reported by the Conference Committee with a new § 222(a) (6) added to the Economic Opportunity Act. That provision authorizes a special program of "Emergency Food and Medical Services" to provide on a temporary emergency basis food and medical services to counteract conditions of starvation and malnutrition among the poor.

Since the purposes of this provision roughly parallel S. 2138 which you introduced earlier this year, I know you are interested in the plans for implementing it. Section 222(a) (6) provides that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall arrange to carry out his functions under that provision through the Departments of Agriculture and of Health, Education, and Welfare. Subject to other statutory limitations it is certainly my intention to insure that the new supplemental emergency services are provided in a manner which does not duplicate or dislocate the arrangements for distribution of food and medical assistance to the poor presently administered by those two Departments.

Beyond that, the views and cooperation of State and local agencies which administer welfare and health aid within the communities receiving § 222(a) (6) assistance will certainly be sought. Indeed, within the framework of the law and the pressures of the needs which led to this new provision, I hope and expect that in most communities those agencies will play a much more instrumental role than just providing consultation and cooperation.

As you realize, it is too early to give definitive answers on particulars. However, I intend to see that this program is pressed as energetically as any authorized under our new legislation. I trust you will call upon me any time that I can provide additional information as our plans develop.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,

Director.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with respect to the remarks of my good friend, the Senator from New York, first, I am glad, indeed, that he will vote to approve the conference report. This means that the report will have the affirmative votes of nine of the Senate conferees. Although, to my deep regret, Senator PROUTY is ill and cannot be present to cast his vote, he has signed the conference report.

Second, in my judgment, we have a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill, well worthy of enactment. I regret that it was necessary to accept the Green amendment, but we had to if we wanted any bill at all. The House was determined that the basic provisions of the Green amendment remain in the final bill. We were, however, able to modify its provisions in conference.

I would like to say to my good friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], that I do not agree with him that the Green amendment is as bad as he has made it seem. In my judgment, there is nothing disastrous about it. Basically, what it does is give substantial but far from complete authority—authority which is subject to the application of criteria applied by the Director in determining whether to approve an application for designation as a community action agency—to States and units of local government to be, either directly or by designation of a public or private nonprofit agency, the community action for a community.

But a State local governmental unit can do that and operate a community action program only if it is approved by the Director as meeting all the criteria for designation of a community action agency and for operation of a community action program under the provisions of the act as we were able to change it in conference. Moreover, if it fails to sub-



mit satisfactory a plan for a program which meets the criteria of the act, or if the Director, having approved such a plan, find that it fails to carry it out satisfactorily, then the Director can bypass the State or local governmental unit or its designee and designate and assist another public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I must say to the Senator that I hope to be able to be in the Chamber for the remainder of his discussion, but I shall only be here for short time at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. I would say to the Senator from Colorado that I have made practically no talk at all. All of the talking has been done by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would like to ask several questions about the other provisions of the act.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to answer them.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did the conference report provide any specific funding for the Headstart program?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did the conference report enlarge or decrease the amount of authorization for the Job Corps over what it has been in the past?

Mr. CLARK. It is the same as recommended by the President.

Mr. DOMINICK. Which is more than it was last year?

Mr. CLARK. It is \$295 million this year and it was \$211 million last year, although, because of a carryover from 1966, the actual expenditures last year were more than \$300 million.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no further comments to make at this time.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. I believe that if the Green amendment goes into effect, if it does, that it really would emasculate the poverty program. I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania as to the effect of the Green amendment, but it is too late to debate that at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield so that I may make a brief response?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to make clear that I am not a protagonist of the Green amendment. I fought it hard in conference but we had the choice of either taking it in principle, as we were able to modify it, or having no bill.

Mr. BROOKE. I understand, but I think the American people are entitled to know where support for the Green amendment came from and where the opposition came from.

I would ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania or the distinguished Senator from New York to enlighten us as to where opposition to the Green amendment came from.

Mr. CLARK. I would say to my good friend from Massachusetts that I can think of no one more capable of answering the question of the Senator than his Republican colleague from New York.

Mr. BROOKE. I direct my question to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The protagonists of the Green amendment were the majority—the Democrats—among the House conferees.

I think the Senator is correct in stating that it should be brought out as to how this came to be. Other people have just as deep convictions as the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New York, except their views may be just the other way around. In the final analysis we have to fight it out as we tried to do in this situation. I must say that I would have been much happier if the first time the bill was considered those who are of my party in the House had concocted a coalition of those for the measure so that this would not be necessary. I do not know whether it would or would not have made a difference, but when we got to conference, of course, it was too late. The dynamics of the matter were such that certain feelings had been engendered by the need for a majority to obtain passage in the House. There were certain commitments. They do not have to be sworn to in blood. They are men of honor, and when they take a position, they stick to it, and they did in this conference.

I have had much experience in these matters, and I have rarely seen a matter such as this in the way of a "dug in" conference.

I would say that unless the Senate conferees got up and walked out, which is what I wanted to do, there was not much more we could have done without running the risk that the program would go to smithereens. They were absolutely dug in on the other side and they would not have it any other way.

I am delighted to hear what the Senator from Pennsylvania said today, in contrast to what he said at his press conference, that the changes we made in the Green amendment were meaningful. I said so originally. These matters had to be fought for and gained with blood and infinite passion, so deeply deadlocked was the conference.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to my good friend from Massachusetts that perhaps we should not make of the Green amendment more of a dragon than it really is. I would anticipate and hope that in the overwhelming majority of cases that the local governmental units and the States would designate the existing community action agency to continue as it has heretofore.

There are, to be sure, a number of areas where there has been a clash between what I believe to be the legitimate aspirations of the poor and units of local government. However, these areas are the exceptions, in my judgment, which prove the rule.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in a moment. Again, I say that the Green amendment is not the way I would have had it, but I say that we may tend to overestimate the damage.

Mr. BROOKE. Does the Senator agree that the Green amendment will perhaps create more situations in more areas than presently exist?

Mr. CLARK. It may, but I am not sure. I can think of one or two. I do not want to name them because that would be invidious. But I do not think it will.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his helpful intercession. One of the things that troubled me deeply is the fact that there does not seem to be a disposition on the part of the overwhelming majority of the Senate to have this out by turning down the report. I know. I have checked it out. There is no question about the statement. There was a substantial vote in the other body on the bill. That vote was 283 to 129. Indeed, many of those who are supposedly the most ardent friends of this particular amendment—to wit, the Representatives from southern States, voted against final passage. I thought that if we had made a major stand upon this, even to the extent of the danger of breaking up the whole thing, that we would have prevailed because of the margin and the cushion of the votes which existed in the House. With that margin, they did not need to keep so much of the Green amendment to pass the conference report. I know that some House conferees have said that in private. But certainly we did not find that reflected in the conference. There is no question about that. There was a deeply dug-in attitude there. The idea of getting a continuing resolution as an alternative to the Green amendment was supported by the minority.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am inclined very much to agree with the position being taken by the Senator from New York. I am also sympathetic to the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. However, I think, here, we are confronted with a practical question so far as extension of the resolution is concerned.

As it now stands, we have gotten as far as December 2. If this conference broke up without some resolution on this very important program—the only one remaining program, the antipoverty program—I doubt very much, with the attitude which confronts us in the House, that we could have gotten another extension of the resolution. That means, for all practical purposes, that the whole antipoverty program might have just dissipated entirely. Of course, that would have wreaked havoc.

I quite agree that we would have been better off without the Green amendment but I think we should give it a try, for all practical purposes, and see how it works out. Here, at least, we do have the likelihood of keeping the whole organization



together and taking it from this point on. I think we should watch it closely. It is regrettable that we could not have had it in the same fashion as we have had it up to now but, as I understand it, the House is adamant. There are some people there that could care less whether we pass an antipoverty program or not. The result would have been, the chances are we would have left here for Christmas without having passed any antipoverty legislation.

We have not had the appropriation request yet to come before the Senate. I understand that that will be one of my responsibilities. There is a lot of talk about adjourning next Friday. I hope that happens, but I am afraid that if we had a hiatus of a month and a half or 2 months without some tangible anti-poverty program, even as bad as this may be—although I doubt very much that it is that bad—the fact still remains. So I think, for all practical purposes, we are a whole lot better off, and I think we should adopt the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Rhode Island. Let me say to him, because he may not have been in the Chamber when I spoke, that I know of no ally I would rather have on my side than the Senator from Rhode Island in the vigilance which is going to be required to see that this thing does not turn into an iniquitous pattern, or become a pork barrel, which it could easily become, remembering the capabilities inherent in the bill.

I hope and pray that does not happen. It does not have to happen. But, it will take vigilance and dedication on the part of people like the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is in a much better position in a matter of this kind to help the country avoid the very real dangers which this amendment poses.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, with today's vote, we can move one step closer to keeping the doors of opportunity open for many millions of poor Americans.

The poverty program is unlike other Federal assistance programs—it is aimed at helping poor Americans help themselves. This is the most important single aspect of the poverty program. It is one now adopted in other Federal programs, such as the work programs for welfare recipients, the neighborhood involvement in the model cities program, and various others.

There was widespread concern that the House-passed poverty bill would dilute this aspect of involvement, of the poor being given a role in determining what types of projects be established in their neighborhoods. We had a difficult time in conference seeing to it that this resident involvement and voice in program control was preserved. But I am satisfied that the bypass and other provisions we worked out in conference will assure the continued operation of local poverty programs, without creating undue disruption. I believe this in spite of charges to the contrary. Of course, if experience proves otherwise, then we have the authority to amend the legislation.

The amount authorized by this conference report is \$1,980 million—\$278 million less than the Senate bill but \$380 million more than the House bill. This figure is a disappointment to the millions of Americans who see expansion of the poverty programs as an important way of reducing the causes of tension among our alienated poor. But even this amount is a victory, for there were many who despaired of getting any bill at all through the Congress this year.

There are a number of amendments to the existing law, which I introduced, about which I want to make specific mention at this point.

Section 215(b) requires each community action agency to encourage the establishment of housing development and service organizations, to focus on the housing needs of low-income persons. These organizations will provide technical, administrative, and financial assistance required to help those persons to utilize existing programs, and to enable sponsors to take advantage of existing mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs. While these corporations may themselves become sponsors of housing, under existing programs, under no circumstances are they authorized to insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs administered by the specialized housing agencies. They will coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts.

Section 222(a)(4)(B) requires that comprehensive health services programs to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. These projects would encourage health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor. In carrying out this provision, the Director would be authorized to provide or arrange for training and study in the field of health services for the poor. Under this authority the Director could arrange for the payment of stipends and allowances for persons undergoing this training and for their dependents. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are directed to achieve effective coordination of programs and projects authorized under this provision with other related activities.

This section is an addition to the section authorizing neighborhood health centers, which I introduced last year and which is included in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

Section 222(a)(8) provides for programs to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons to be carried out as a special program. Under my amendment, this program would be known as Project Find, while under the House bill it would be known as Senior Opportunities and Services. The conference report accepts the House name for the program. The Senate bill intended the program to be for the benefit of persons over the age of 60, while the House amendment used 55 as the eligibility age. The conference report adopts the Senate age limit. Both my amendment and the House bill list the development of certain all-season

centers as one of the areas of activities to be included in program. The House bill, unlike my amendment, requires that these centers be controlled by the older persons themselves. The House bill also provides that in administering this program, the Director must utilize to the maximum feasible extent the services of the Administration on Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The conference report adopts the language of the House bill on these two latter points.

In achieving coordination with the programs of the Administration on Aging in HEW, I would expect that the Director of OEO would seek to supplement services for seniors where the AOA has established centers which do not focus sufficiently on the poor. Further, where such services do not exist at all for poor seniors, then I would expect him to move aggressively to make sure they are made available. Action is needed, at this point, and I would hope it would not be postponed pending the outcome of interagency disputes.

The needs of the elderly poor have been set out at length in the subcommittee hearings, and I summarized them in a speech in the Senate on October 3. They are set out also in the Senate committee report. Further documentation is available in the volumes of hearings of the Special Committee on Aging.

I would reemphasize my hope that OEO move swiftly to implement this new program for our seniors.

There are a large number of other provisions in this conference report, designed to enhance the lives of our elderly poor, which I sponsored. They are intended to strengthen the role of the Assistant Director for the Elderly Poor, a position created under the terms of an amendment I introduced last year. We have not focused enough resources on or attention to our elderly poor—but now OEO has both the mandate and the machinery to do it.

Section 224 requires the Director to encourage the development of neighborhood centers designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in fields particularly relevant to the needs of the poor, and so organized as to promote the maximum participation of neighborhood residents in center planning, policymaking, administration, and operation. Such centers would be responsive to such neighborhood needs, including counseling, referral, followthrough, and community development activities, as may be necessary or appropriate to best assure a system under which existing programs are extended to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are responsive to the range of community, family, and individual problems, and are fully adapted to neighborhood needs and conditions.

There are two other matters I want to discuss specifically, at this point.

First, the legal services program. Section 222(a)(3) says, in part, that—

No funds or personnel made available for such program . . . shall be utilized for the defense of any person indicted (or proceeded against by information) for the commission of a crime, except in extraordinary circum-



stances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director has determined that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available.

But the statement of the managers on the part of the House, referring to this section says:

It would prohibit the use of funds or personnel made available for this program for the defense of any person charged with crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director determines that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available.

From these two excerpts, there appears to be a conflict between the statutory language and the statement of the House managers. The statute permits legal services counsel to be made available to individuals charged with a crime, up through the indictment or information proceedings. The statement of the House managers would seem to prohibit use of legal services counsel by those charged with a crime. It is my recollection of the conferees' discussions of this matter, that legal services counsel were intended to be made available through the indictment or information proceedings. Thus, the statement of the House managers should not be read as restricting the statutory language.

Second, section 603 of the conference report concerning political activities. This section is a modification of section 246 of the House bill. As modified, the conferees intended section 603 only to preclude use of OEO funds themselves to support political activities. They did not intend it to restrict any recipient agency's activities which are not supported by OEO funds.

Mr. President, there are many other important provisions of this conference report—all of them aimed at keeping OEO going strongly forward in its efforts to help the poor help themselves.

I am glad to have had a part in the development of the report, for I consider its provisions crucial to help us meet the unmet needs of America's poor.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Senator CLARK, deserves the highest praise for his diligence in seeing this bill through the authorization process. It is a stronger and better bill than it would have been without his efforts, and we all owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

I believe that the amendments agreed upon by the Senate-House conferees can make for an improved and more effective bill. I am pleased to note that three of the amendments that I proposed on the floor of the Senate, and which were adopted, have been retained in conference.

Because of criticisms I had received from constituents concerning certain aspects of the program in Kentucky, I introduced amendments to deal with these problems. It was my belief that these amendments would insure certain procedures and safeguards necessary to

make the poverty program more effective and responsive to the efforts of our communities in assisting the poor.

The amendments that I offered which were retained in conference are as follows:

First, the present law provides that the assignment of VISTA volunteers shall be under such terms and conditions as the Director may determine but volunteers shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Where an assignment of volunteers has been consented to by the Governor and, at a subsequent time, he does not feel that the volunteers are carrying out their duties in the best interests of the program the present law does not specifically authorize the Governor to request the withdrawal of such volunteers. I have been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity that in the absence of explicit statutory authorization it is the policy of the agency to withdraw volunteers at any time at the request of the Governor. My amendment would write this policy into the bill so as to avoid any misunderstanding as to the individual responsibilities of the Governor and the Director.

My second amendment as modified by an amendment of Senator BYRD of West Virginia, requires that the Director of OEO employ the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants in the VISTA programs as is required of those who are selected as representatives of VISTA. In securing its applicants to serve as volunteers in its programs VISTA uses application forms substantially the same as those used by the civil service. Where such applications reveal circumstances indicating criminal activities, subversive activities or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the application to the FBI for further investigation and where the charges are substantiated the application is denied.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. For example, the Appalachian volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian volunteers has no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

This amendment would make applicable to all categories of volunteers the same procedures so as to assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and good character. At the same time, this amendment would authorize the Director to prescribe other qualifications for those volunteers selected from the poor and low-income residents of the area to be served who cannot meet the educational qualifications of the VISTA applicants.

A third amendment that I introduced and which the conferees accepted requires the Director to make arrangements under which State as well as local bar associations would be consulted and afforded an opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the legal services projects before they are ap-

proved and funded. In addition the Senate bill contained a provision, not in the House bill, which requires the Director to seek the comments and recommendations of the State and local bar associations on the conduct and operation of a legal services program after that program had been approved and funded. I am pleased to note that this provision was retained in conference. It is important that State and local bar associations, after an initial OEO grant has been made, exercise a continuing review of the operations of these projects so as to make certain that they are carried out in the manner that they were originally proposed and that they are administered to meet the particular needs of the local community in keeping with the recommendations of bar association members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of section 222(a)(3), followed by the comments on this provision contained in the conference report be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SECTION 222(A)(3)

(3) A "Legal Services" program to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall make arrangements under which the State bar association and the principal local bar associations in the community to be served by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the proposed project before such project is approved or funded, and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the operations of such project, if approved and funded. No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this part) shall be utilized for the defense of any person indicted (or proceeded against by information) for the commission of a crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director has determined that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT COMMENTS

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain provisions relating to Legal Services programs. The Senate bill provides that these programs must further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services. The comparable provision of the House amendment requires that legal services programs provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in the furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. On this difference the House recedes. The Senate bill requires the Director to make arrangements under



which State and local bar associations would be consulted and afforded an opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the project before it is approved and funded and to submit comments and recommendations on the operation of the project after it is approved and funded. The comparable provision of the House bill requires the Director to establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar association is afforded ample opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded. The conference report adopts the Senate language, but with the addition of the word "principal". The House amendment also contains a provision, which has no counterpart in the Senate bill, which provides that no funds or personnel made available for the legal services program under whatever provision of the act it is conducted, shall be utilized to organize or assist in organizing any unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance, or for the defense of any person charged with participating therein, or with the commission of a crime committed in the course thereof, if such person organized or assisted in organizing such demonstration or civil disturbance. The conference substitute contains a modification of this provision. As modified, it would prohibit the use of funds or personnel made available for this program for the defense of any person charged with crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director determines that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available. The portion of this provision dealing with use of program funds and personnel to organize or assist in organizing unlawful demonstrations or civil disturbances is treated in the new section 613.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a fourth amendment that I proposed, and which was adopted on the Senate floor, required that the chief elected official or officials of a community have the opportunity to serve on their community action board and if such official desired not to serve, to designate a person to serve in his place. In addition, the amendment specifically provided for membership on community action boards of representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

I am pleased to note that the conferees accepted the provision of the House bill which is more comprehensive and far reaching and requires that a community action agency must be a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency designated by the State or a political subdivision or combination thereof, so long as it has the power to enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of the title, and is designated as a community action agency by the Director.

It is my belief that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is not only appropriate but necessary to mobilize all local resources, including funds, and the abilities and capacities of the community's officials, and to fix responsibility on those who operate the programs. As one who has supported these programs, I want them to succeed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to pay my respects to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the floor manager of the bill, the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. JAVITS], and other committee members whose efforts and hard work over a long period of time have made this legislation possible.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, as we near the completion of Senate action on the poverty legislation, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Bill Smith and Howard Hallman of his staff, on the truly remarkable job they have done throughout the year on this legislation.

Senator CLARK held hearings all over the country and his staff ably supervised the work of many consultants in evaluating the poverty program. They guided the bill through committee and through floor consideration with great skill.

But perhaps the finest work that Senator CLARK did was in presiding over the conference. It was a long and difficult conference, and Senator CLARK was patient and thoroughly committed to the Senate approach throughout. His diplomacy and leadership were critical in getting a bill that is as good as the one before us. The bill has its deficiencies, but it would be far less acceptable but for the work of Senator CLARK.

The work of Bill Smith and Howard Hallman on the conference was equally important. They prepared all of the material that the conferees needed and worked long hours on developing compromise positions that would be acceptable to the House and satisfactory to the poor people of our country. The Senator from Pennsylvania and his staff deserve the thanks of all of us today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the

Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 16, as follows:

[No. 380 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Aiken	Gore	Mondale
Anderson	Griffin	Monroney
Baker	Gruening	Montoya
Bartlett	Hansen	Morse
Bayh	Harris	Morton
Bible	Hart	Mundt
Boggs	Hartke	Nelson
Brewster	Hatfield	Pastore
Brooke	Hayden	Pearson
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Percy
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Case	Kuchel	Smith
Church	Long, Mo.	Spong
Clark	Mansfield	Symington
Cooper	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Cotton	McGovern	Yarborough
Dodd	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Miller	

NAYS—16

Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Curtis	Hill	Sparkman
Dominick	Holland	Thurmond
Eastland	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McClellan	
Fannin	Russell	



## NOT VOTING—22

Allott	Lausche	Ribicoff
Bennett	Long, La.	Scott
Dirksen	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Hollings	Moss	Tower
Hruska	Murphy	Tydings
Inouye	Muskie	
Jordan, Idaho	Prouty	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I again commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the initiative and the effectiveness he has shown.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In his handling of the poverty bill throughout the hearings, and during the consideration of the measure on the floor, Senator CLARK demonstrated outstanding skill and leadership. He exhibited those same qualities as the chairman of the conference, maintaining a high degree of fidelity to the intent of the Senate, and certainly indicating clearly and strongly again, his deep interest in the people of this country, his effective response to those who are in such dire need of help. His efforts deserve the high commendation of the Senate.

I wish also, at this time to extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and to the others who serve on the committee. The extensive hearings conducted here and in the field—in the cities and poverty areas; the long and arduous labors—in excess of 20 days in the conference, all served to produce, I think, an exceedingly good and sound bill for the interests of the poor people of this country. So, we have the committee members to thank. Their devoted efforts were certainly exemplary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wanted to note that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is the ranking minority member of the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, which handled this bill. He gave it indefatigable attention, faithfully attended the hearings in the field, came to as much of the conference as he could, probably more than he should, and then had to go to the hospital for a checkup; and I think his name must be mentioned most favorably and graciously in this connection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I concur wholeheartedly. I did not mention him because I knew he was in the hospital; but I, too, know where his heart and hope would have been had he been here.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his kind words. I should like the RECORD to show the great gratitude that I feel, personally, for the unfailing help, devotion to duty,

and assistance which were given in pressing this bill through the Senate, and then in completing the conference agreement, by all of the members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. Their names should be mentioned: The two Senators KENNEDY, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator PELL, Senator NELSON, Senator JAVITS, Senator PROUTY, and Senator MURPHY. Without their assistance, we could never have put this bill, which is essentially bipartisan in its concept and its execution, through Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. I should also like to pay special tribute to the members of the staff of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, who did an extraordinarily able job, without regard to working hours, in helping us on this matter, particularly Mr. William Smith and Mr. Howard Hallman, but also the staff members of individual Senators, including Mr. Petrocelli, Mr. Walinsky, and a number of others, who were of great help to us in bringing this bill to conclusion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join the Senator from Pennsylvania in his tribute to the staff, and to pay special tribute to Mr. Smith and Mr. Petrocelli, who I think were the real stalwarts in this whole matter.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. I should like to join in paying tribute to the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarkable patience, calmness, and good nature throughout these hearings, and also for his indefatigable effort in conducting as many hearings as he did, as shown by the stack of volumes on our desks.

## STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I wish to make a brief report to the Senate on the state of the committee's proposed recommendations to the Senate on standards of conduct by Members of the Senate, and by officers and employees of the Senate. The committee expects to put its recommendations into final form next week. In addition to the standards, the committee is still engaged in the preparation of a detailed report to accompany them. Because the current session of Congress is nearing an end, there is not sufficient time for the Senate to fully and properly consider our recommendations. We regret that circumstances beyond the control of the committee, which included other duties of the committee, made it impossible to complete these recommendations and report earlier in time for full consideration at this session.

The committee requests that the lead-

ership set a time in January 1968 for consideration of the proposed standards which will be submitted as additions to the rules of the Senate.

It is not known now at what date we shall reassemble in January, and for that reason I did not request of the leadership a specific date, but I did discuss this with the leadership, and this suggestion is generally acceptable to them. So we will leave it on that basis.

As the recommended standards are not in final form at the moment and the committee's report has not been fully prepared, it would be premature to attempt to describe our proposals at this time. The committee has made a determined effort, for a period of over 2 years, to explore most of the ethical problems of conduct by Senators, and by officers and employees of the Senate, that have arisen in recent years, and to consider the various solutions that have been proposed both within and outside of the committee.

The subjects of our standards will include most of the items mentioned in my letter to Senators dated July 20, 1967, as well as other matters. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter just mentioned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, SELECT COMMITTEE ON  
STANDARDS AND CONDUCT,

July 20, 1967.

U.S. SENATE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is undertaking the preparation of standards of conduct for Members of the Senate, and officers or employees of the Senate. In view of the novelty and the varied views of such standards, the Committee would like to have your proposals or ideas for consideration.

Because little experience is available, the Committee has not yet finally defined the areas of activity which should be governed by standards. The following broad subjects are being considered by the Committee or have been advocated by others:

1. Outside professional, business, or financial activities of Senators.
2. Gifts to Senators, including testimonials.
3. Disclosure of income or assets by Senators.
4. Outside professional, business, or financial activities, or employment of staff members.

The itemization of these suggested subjects is not intended to preclude other areas that may properly be included in a code.

Certain areas, such as regulation of travel and limitations on campaign finances, are more clearly within the cognizance of other Committees of the Senate.

Your comments and suggestions will be appreciated and will be subject to careful examination by the Committee. Please address any reply to me at room 222 of the old Senate Office Building.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,  
Chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, our recommendations, together with the report thereon, will be completed and released in time for study and analysis prior to consideration by the Senate.











# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 12, 1967  
For actions of December 11, 1967  
90th-1st; No. 202

## CONTENTS

Acreage allotments...13,14	Forestry.....4	Price supports.....13,14
Appropriations.....1,39	Grain reserves.....35	RC&D projects.....6
Beef.....22	Housing.....31	Recreation.....6
Census.....27,32	Information.....30	Research.....25
Cooperatives.....20	Lands.....13	Rural poverty.....24
Copper imports.....9	Loans.....11,34	Social security.....5,23
Cotton.....13	Marketing orders.....6,7	Statistics.....30
Disaster relief.....34	Meat inspection.....12,21	Taxation.....26
Economy.....26,41	Mink imports.....36	Telephone loans.....11
Education.....8,15	Natural resources.....37	Wage-price guidelines...17
Fisheries.....28	Pay raise.....2	Water pollution.....16,29
Food prices.....10	Peanuts.....14	Watersheds.....40
Foot and mouth disease..38	Pears.....6	Wheat.....6
Foreign aid.....1	Postal rates.....2	Wildlife.....6,33
Foreign trade...9,18,36,38	Poverty.....3,19	

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference versions of continuing appropriations measure, pay-raise and postal-rates bill, and poverty bill. House received conference report on San Rafael Wilderness bill. House committee reported bills to authorize marketing orders on pears, expand RC&D projects cost-sharing, and adjust wheat allotments. Senate passed bills to authorize transfer of peanut acreage allotments and to provide one-price program for extra-long-staple cotton. Rep. Berry submitted and discussed measure urging embargo on meat imports from countries with foot-and-mouth disease.

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. By a 366-26 vote, agreed to the conference version of H. J. Res. 888, the continuing appropriations measure (see Digest 200 for provisions). pp. H16572-85

The Daily Digest says the House will consider the supplemental appropriation bill today, Dec. 12. p. D1115

House conferees were appointed on H. R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H16556



2. PAY RAISE; POSTAL RATES. By a 327-63 vote, agreed to the conference version of H. R. 7977, the pay-raise and postal-rates bill. pp. H16585-617
  3. POVERTY. By a 247-149 vote, agreed to the conference report on S. 2388, the poverty bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H16558-72, H16619, H16632, H16639-40
  4. FORESTRY. Received the conference report on S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, Calif. (H. Rept. 1029). p. H16618  
Rep. Conelan inserted and discussed an article criticizing the Georgia-Pacific Co. for continuing to cut redwoods that are being considered for a national park. p. H16670
  5. SOCIAL SECURITY. Received the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill (H. Rept. 1030) (pp. H16684-705). Rep. Albert said this bill is to be considered Dec. 13 (p. H16556).
  6. PEARS; RC&D PROJECTS; WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10564, to authorize marketing orders for pears (H. Rept. 1019), and S. 852, to authorize cost sharing for recreation and fish-wildlife in Resource Development and Conservation projects (H. Rept. 1020). p. H16707  
The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1722, to provide for adjustment of wheat allotments in counties where wheat is the principal grain crop and where allotments are low in relation to cropland because farmers shifted prior to 1951 from wheat to an alternative crop or crops which have proved unprofitable because of plant disease or sustained loss of markets (H. Rept. 1021). p. H16707
  7. MARKETING ORDERS. Rep. McFall commended the marketing orders program. p. H16654
  8. EDUCATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7819, the elementary and secondary education bill. Senate conferees have not been appointed. pp. H16617-8
  9. COPPER IMPORTS. Rep. Olsen objected to the present level of copper imports. pp. H16631-2
  10. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Zwach inserted an article stating that use of the supply-demand theory decreases the amount of food available. p. H16634
  11. TELEPHONE LOANS. Rep. Nelsen objected to REA loans to large telephone companies. pp. H16640-1
  12. MEAT INSPECTION. Rep. Smith, Iowa, inserted and discussed a statement of practices followed by some meat companies. pp. H16677-8
- SENATE
13. COTTON; LANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 10864, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Saline Co., Ark., to the Dierks Forests, Inc. Sen. Jordan, N. C., explained the committee amendments as follows: "... first, provide price-support loan for extra-long-staple cotton at 1½ to 2 times the support loan level for upland cotton, but in no event less than 35 cents per pound. As in the case of upland cotton, payments would be made to producers to bring the total support from 65 to 90 percent of parity. Price support



for a State operating a lottery, or for an officer or employee of that State who is charged with the administration of the lottery."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "selling, redeeming, or collecting"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section prohibits a State member bank from accepting deposits or cashing or otherwise handling checks or other negotiable instruments, or performing other lawful banking services for a State operating a lottery, or for an officer or employee of that State who is charged with the administration of the lottery."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "selling, redeeming, or collecting"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section prohibits a State nonmember insured bank from accepting deposits or cashing or otherwise handling checks or other negotiable instruments, or performing other lawful banking services for a State operating a lottery, or for an officer or employee of that State who is charged with the administration of the lottery."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "selling, redeeming, or collecting"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section prohibits an insured institution from accepting funds from, or performing any lawful services for, a State operating a lottery, or an officer or employee of that State who is charged with the administration of the lottery."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
ABE MULTER,  
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
HENRY S. REUSS,  
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,  
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,  
FLORENCE P. DWYER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOHN SPARKMAN,  
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,  
WALLACE F. BENNETT,  
BOURKE HICKENLOOPER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10595) to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill prohibited national banks, State member banks, State nonmember insured banks, and insured savings and loan associations from selling, keeping any records or books for the State lottery or its agents or from redeeming, collecting, keeping any books or records with respect to or otherwise handling in any way lottery tickets or transactions associated with lottery tickets.

Under the amendments agreed to by the conferees, the prohibition against bookkeeping and recordkeeping was deleted, and a provision was added to make clear the intention not to prohibit the acceptance of deposits and the performance of other lawful banking services.

No inference is to be drawn of any legislative intention to grant banks or other financial institutions any authority which they would not possess in the absence of this legislation. As there are cases currently pending in the courts in which the legal power of national banks to engage in certain activities is at issue, neither the report filed herewith nor this statement is to be construed as evidence of any legislative intention to express approval or disapproval of the legality of any practice or activity carried on by financial institutions, other than that which is specifically prohibited under this legislation.

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
ABE MULTER,  
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
HENRY S. REUSS,  
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,  
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,  
FLORENCE P. DWYER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY NEEDS A NEW NAME

(Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, George Washington University needs a new name.

The Father of our Country, the first President of the United States, the hero of Valley Forge, and the epitome of patriotism in the darkest hours of the Republic, would resent the use of his name on a school whose president issues a directive suspending all military recruiting on the campus.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the recruiters are not a part of the selective service. The recruiters seek volunteers only.

Perhaps Arnold-Carmichael University would be a better name. Surely Benedict and Stokely would be proud.

#### JUNK MAIL LOBBYING

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have seen many examples of lobbying in the Halls of Congress, but I

believe no lobby has been as rough, ruthless, and cynical as those interests seeking lower rates for third-class mail.

Here is the latest example. A prominent citizen in my congressional district was offered by an intermediary a political war chest in excess of \$100,000 to try and eliminate me from Congress in 1968. This potential candidate told me he was so sickened by the nature of the offer that he turned it down with the observation that he himself agreed that third-class mail should pay its way. The same interests then approached him again, stating that they did not care how he felt, because anybody would be better than the present Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, and they would do anything to get rid of the present Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, \$100,000 is a lot of money in West Virginia. I personally doubt if anyone ever spent that much money in a congressional campaign in our State. We have heard many stories about direct-mail concerns claiming that higher third-class rates will throw them out of business.

If the junk mailers can afford to raise over \$100,000 in order to launch a political campaign, surely they can afford to pay postage rates which are not subsidized by the taxpayers and mailers of first-class mail. This just shows the lengths they will go to try and buy a seat in Congress.

#### STOKELY CARMICHAEL RETURNS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that Stokely Carmichael will arrive in New York this afternoon at 3:40 p.m. aboard flight 707 Air France.

At that time the U.S. Department of State will ask him for his passport, a mild slap on the knuckles, but under present law, it is about the only thing which can be done by the Passport Division.

I am however, hoping that the Justice Department will take appropriate action against Carmichael. He has been quoted as saying he is returning to assume the responsibility for his statements.

His statements, Mr. Speaker, make Stokely Carmichael guilty of sedition.

I have called, written, and pleaded with our Justice Department to take action against this seditious demagog. Justice has responded with an incredible amount of study.

However, the law on sedition is very clear. I have even had a treatise on the law on sedition, as provided by the Library of Congress, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than 5 months ago for the edification of the Department of Justice.

Yet this morning, Justice responded to the announcement of Carmichael's return by saying it was studying the matter.

Historically, we say that justice is supposed to be blind. If action is not taken by the Justice Department today,



I would say that Justice Department is blind to violations of the law.

# THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, AGAIN A STATE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, December 10, was the 150th birthday of our State of Mississippi. On the 10th of December 1817, Mississippi became the 20th State to come into the Nation. We have served under the Spanish flag, the French flag, back to the Spanish flag, then the English flag, the flag of the United States, the Confederate flag, and back to the flag of the United States, where we will stay. Our first Governor was David Holmes and the State capital was located near Natchez.

We are celebrating this great occasion in various ways down in Mississippi. I commend the Governor and the sesquicentennial committee in their detailed plans for this celebration.

We have had a colorful 150 years in our State. I also feel the next 30 years, before the turn of the century, will be years of great economic benefit for our people and further improve the per capita income for Mississippians.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., December 11, 1967.  
The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor of transmitting herewith a sealed envelope received by my office at 11:45 p.m., Friday, December 8, 1967, from the White House and said to contain H.R. 162, An Act to grant the masters of certain United States vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements, and a veto message thereon.

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk.

## TO GRANT MASTERS OF CERTAIN U.S. VESSELS A LIEN ON VESSELS FOR THEIR WAGES AND FOR CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning H.R. 162 without my approval.

This measure could seriously endanger private financing for ship construction.

It could lead to far greater Government subsidies for the merchant fleet—and place an undue and unnecessary financial burden on the American taxpayer.

It could also result in extended litigation.

In short, H.R. 162 is bad public policy.

The preferred ship mortgage is a useful and time-tested private financing device for building our merchant fleet. The holders of these mortgages are now secured creditors. Under existing law, their liens are paid immediately after those for seamen's wages, tort judgments, or other contract liens which attached prior to the preferred mortgage.

The mischief in H.R. 162 is this: It would—for the first time—give the highest priority lien to those who contract with the ship's master for ship supplies and other items. As a result, it places these suppliers and contractors in a superior position to the holders of preferred ship mortgages.

In substance, H.R. 162 could reduce the preferred mortgageholder virtually to the status of an unsecured creditor.

This could destroy the usefulness of the preferred ship mortgage as a means of privately financing merchant ship construction—a method which Congress itself authorized and approved in the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920.

Some portions of H.R. 162 are desirable. I believe it is wise to give the master of a vessel a lien for his wages that would have the same high priority as a seaman has for his. This affords the master greater protection for the fruits of his labor.

If the Congress enacts a bill so safeguarding the ship master's wages—without the offending provision I have discussed above—I would be happy to approve it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1967.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 428]

Annunzio	Dingell	Henderson
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Herlong
Ashley	Fino	Hosmer
Bates	Fountain	King, N.Y.
Bell	Frelinghuysen	Kornegay
Bolling	Fulton, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Broomfield	Halleck	Lukens
Carter	Hardy	McEwen
Celler	Harrison	Martin
Cowger	Harsha	Mathias, Md.
Dickinson	Heckler, Mass.	Michel

Nichols  
Resnick  
St. Onge

Sikes  
Snyder  
Stratton

Watson  
Willis  
Wyatt

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMEND- MENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE RE- PORT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 7, 1967.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we now have pending before us comes before us in such a way that we have to either vote it up or down.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House did their best to defend the position of the House. In my judgment we were successful in doing this—in defending the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to state at this point that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] deserves considerable credit and in my judgment deserves a medal for distinguished service in her support of this program which is so absolutely necessary in the passage of this legislation. She is an able legislator with penetrating insight into the problems we face with this legislation. I value greatly the work she has done in making this a successful legislative effort and I think that the beneficiaries of these programs will be thanking her in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, much of the criticism of the existing antipoverty programs has been attributed to the lack of involvement of responsible units of local government. In recognition of this, the most significant House committee amendment we brought to the floor on November 7 required community action agencies to be States, cities, or county governments or that such governments designate the public or private nonprofit agency to be the community action agency for the community. The Members of the House supported the committee in defeating floor amendments which would have undermined this principle.



I can report to you today, Mr. Speaker, that the managers on the part of the House have been successful in gaining the acceptance of the conference on this principle. The conference report and the House adoption of it today assure that responsibility for community action programs will rest largely in the hands of local officials who are elected and responsible to the people for their actions.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I can report that the conference has adopted the House provisions with respect to the structure of community action boards so that governing and administrative boards of community action agencies must, as we provided in section 211 of the House-passed bill, consist of one-third public officials, one-third representatives of the poor, and one-third representatives of business, education, and labor and other comparable interests in the community. Moreover, the House provision limiting the size of these boards to no more than 51 members has been accepted by the conference. This provision, it is hoped, will eliminate the chaos that has existed in some communities where community action boards have been incapable of effective action because they consisted of literally hundreds of people.

In section 210(d) of the bill as it passed the House on November 15, we provide that the Director could provide financial assistance to a public or private non-profit agency as a community action agency other than one designated by a unit of local government only where a State or any qualified political subdivision was unwilling to be designated as the community action agency or when a designated community action agency had failed after having a reasonable opportunity to do so to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program. It was our intention by this provision not to deny a community the benefits of this program because of the inaction of the local government. The House conferees accepted a clarifying addition to these two circumstances in which other than a political subdivision may be used as a community action agency. This clarification would extend the authority to recognize an agency other than a local political subdivision where the appropriate local unit of government has failed to carry out its plan in a satisfactory manner. However, even in the exercise of the authority under section 210(d), the requirements that the governing board for such agency consist of one-third public officials, one-third representatives of the poor, and one-third representatives of business, education, and labor and other comparable interests in the community as required in the House-passed bill were accepted by the conferees.

Thus, we have assured that in all community action programs responsible local public officials will be significantly involved in the programs. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I do not agree with the critics of the committee approach who feel that we have taken the innovative thrust out of community action programs by these changes. To the contrary, I have great confidence that the involved local public officials in the community action

programs will bring about new innovative thrust to community action programs and will attract new energies and financial resources in making these programs more effective in assisting those trapped in a cyclical grip of poverty to enter into the mainstream of American economic prosperity.

The Senate bill provides that not more than 15 percent of the funds for title II could be used for pilot or research programs. The House provision provided for no more than 10 percent. The Senate bill also required that of the 15 percent, \$50 million would be available only for research and pilot projects for the purpose of assuring a more effective use of human and natural resources in rural areas to slow the migration from rural to urban areas. The substitute provides that one-third of the funds allocated for research and pilot projects shall be used for this purpose.

The Senate bill provides that before approving any grant or contract for a pilot project in a community, the Director must solicit and consider the views of the community action agency if there is one. The House amendment provided that the community action agency or the appropriate political subdivision must approve such projects. The conference compromised the disagreement by requiring the Director to submit the plan for a proposed pilot project to the appropriate community action agency or local governing officials. If they did not disapprove the plan within 30 days, the Director could proceed. If such agency or officials disapproved within 30 days the Director could not proceed without again considering the entire project in the light of the objections and unless he found the project to be consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of title II.

Mr. Speaker, Extensive revision of the authority for the Job Corps was made in the House-passed bill. Among the tightening provisions are:

First. Procedures for selection and recruitment of enrollees have been strengthened.

Second. Greater emphasis is required to be given to the use of existing vocational education facilities for the Job Corps.

Third. Enrollment on a nonresidential status has been encouraged.

Fourth. Appropriate testing and counseling of enrollees prior to graduation to effect placement in employment for which the trainee has been prepared is required.

Fifth. More effective participation of the states in Job Corps programs and coordination with State-operated programs are required.

All of these provisions have been retained in the conference agreement.

Finally, the conference substitute requires that operating costs be reduced from the \$7,500 required in existing law to \$6,900 per enrollee per year. This represents a compromise from the Senate bill's \$7,300 and the House-passed bill's \$6,500.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the importance of skilled training and employment in eliminating poverty, greater

emphasis has been given to job training. The House-passed bill would enable a community to structure manpower training programs specifically to meet local needs using existing program concepts such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps or the new careers program or the Operation Mainstream program as a part of a total package adapted to meet the specific training and employment needs of local citizens. These new provisions include incentives to encourage private employers to hire and provide intensive training on the job to unemployed and seriously disadvantaged persons. These principles are retained in the substitute with the addition of a special impact program to operate in rural and urban areas with either substantial outmigration or concentrations of low-income persons. The language is a rewrite of authority contained in section 131 of the existing law.

The conference substitute authorizes \$1.98 billion for fiscal year 1968 and \$2.18 billion for fiscal year 1969. The 1968 figures are \$80 million below the 1968 budget estimates and \$291 million below the Senate-passed bill. While these amounts are above those provided in the House amendment voted upon November 15, I think it should be kept in mind that these authorizations are well within the amounts actually budgeted and represent a minimum that should be authorized particularly when we are making substantial revisions in the programs by the involvement of State and local governments in the administration of community action programs.

Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Nation are looking to improved program operations and greater benefits from the Economic Opportunity Act due to the changes made in the legislation this year. It would be a drastic mistake to handicap programs by severely curtailing funds to support them. Underfunded programs even under more effective and responsible local administration will have great difficulty in producing desirable effects. I hope that we will not defeat the success of the substantial changes made in the legislation by not providing the programs with adequate funds. But this is a matter which addresses itself more properly to the membership of the House when it considers supplemental appropriations which I understand will come up in the House tomorrow.

My hope would be that funds would be provided adequate to assure no cutback in programs and that a hoped-for relaxation of international tensions would permit the programs to be more fully funded in the future.

Provisions in the House amendment which extended restrictions against political activity to include partisan and nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate as well as any activity to provide prospective voters with transportation or any voter registration activity have been preserved in the conference substitute and transferred to section 603 in title VI so as to assure their applicability to all programs funded under titles I to VIII.

The provisions adopted on the floor of the House prohibiting the use of funds



in connection with labor organization activities have been retained in section 834(d).

Section 613 embodies principles of the House amendment prohibiting the use of funds under the act in connection with unlawful demonstrations, rioting, or civil disturbances.

Prohibitions against the use of legal service operations to defend persons charged with participating in an unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance have been broadened to include the defense of any person indicted or proceeded against by information for the commission of a crime except in extraordinary circumstances.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would refer my colleagues to the statement of managers which appears on pages 61 to 94 of the conference report and contains an item-by-item description of 196 substantive differences between the House amendment and the Senate bill which were resolved by the conference. I think that the conference report represents a sound resolution of the differences between the two bodies. I am strongly convinced that it preserves the essential changes made by the House in the Economic Opportunity Act programs and I am confident that with these changes much greater progress can be made in finding and providing solutions to the problems of many low-income families throughout the Nation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would ask the gentleman: Is it not true that what we are voting on in this conference report is basically the difference in the 1-year authorization, which is in the conference report?

The House was successful in maintaining almost all the amendments that were adopted here on the floor of the House in the conference committee, but the real difference is that in the first year we have raised the amount of money from \$1.6 to \$1.98 billion. We have extended the program for 1 additional year at \$2.2 billion, or in that general area.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that all the bills this year contemplated a 2-year program, and the opportunity crusade also so contemplated. And it would certainly be unwise to think about a 1-year program.

Now, the money was raised in conference, but some of the conferees on the gentleman's side were very generous and even made mention that money as we handled it would not be any detracting consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say to the gentleman—if he will yield himself another minute—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to myself.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman that we are marking up the poverty program appropriation this afternoon by this vote.

I am forced to vote against this conference report because I cannot commit myself to an authorization of \$1.98 billion in this fiscal year with the large budget deficit that we are facing. In our markup today, I am sure Democrats and Republicans alike will join together in a much smaller figure.

I think it is a mistake for Members of this House to vote on the larger figure today on this conference vote.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

The gentleman from Wisconsin well knows that it takes \$1,787 million to fund the program for the fiscal year 1968 to the same extent that it is funded at the present time. I feel we have something to think about here and the figure we put in this bill for the fiscal year 1968 is reasonable because we have restructured the program. To say we are not going to let any communities that may desire to come in and take advantage of the new legislation, I think would be undoing the hard work of this Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is a fact, is it not, essentially with respect to the 2-year authorization that the conference report represents a compromise? The amendment by the gentleman from Florida would have terminated the program in 6 months. It now being late in December, the action of the conferees has the effect of making this an 18-month program. Further, is it not so that were this rejected on the ground raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin that we can assure the Members of this body that the other body would not recede on this point?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. I think the Members of this body want to see this program restructured and want to see these new amendments go into effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long battle—3 years—attempting to change the Economic Opportunity Act and OEO. Not that there have not been some changes, some good ones that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and I have advocated; and some good changes that we never thought of.

However, there are some changes that I think are unwise, even damaging to the program. There is a continuance of programs in a way that even 3 years ago I thought was unwise. They were expressed in the minority views of 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967.

What are some changes CHARLIE GOODELL and I have recommended that are now incorporated in the EOA, or will be with the passage today of this bill?

There has been some tightening of the Job Corps, with better discipline and more regionalization—improved but yet inadequate control of costs.

In other programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, there will be improved involvement of private enterprise—not sufficient—but there will be improved involvement.

The Economic Opportunity Council is given direction now to coordinate Federal programs. We have guaranteed at least one-third representation of the poor on community action boards, except as diluted by the Green amendment.

There will be greater involvement of State and local governments, although it went too far in the amendment.

We have included an emergency food and medical services program for the hungry and those who are suffering from malnutrition.

We have a division of authority in community action, so there will be an urban director and a rural director of community action in OEO.

In the past we transferred work study and basic adult education to the Office of Education, and now there has been a delegation of the Followthrough to the Office of Education.

Let me capsule here what I think is wrong with the Green amendment. It is difficult, really, to explain in some cases because there has been a necessity for an increased involvement of responsible and responsive State and local governments, as well as the elimination of self-appointed spokesmen for the poor. But I believe it is now possible for local governments to totally exclude representatives of the poor from any share in policymaking where the political subdivision itself is the community action agency.

Mr. Howard W. Hallman, director of the poverty program study, wrote to the Senate conferees:

This repudiation of the poor is a serious error for these reasons:

It breaks a promise held out to the poor of all races and ethnic groups to have a voice in their own destiny.

It will increase the alienation of the poor by showing that once again they are rejected by society.

It plays into the hands of extremists who say, "I told you so. Only violent revolt is the solution."

It will aggravate already building tensions. It will contribute to a national social disaster.

What continues to be wrong with the Economic Opportunity Act? What can be done about it?

First. Make residential centers, now called Job Corps, a part of vocational education for those who need such a change in environment and who cannot receive better training at less cost in other programs, no matter what their family income.

Let us quit segregating the poor. I believe that economic class segregation is as bad as racial discrimination and it might turn out to be as debilitating.

Second. Develop a national manpower policy and coordinate and consolidate similar programs now administered not only by OEO but the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Third. Develop a preschool and early years policy and coordinate and consolidate such programs now administered by



OEO with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Fourth. Change from a project-by-project approval of programs between the Federal Government and local organizations and agencies whereby the local groups must develop "grantsmanship" in order to secure funds. Local groups now find they must not only request funding for programs which would meet their highest priority needs, but also for programs they hope will catch the fancy of some Federal administrator who must approve each and every proposal. We must change to a program where the Federal Government makes allocations—block grants—to States, based on a national policy. The States then would allocate the funds to local agencies and organizations, based on their particular and peculiar needs.

What should we do about this if you believe as I do? Vote against the conference report? No. After much soul searching, I have decided to vote for the conference report.

I plan to watch, scrutinize, and evaluate the operation of the OEO community action program, to point out its mistakes, and try to remedy the legislation when it comes up for consideration again.

I hope to encourage the people in my district to utilize step 2 of the Green amendment under which the local political subdivisions designate the public or private nonprofit agency so they will have a governing board, so the poor will have a voice in whatever policy decisions are made as specified in section 211 (b) and (e) of this bill.

You may ask why I am voting for the conference report. Because it is now such a good program? No. Because I have had a change of mind about the administration of the program by Sargent Shriver? No.

But there are three reasons I have chosen to vote for the conference report.

First, I do not believe it is worse than the bill that passed the House. In some respects it is better. We had to compromise a difference in money. But the details related to money concern us more greatly in the appropriation bill than in the authorization bill. I think we should make our decision on the program, and we should go into the amount of money involved when the appropriation bill is brought up in the supplemental appropriation bill.

Second, I think that by voting for the program it will help me in trying to give assistance to the community action agencies in my own district.

Third, in my view this is the final choice of whether the programs in the Economic Opportunity Act should be eliminated or continued. I have felt for a long time that they should be continued though changed.

This is the final week of the first session of the 90th Congress. Time has run out for the remedial changes involved in the Economic Opportunity Act. This is the decision I have come to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have read the conference report, the language on page 70 of the report in the statement on the part of the managers bothers me. In the

conference we agreed among the conferees that the interpretation I had of section 211(b), clause 2, was not correct; that mayors could appoint the representatives of the poor. Assurance was given to me by my colleagues on the conference committee that section 211(b) (2) did not mean that mayors could make the appointment of the representatives of the poor. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], to yield so that I might inquire whether my understanding is correct that the intention of the conferees was that the mayors should not be able to appoint the poor, that the poor should select their own representatives.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman's understanding is absolutely correct. It never was intended that the mayor in any municipality appoint the representatives of the poor. It was intended, even where the local government is a community action agency, that representatives of the poor should be selected according to democratic procedures, as they have been, and in accordance with the regulations and directives, but never will the mayor appoint the representatives of the poor.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, because I wanted to ask this so that the legislative history will be written, and it will be abundantly clear that never will the representatives of the poor be appointed by the mayor or other officials of a local political subdivision.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to discuss briefly the local participation in the community action program. It is my understanding that the local participation has now been changed from the 10 percent to 20 percent, but it may still be in kind rather than in cash, as it passed the House.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. We should bear in mind that 20-percent local participation was in the law as it passed the Congress last year, so we accepted the present law for the 80-20 share in title II. We did drop the requirement that one-half of the 20-percent local share must be in cash.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as we may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the many problems that confronted the conferees in attempting to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate. The House conferees sustained and kept in the bill many important features that will probably make the bill much better than it was, that will lead to lessening of most of the abuses.

I feel they went too far with their money, but I have been assured by the Appropriations Committee that the appropriations will be much less, and since this is merely an authorization, I am going to support the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think I will not need to take the 6 minutes. I rise today in strong support of the conference report. This conference report and the final legislation does not include probably everything that any one person in the House wants, but it was a good compromise, in my judgment.

The major threat of title II of the bill was not changed. The House language was retained. There were three or four minor modifications of that provision, but, by and large, the House, under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], was able to insist on this language. Mr. Speaker, throughout the days the conferees worked on this bill, the chairman of the House conferees offered real leadership—his patience, his understanding, his persistence made this conference report today possible.

May I also say a word about the 2-year extension of this legislation? I am one of those who believes very strongly that the legislation should be continued for the 2 years. I need not remind my colleagues we are already 6 months along in fiscal year 1968, and it seems to me that it would be a major error to say we would have to come back in January, or about the first of February, and start work on this legislation again. Therefore, I hope that the Members of this House, by an overwhelming majority, will support the conferees in submitting this report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. There has been a lot of talk all the way through the debate, and especially in the conference, that the poor were left out and omitted under the gentlewoman's amendment. I hope the gentlewoman will elaborate on the provisions dealing with representatives of the poor.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman for his suggestion.

All I can say is that those people who repeat and repeat, "There is no provision for the participation of the poor" must subscribe to the theory, "What I tell you three times is so." Their repetition of it 100 times does not make it so.

I suggest they read the bill.

The bill which was brought to the floor of the House by the committee provided for the "maximum feasible participation" of the poor. The conference report provides the same thing. There is language in four different places in the bill specifying that the poor will be involved in planning programs to meet the needs of the disadvantaged.

On both the community action boards and on the governing boards, both of which are limited to not more than 51 members, at least one-third of the members shall be selected by the poor and represent the areas in which the poor live. So there is this participation by the poor.

However, the change which the House adopted by a very substantial majority several weeks ago said that the community action agencies would not be controlled by the poor; all of the people in



the community, also, have a right to have a voice through their elected officials on how their money is spent and the kind of programs most needed in the community.

The conference report has the same language that the House approved: that a State or a political subdivision of a State can be designated as a community action agency; or, if the State or political subdivision does not want to be so designated, they can designate a private agency.

But there is participation by the poor and by the elected officials.

Mr. PERKINS. Where the local government serves as the community action agency, if I understand the statement correctly, it is provided in the bill and in the conference report that representatives of the poor will constitute at least one-third of the community action board. They will participate in formulating policy. They will influence policy decisions. But they will not have the final say-so.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is absolutely correct. We were very careful in using the word "selected." At least one-third will be selected by the poor from these areas. We provide maximum flexibility, so that the local areas can determine how these poor will be selected.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there not a sound reason for this procedure, when the local government serves as the community action agency, since they pass judgment upon public-related projects and other things, as to how much funding will be involved and the size of the programs?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The chairman is correct again.

I like to refer to this part of the bill as the gentleman from Illinois referred to it, the "home rule" provision. When we have elected government officials in an area, they are the ones who are responsible to the entire electorate. They should be responsible to the electorate.

As I said before, if they are blind to the needs of the poor and if they are deaf to any pleas for change, then the opportunity is available to all the people in the area to throw them out at the next election.

Mr. PERKINS. I like the terminology on home rule, but as I view the operation of this amendment I feel that it will be furthering good government of the people, by the people, and for the people. We have had this procedure for two centuries, and we must place responsibility with authority. I cannot think of any group of people, when they face the electorate continuously, who will not be on their toes to do a good job.

I believe this will considerably strengthen the programs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the distinguished gentlewoman please tell me how the so-called Green of Oregon amendment would operate, say, in my district, which has 12 municipalities in it?

Each one of them could be designated as the sponsor of a project. Suppose three or all of them wanted to get together and sponsor a project in common. How large a board would there be and who would designate the members of the board in that case?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Because the situation does vary so much over the 50 States, by intent we left a great deal of flexibility in the area to which you refer. It could be done in any one of several ways. All of 12 of these municipalities could come together and they could decide upon a coordinated plan that would serve the interests of all the people in those 12 communities. They could probably coordinate existing programs to a much better extent than they could at the present time. If the 12 were designated as a "community action agency"—they would have a board and on this board there would be up to 51 individuals. Up to one-third of them are elected officials. At least one-third are representatives selected by the poor, and the remainder are to be representatives from the community at large; that is, from education, religious, and welfare groups.

The second alternative, I will say to the gentleman from Florida, is that six of the municipalities—or three of them could get together or indeed, if there was not this cooperative spirit, each one of the 12 could develop its own community action agency.

May I say that in my own State of Oregon I hope there will be a coordinated effort in the areas involved and a maximum degree of cooperation.

Mr. PEPPER. If the gentlewoman will yield, may I ask one question? Suppose municipality A is designated to sponsor a given project. There will be a board set up in accordance with the provisions of the amendment in that case.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is right.

Mr. PEPPER. Suppose municipality A goes in with municipalities B, C, and D for a common project. Will their several boards cooperate and work together, or will there be a new board which would function on behalf of the municipalities sponsoring that joint project?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If each one of the municipalities has been designated as a community action agency, each one would be responsible for the programs. This would not prohibit them from cooperating on a specific program if that specific program were a part of all their work.

Mr. PEPPER. And there would not have to be a new or common board? They could use their several boards?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. For instance, if they wanted to cooperate on Headstart, four or six boards could get together and join each other in the one program, but if each one is organized as a community action agency, applied and asked to be designated as one, each one would have its board.

Mr. PEPPER. And those boards could work together?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentlewoman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield an addi-

tional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentlewoman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to compliment the gentle woman for the outstanding job she has done and ask her if it is not a fact that the provision of the so-called Green amendment has been substantially retained in the conference report?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is absolutely correct. There were minor modifications, but they do not change the intent.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentlewoman will yield further, may I make this brief statement, as I do not expect to speak at any other time.

I served on this conference, and I must say I have never seen a conference do a better job toward maintaining the position of the body it represented than was done by the conferees on this bill. The Senate conferees were united and I think unanimous both with respect to the money and with respect to the provisions of the so-called Green amendment. The conference report which we have brought back represents, in all substantive issues, the position of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the other body wanted a far more liberal bill, moneywise, than the House of Representatives had seen fit to adopt. Surely the House will agree that the conferees went as far as they possibly could to maintain the House position.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon will yield further, I wish to say that the conference was made up of strong men and women on the House side—and at this time I wish to compliment my distinguished Republican colleagues for their active and skillful participation in the conference, although they differed with us on many issues. May I also say, Mr. Speaker that I have never seen a member of a conference or of a committee or of the House of Representatives who did more work on a bill or on a conference report than the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] did on this bill. He worked tirelessly. He worked day and night. I have never seen a committee chairman maintain better communication with his colleagues than the gentleman from Kentucky maintained on this bill. This is a fine bill. It is a needed bill, and this bill is a monument to one of the gentlest and at the same time one of the firmest men I have ever known, CARL PERKINS. I hope and believe that the House will support its conferees and send this bill today to the President of the United States. I think we will have a better antipoverty program because of this legislation.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the eloquent remarks just made by the distinguished majority



leader. I endorse 100 percent the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma in regard to the chairman of our committee. The Representative from Kentucky was a gentleman at all times—yet a very insistent and persuasive defender of the House position. Because of his untiring work—we have a conference report today of which we can be proud.

The SPEAKER. The time of the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the changes and provisions of this conference report now pending before us with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I believe that those who have previously expressed their feelings and who have talked on this conference report have expressed the fact that the conferees have retained the substance of the so-called Green amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much have liked to have seen the conference report come back with something nearer the amount of money that was authorized in the House bill. However, I am confident that the conferees did the very best job of which they were capable under the circumstances. I further want to say that insofar as the substance of the so-called Green amendment is concerned, it is my opinion that this will make the act more effective. I believe it directs the thrust of the act more in the direction of what was intended when the bill was originally presented to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, recall that I had some participation in that endeavor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the distinguished gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute, although I wish I could yield to her more additional time.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield further to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], for the distinguished, diligent, and able job which the gentleman has performed with reference to this legislation as well as other legislation which has been brought before the Committee on Education and Labor and which the gentleman has brought to the floor of the House since he has had the chairmanship of the committee thrust upon him.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the membership of the House of Representa-

tives that despite the writings of some reporters to the contrary, no Member of this House of Representatives has done a more dedicated, a more complete, a more intelligent, a more successful job of developing and bringing before the House legislation designed to benefit the poor of this Nation and to lift the educational, cultural, and social standards of the poor, as well as all of the people of these great United States of America, than the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. It is my opinion that without doubt we can say if the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon had not been willing to give the thorough study and thought to the bill that she has given to it, we would today be without an extension of this authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon for all that she has done.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, votes like the one each of us is called upon to cast on this issue which is now before us call for real soul searching, careful analysis and thinking, and a fine final balancing of all the pros and cons of a bill which has ample measure of both.

I earnestly wish at a time like this that our rules, like the rules in the Senate, did not call for a fixed and rigid limitation on discussion. We face the final chapter in our consideration of one of this session's most important bills. After 7 weeks of committee hearings, 3 weeks of committee markup, 2 weeks of off and on debate here in the House, and more than 2 weeks of conference committee deliberations, each of us has much more to say than can be said in a few minutes. But we must forfeit that limit.

There are serious faults in this bill. In my opinion a number of the amendments which were proposed in committee and here on the floor, aimed at strengthening the job orientation of the whole program and the involvement of private enterprise, were good amendments.

Such improvements in this program are vital if it is to be truly successful in the long run. The conference reports takes a few short steps in the direction of improvements in this area, but that portion of the debate ended for this year on this floor some weeks ago.

The bill and the basic program have other faults. The unit costs of Job Corps programs are too high. The independent audit of the GAO which we unanimously adopted in the House has been indefinitely delayed because of lack of certain funding. A desirable restriction on the number of supergrades has been dropped. In view of the needs of the Nation, the moneys herein authorized are inadequate, but in view of the provisions of this particular bill and the serious eco-

nomie crisis we face, the moneys herein authorized are too high. There is no allocation of funds even by titles for the second year of this program.

But the most serious fault in this measure involves its unfortunate overreaction to the proposal for the involvement of State and local officials in community action programs. Some meaningful involvement of our elected officials in community action was long overdue, and was proposed and strongly backed by my party in committee and on this floor. Unfortunately, this bill as now before us swings from no required involvement of local officials to the far extreme of complete control and possible domination. One of the few great innovations in this program as it now exists was the basic idea of self-help on the part of the poor, which in many parts of our Nation means our Negro brethren. By this amendment there has been created a terrible danger that this most promising and meaningful element of self-help will be replaced by a return to a strictly welfare philosophy of doing for in place of doing with. May our fears prove unfounded in actual practice, and may each of us who is truly concerned watch carefully in his or her own district and State to limit the effect of this removal of the poor from policymaking responsibility and authority.

But with all of the bill's faults, our simple choice today is between life and death for this program. And with this the case, my personal choice is for life. I am in hopes that when the appropriation bill comes before us it will involve a reduced amount of funds. But today I shall personally vote in favor of the conference report. America dares not let this program expire here today.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I believe the conference in its action has made two significant improvements in the bill as it passed the House.

First, of course, is the elimination of the 10-percent cash requirement for local programs. Under the bill as it passed the House at least half of the local share would have to have been made up in cash. This has now been removed so that the entire 20 percent local share can be made up of services and otherwise in kind.

I believe this is particularly important to stimulate voluntary efforts in support of the antipoverty program and to insure that programs are not terminated because localities are unable to raise the required cash or local officials are unwilling to seek additional tax revenues for these purposes.

Second, the conference adopted a 2-year authorization. It seems to me that this will provide for some stability and some life expectancy for the program.

For too long the antipoverty program has had a life expectancy of, at best, 6 months.

What I think it needs now is a clear commitment by the Congress so that it can move forward with real support.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, but what there are some serious faults in the conference report.



The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and I tried to remove the Green amendment. I will not repeat what I said at that time, but I still have serious objections to it. But I think what is more important is that we recognize that by voting for the conference report today, we will support rather than imperil the program at a time when the country is facing its most serious domestic crisis since the Civil War.

I think the 30 million poor in America, including the 8 million unemployed and underemployed, deserve strong support and a clear commitment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that by voting for this conference report, we will make clear our concern for the inner-city, for the ghetto, and for the disadvantaged.

I would be frank to say that I think the sights of the Congress, if anything, are far too low. I hope that some of the modest steps that are taken in this bill will be strengthened by subsequent Congresses, namely, by a massive attack on job training and upgrading of skills. I hope the Congress will do something in concert with private enterprise, with labor, and others that will make possible the training and upgrading of skills of some 500,000 Americans.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would add that I very much hope that the Committee on Appropriations will do all in its power to give full and adequate funding to this bill. Measured against the needs of America and the problems of our cities, the fullest possible funding is imperative. Funding at a level of \$1.6 billion would mean the shutdown of 150 community action agencies, deprivation of Headstart programs for more than 29,000 children, and the termination of follow through activities for some 180,000 children. We must not permit this to happen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my remarks to section 406 of title IV of the bill. As we know, the conferees, in working out differences accepted a stipulation to the House-passed version which was insisted upon by one of the Members of the other body. This stipulation appears in section 406(f) and states:

The President may, if he determines that it is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this part, transfer any of the functions under this Section to the Secretary of Commerce.

During debate on the floor of the other body last Friday, the senior Senator from New York, in discussing this stipulation said:

I feel the President has that power to transfer immediately. In other words, as soon as the bill is signed, if he feels that a change

ought to be made in that respect, in my judgment the bill gives him the authority to make it. He can make it at any time from the time the bill is signed. I hope the President will use that power and not see it as a dead letter on the books.

Mr. Speaker, were the President to make such an immediate transfer of this authority, I feel that such a move would serve to distort the intent of the Congress. The Senator attributes the House's insistence that SBA administer these small business programs to the threat of one Member of this body. Such is certainly not the case, Mr. Speaker.

May I point out that on October 31, a letter unanimously signed by all 15 members of the House Small Business Committee was sent to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, specifically asking that this authority not go to the Department of Commerce, but remain with SBA.

No less than 16 speeches were made on the floor of the House by Members from both sides of the aisle, all asking that this authority remain with SBA.

In the other body, the esteemed chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business both made speeches on the floor of the Senate, both speeches concluding with a plea that the House change the Senate-passed bill so that these functions would be retained by SBA.

I cannot disagree with the senior Senator from New York on the legislative history of this bill, that his amendment obviously grants the President the transfer authority, and his remarks would seem to urge the President to do this at once. However, I do say that if the President were to utilize this authority without giving the Small Business Administration a chance to show what they can do, such action would be an outright breach of faith and would make a mockery of the efforts of this House which is trying to help the needy small businesses of this country in the best possible manner; namely, by having the best qualified agency do the job, and that is the Small Business Administration.

In fact, in the Senator's own New York City, it is not the Department of Commerce that has been active in Harlem, as the Senator alleges, but the SBA. It is the SBA which posted trained loan and management assistance personnel in the very heart of the ghetto areas of New York. It is the Small Business Administration which is providing small economic opportunity loans to poverty-area small business owners and would-be owners, and tying some of these loans to management training and continuing face-to-face counseling by its own management specialists or SBA's Service Corps of Retired Executives—SCORE.

Further, on the question of who should administer to the small business needs in the poverty areas, the conference report language is carrying out the intent of Congress, expressed some 10 years ago when the Small Business Act was legislated, and reiterated time and time again that:

It is important to make sure that no small business functions remain in any other

agency (Rept. No. 555, 85th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 7963 which, when enacted, became the Small Business Act of 1958).

In fact, in order to enable the President to carry out this congressional intent, Congress enacted section 12 of the Small Business Act, granting the President authority to transfer any and all small business "functions, powers, and duties of any Department or Agency which relate primarily to small-business problems."

Consequently, to set the history of this bill straight, the House of Representatives intends this legislation to mean that the President may deviate from the congressional intent embodied in the aforementioned House report of 1958 and section 12 of the Small Business Act, but not by the stroke of a pen, but only by using the long-established reorganization practice and procedure and, furthermore, only if, after expiration of a sufficient trial period, and determination that SBA is either incapable or unwilling to carry out the provisions of section 406, and if the President further determines that it is "necessary" to thus transfer these functions to the Department of Commerce.

I would say, without fear of contradiction, that congressional intent in this matter requires that SBA be given at least 1 or 2 years to work on the programs delegated to them in section 406.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, everybody has a little bit different idea of why they should or should not support this legislation. You have heard the issue raised here today that the conference report should be rejected because it provides for a 2-year authorization rather than a 1-year authorization as the committee in its initial action recommended.

I say to you, it makes no difference whatever whether it is a 1-year or a 2-year authorization. We authorize 2-year programs, 3-year programs, 4-year programs in all our other Federal programs such as our aid-to-education program for Elementary and Secondary Education Act which is for 3 years.

I do not think anybody can find real justification for voting against this program because the conference report recommends that it be for 2 years rather than 1 year. It must be stabilized if it is ever to work. Only time and good administration will do this.

Some people say that we should oppose this program because the money is in excess of that recommended by the House initially—and that it is. But we know quite well, having heard from the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that nothing near the amount authorized is going in the end to be appropriated.

I think you can take the word of the chairman of the committee for that. We did not appropriate what was authorized last year. We will not this year or next.

Some people say that we ought to reject this conference report because the poor are going to be segregated or because the poor are going to be excluded. Well, if anybody has made an effort to



segregate the poor, it is the emphasis that some have laid upon the role of the poor in the community action program who distort out of all proportion the so-called role of the poor.

Certainly the poor are not going to be excluded because, explicit in the new definition of a "community action agency," is the role of the poor as they participate, and one-third of the community action agency must be representatives of the poor.

I will tell you what the issue is. There are some who would like to continue this program as it is with a continuing resolution, and for the life of me I do not see how anyone could in good faith vote to continue this program as it presently is, in view of the criticisms that every Member of this House has had of the program as it is now operated.

It is not a question of whether or not we have a program. The real crux of the matter is: What kind of a program are we going to have? I believe if we are going to have a program, that we must take recognition of the fact that this committee this year has done what should have been done at the outset, and that they have placed proper authority in the proper hands of local elected officials who do have some responsibility to the electorate and the people. I sincerely believe that even though I have other serious objections to the bill the legislation must be properly administered, for it has been poorly operated; there has been fraud in my district connected with the program—if we turn this program over to the elected officials, the time will not be many years away when this bill will not be controversial in the House of Representatives, because I believe these responsible elected officials will do a responsible job. It will gain the favor of the people and will allow, in time, people like myself to vote for the proposal who must, in view of the past, see first a proven record of performance. We have given local officials such responsibility in many other areas of legislation. It is consistent to do so with this program if indeed we are going to even profess a belief in States rights.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I supported this legislation when it passed the House before it went to conference. I did so with a number of reservations. My reservations were not because I felt there was no need for such a program, for the need is everywhere apparent in our urban centers today. I did so rather because I felt that unless the program is improved materially in many aspects of its operation, it is likely to fall of its own weight, with a reaction that may well have very undesirable and unpleasant consequences.

Unfortunately, the improvements in the legislation which had been added by the House committee after a great deal of work, have many of them gone down the drain, and we have not taken advantage of other opportunities for improvement.

Specifically, it is a disappointment that a 2-year authorization has been added to the bill. This means that there will be no examination of this program in any depth by the Committee on Education and Labor for the second year. It is true, of course, that there will be a requirement for appropriations, but this will not get into the advisability of the various policies presently being followed and perpetuated in their errors by the present legislation.

The game of politics has dipped even deeper into the affairs of poverty at the expense of a voice for the poor by the retention of the so-called Green amendment. However, I was happy to see retention of the amendment to bar certain political activity of poverty workers. This political activity has been more of a detriment to community acceptance of the program than a help.

Moreover, elimination of other improvements in standards and administration, such as those in the Erlenborn amendment, which would have prevented unrestricted transfer of funds between the titles of the act, and the limitations upon the employment of experts and consultants and advisory committees, invite continued abuses.

A favorable aspect of the action of the conference committee is the removal of unrealistic local contribution to cost in cash which had been written into the House version of the bill. It seems to me that the requirement of a 20 percent local contribution in cash or kind, subject to waiver by the Director, is a far more realistic approach, and one that will permit the program in areas of the greatest need which might otherwise be deprived.

Ultimately, the choice as to whether to vote for the bill seems to turn on whether this program is to continue at all or whether a better bill might be secured if the measure were returned to conference. Unfortunately, with the views and the makeup of the conference committee at the present time, further progress seems unlikely. Therefore, with the serious reservations which I have mentioned, which I intend to continue to dwell on, I am supporting it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the conference report, and I wish to commend both the distinguished chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Oregon for the superb and outstanding job on a bill that I, very frankly, thought had no chance earlier in this session. They have piloted through the House a good bill, and this is a good conference report. I shall support it.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] in his kind references to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

In my 19 years in the Congress, I have never known a committee chairman who was confronted with quite the

problems as our able and beloved friend. His patience, good humor and kindness paid off to the country and to himself. He has rendered the entire Nation a great service.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] for her persistence, dedication and devotion regarding a basic fundamental principle. She manifested throughout this session a confidence in local government and through that belief in local government she has strengthened this bill and played a vital role in making it acceptable to the Congress and to the country.

I commend the members of the Education and Labor Committee, on both sides of the aisle, for their splendid and successful efforts to work out a bill acceptable to the Congress and to the country. Each of them and the staff of this great committee deserve the commendation and the high esteem in which they are held by this House.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add a few words to what has already been said by the chairman of this committee, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and others who served on the conference committee for about a dozen days, morning, noon, and night. It was a difficult conference, because this is the type of legislation that usually creates a great deal of discussion and differences of opinion. Every member of that conference probably felt that he or she could write this bill better than the bill that is now before us. Each of us had our own strong beliefs on certain points in the legislation. Some of us felt that the participation of the elected public officials would lend more dignity to this program in the communities.

It would also allow elected community officials to participate not alone with responsibility, but to have some of the authority in managing these programs. Perhaps in the large urban centers where you have organized civic groups they can take over, but those of us who come from districts where in the main they are controlled by urban communities, we have no such agencies. We do not have multi-million-dollar corporations that set up boys clubs and all kinds of aids for the so-called poor and poverty stricken. So the only peoples they can go to in a small community are, in the main, the elected public officials.

Somehow or other this program has operated in a vacuum insofar as the elected public officials are concerned, and with the Green amendment, in spite of all the misunderstanding and all the propaganda that was put out by those who either refuse to read the Green amendment or at least certainly refuse to understand it, the community will have a direct interest in every program. I say that in the next few years we will find that this program will find its level and will become a part of our everyday exercises in our communities and the poor



will gain many more benefits than under the present operation.

I want to add my endorsement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] in his praise of the lady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] for her very valuable contribution to our deliberations.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there are features to this conference report which I cannot support, and I am sure this represents the position of many others who are present today. But I am going to vote for the conference report. As I see it, this is the only practicable thing for the House to do. There has to be an authorization bill.

To operate on a continuing resolution into next year would be an abdication of power and responsibility by Congress and a confession of incompetence.

I have made it clear over a period of weeks as to what my position is with regard to appropriations under this legislation, and I wish to reiterate my position at this time for the RECORD.

I am supporting a continuation of the poverty program, as far as appropriations are concerned, at a level of \$1.6 billion, substantially at the level of last year. On the appropriation bill I shall work for the \$1.6 billion figure, and will do all I can to secure its adoption by the House and the other body.

My vote for the authorization legislation today is not a commitment to support appropriations at the authorization level.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is the strong position of many of the Members who will vote for the conference report. As a practical matter, we have no other course to follow, other than to support the authorizing bill in the conference report. The battle over the level of spending will come on the appropriation bill, which I hope will be before the House tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to clear up one point earlier in the discussion today, and I wanted to ask the chairman to comment on it. Before I ask that question, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for the leadership he has shown in this legislation. A few months ago nobody would have bet a wooden nickle we would approve a poverty program in this Congress. Under the leadership of the gentleman, we are here today with a bill. I hope his soft voice and likable manner will not obscure the fact that he is a great leader.

The question I wanted to ask is whether or not the mayor of a municipality could appoint the members of a community action board? It is my understanding that the bill provides that the members of the community action board, for the poor people, shall be elected in a democratic manner, but as a technical proposition, they have to be appointed to that entity by the community action agency and the head of that agency. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman well knows it was never contemplated that any governing authority select representatives of the poor as such, but the poor will select their own representatives. However, after the poor have selected their representatives through democratic processes, then to certify the members as representatives of the poor, naturally I presume the mayor would have to do that. But that is separate and apart from selecting them originally.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman a question on this, because we had better clear up this point before the conference report is adopted. I do not know of any instances where the mayor has to select the membership to a board. If the poor select their members for the board, are we saying that the mayor can say "No"?

Mr. PERKINS. No, I am not stating that. I have not stated that. I am only stating that when the application is made, to get the program funded, naturally the representatives of the poor will have to be—that will have to be made clear, who they are, as to who certifies them, and that would depend upon the regulations of OEO, I would think.

They must be duly selected in a democratic way.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, it is true that the mayor cannot veto the selection of the poor; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. It was never intended that the mayor select the representatives of the poor or veto any method of selecting the poor that the poor may choose in selecting representatives to serve on a community action board.

Mr. QUIE. In the case where the political subdivision is the political action agency, then the mayor will have to certify who are the representatives of the poor. That is what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I wonder if the chairman would ask consent for all Members to extend their remarks prior to moving the previous question on the conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the six House Republican conferees on the OEO poverty legislation (S. 2388) refused to sign the report as protest against the conference bill. There were some 195 differences in the two versions which went to conference. For your convenience, we

have summarized some of the principal features of the bill which has emerged. In some instances, the conference recommendations are substantially different from—or an outright reversal of—decisions made by the House in acting upon the poverty bill.

#### AUTHORIZATION

The majority conferees have agreed upon a 2-year authorization of the poverty programs and have authorized \$1.98 billion in fiscal 1968 and \$2.18 billion for fiscal 1969. None of the \$2.18 billion is allocated to specific titles or programs in the second year. This means that the Director is free to fund the various programs without any authorization guidelines by the Congress. As you know, the House bill contained only a 1-year authorization of \$1.6 billion for fiscal 1968.

By their action, the majority conferees have effectively eliminated further review or consideration of the poverty programs at least until 1969.

#### LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO COSTS

House conferees receded from the House amendment which required a cash contribution from non-Federal sources of at least 10 percent of the total cost of community action programs. Subject to waiver by the Director of OEO, 20 percent of the total cost of such programs must be met from non-Federal sources in cash or kind.

#### THE SO-CALLED GREEN AMENDMENT

The provisions of the so-called Green amendment remain essentially intact. There continues to be three structural alternatives for a community action agency—CAA:

First. A governmental body—State or political subdivision—shall be designated as the agency, with authority to plan and conduct programs. The programs are to be administered by a "community action board" which includes one-third representation for public officials and at least one-third representation for the poor, with the balance representing community groups and interests—labor, religious, business, et cetera. The bill provides that such boards shall have a full opportunity to participate in the "development and implementation" of programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with maximum feasible participation of residents of such areas.

Second. In the absence of a public body willing to serve as the CAA, or if the public body so designated fails to develop a satisfactory plan, the Director may provide financial assistance to another agency—to be designated as a CAA—which has a "governing board" whose membership is constituted like the administrative board described above, with major policymaking and other powers specified in section 211(e). The conference bill allows the Director to exercise this authority where the CAA fails to carry out its plan in a satisfactory manner.

Third. A State or political subdivision may decline to serve as a CAA but designate another public or private, nonprofit agency to so serve. The agency so designated is required to have a governing board constituted similarly to the administrative board described earlier.



However, its policymaking and other powers are identical to those of the governing boards of CAA's designated by the Director under the second alternative described above.

The conference did not alter the authority of the Director to provide financial assistance to public or private, non-profit agencies, notwithstanding a designated CAA of any type, for certain limited purpose programs or projects. This authority, as described in section 221(b), can be used only in the absence of a CAA, or, if there is a CAA, with its approval.

The House version of S. 2388 extended the membership requirements of community action boards and governing boards to a subsidiary board or council serving a particular geographic area which has been given responsibility for policy determinations by the CAA, or is serving in an advisory capacity to the CAA on such determinations. The conference substitute provides that where a CAA places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to certain program matters in a subsidiary group within a geographic area, its membership must be broadly representative of such area, subject to regulations of the Director which assure adequate opportunity for membership of elected public officials.

The effective date of the so-called Green amendment is controlled by section 401 of the act. Each existing CAA must comply with the new requirements as to board membership—including one-third representation for public officials—as of July 1, 1968. Such CAA's may, however, continue to operate and receive financial assistance—unless another CAA is designated and funded by the Director pursuant to the revised provisions of title II—through January 1969.

#### THE GURNEY AMENDMENT

During floor debate in the House, Representative GURNEY succeeded, on a rollcall vote of 332 to 79, in adding to the legal services program authorization on a prohibition against the use of funds or personnel, first, to organize civil disturbances; or second, to defend any person participating in such a disturbance against the criminal charges resulting therefrom. As revised by the conference majority, such funds or personnel may be utilized for the defense of any person who has been indicted for a crime only in those "extraordinary" circumstances where the Director determines that adequate legal assistance will not otherwise be available for an indigent criminal defendant.

#### THE GARDNER AMENDMENT

Congressman GARDNER obtained House approval for a new section in title VI barring employees of any agency assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act from engaging in any "picketing, protest, demonstration, riot, or any similar group activities," and prohibiting the extension of assistance under the act to "any person convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activities resulting in material damage of property or injury to persons." The latter pro-

hibition would have incorporated as part of the permanent law of the act the provisions of the Broyhill amendment contained in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

The conference agreed to delete the prohibition modeled after the Broyhill amendment, and limited the bar on engaging in the various group activities described above to any "unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance." The revised wording permits individuals paid with poverty dollars to engage in lawful demonstrations, protests, and other such activities in the course of and pursuant to his employment.

#### THE FINO AMENDMENT

As adopted by the House, the amendment of Representative Fino added as a precondition of financial assistance, for title I-B programs—work and training for youth and adults—that no person charged in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party.

The conference eliminated the precondition and substituted the following words:

The Director shall terminate financial assistance for any programs under this part in any case in which he determines that any person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for the administration of the programs is a member of the Communist Party.

#### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE INVESTIGATION

Representative DELLENBACK secured House acceptance of authority for the GAO to investigate the poverty programs under the act and report to Congress by May 1, 1968, with an allocation of \$2 million for this purpose. The conference majority moved the reporting date back to December 1, 1968, and eliminated the specific allocation of funds.

#### EXCEPTIONAL TREATMENT OF RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The House voted to terminate the exclusion of certain types of public assistance payments for purposes of determining the eligibility of recipients for poverty program participation, effective June 30, 1968. The conference majority voted to continue such special treatment through June 30, 1969.

#### JOB CORPS

One major change in the present law and structure of the Job Corps was contained in a House amendment which eliminated the requirement that 40 percent of all Job Corps males be assigned to conservation centers. The conference restored this provision and continues the present practice.

The House amendment also contained a requirement that Job Corps activities aggregate 60 hours per week, which requirement was dropped in conference.

The House amendment placing a limitation of \$6,500 per enrollee on direct center operating costs was raised to \$6,900 per enrollee. This limitation will also apply during fiscal 1969.

#### SISK AMENDMENT

An amendment by Representative SISK prohibited any pilot or demonstration project from being commenced within any political subdivision without the ap-

proval of the community action agency or, in their absence, the local elected officials. Majority conferees agreed to this provision after altering the approval clause to a local veto provision which can be overridden by the Director within 30 days.

#### ASHBROOK AMENDMENTS

Amendments by Representative ASHBROOK repealed sections of the law giving the Director authority to employ experts or consultants and to appoint advisory committees. Both authorities were restored in the conference with a limitation of 100 days in any 1 fiscal year in which a consultant may be employed.

The conference likewise rejected the Ashbrook amendment which limited the number of supergrades which may be employed by OEO to a ratio of 1 to every 100 employees.

#### AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS

An amendment by Representative ERLBORN repealed section 616, authorizing the Director to transfer funds from any one title in the bill to a program or activity in any other title. The conference restored this authority to the Director.

#### PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

An amendment by Representative STEIGER of Wisconsin required the Director or Administrator of programs under this act to make public announcement of any contract for a study, evaluation, research, or demonstration project and of the results of such project. The conference modified this provision to eliminate "studies and evaluations" from the requirement. Majority conferees felt it was mistreating OEO to require them to hang out their "dirty laundry" in the form of evaluations paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my strong support for the antipoverty program. The Office of Economic Opportunity has already helped hundreds of thousands of Americans begin the upward journey to self-realization and self-respect. The OEO by helping people to help themselves, has contributed to a stronger, richer, and better America for each and everyone of us, poor and rich alike. But we have a long way to go before the war against poverty has been won.

Before I go any further, I want to emphasize that in combating economic poverty—and the spiritual poverty, disease and mental and physical apathy that so often accompany it—we are making an investment that will return many times the cost to ourselves and to our country. The benefits of taking unskilled, now unemployed men and women and helping them to become skilled, self-supporting and productive citizens, are now obvious. Reports I have seen indicate that if we upgraded the job skills, education and, consequently, the earning power of all the potentially or actually employable among the 30 million Americans now in poverty, we would I believe realize a \$50 or \$60 billion increase in our gross national product. This certainly would be well worth the investment in time, money, and effort that is required.



My support of the antipoverty program is based on more than academic theorizing, however. It is based solidly on what I have seen in my own Second Congressional District in California.

We had, in the Second District of California, which comprises 19 counties, 11 summer Headstart projects, which in 1967, helped give 648 children a better chance in life. These Headstart projects have an almost equally beneficial effect on the families of the children who are involved. In addition, some 760 youngsters are acquiring essential work experience and much-needed income for themselves and their parents through participating in the five Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. A number of small farmers have been given a better chance for success by the 78 individual rural loans which have been granted them.

I do not have any figures on the monetary value of the accomplishment of the four conservation centers in my district which have 616 enrollees, but I recall that early last spring, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior estimated the total value to the Nation of the conservation effort alone of the centers to be worth over \$27 million. To get their true value, you would have to add to that, a number of other tangible and intangible benefits to the enrollees and the country, such as the benefit of a productive, self-supporting member of society as contrasted with the social and economic cost of an individual or family on welfare, with the increased incidence of antisocial behavior that so frequently accompanies life on welfare.

In addition to those projects I have cited, the 30 VISTA volunteers are making a noteworthy contribution to the welfare of many of those less fortunate than themselves.

In the brief time that I have at my disposal, I cannot begin to enumerate all the good that has grown from the many activities undertaken by those dedicated people who comprise the community action agencies in my district.

For the benefit of my many good friends on the other side of the aisle, perhaps I should point out that Governor Reagan wholeheartedly endorsed the poverty program. California has received more OEO funds than any other State. California has accepted more than \$57 million for Federal poverty programs this year alone.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues well know, I have consistently supported the war on poverty since it was first envisioned. I supported the establishment of the Office of Economic Opportunity and I supported the various programs through which this agency wages this war on poverty, for I feel they are attacking the problem at the source; namely, the present inability of many of our citizens to earn their own way. This is an educational effort which I feel must be continued if these citizens are to have the opportunity to become contributing members of our society rather than to face a life on welfare. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I wholeheartedly support the measure which the conferees have brought before us today because I feel this is the best

program attainable to continue this war on poverty.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this conference report—on S. 2388, extending the Economic Opportunity Act—but I shall do so with reservations sufficient enough to compel me to make them a part of the record.

There are great and special problems faced by those of our fellow citizens who are today's poor—those individuals who, as Jacob Riis has said, cannot keep up in civilization's race to get ahead but "fall behind—lose hope and ambition, and give up, thenceforward (to become)—the victims, not the masters of their environment."

In times past, we used to deal with these problems—as we did with many other social problems—on something approaching a person-to-person basis but, as "government" at all its various levels gradually assumed this responsibility for our more affluent citizens in an ever-more-affluent society, this attitude began to disappear until, today, scarcely a trace can be found of it, except on a collective basis.

I am not at all sure this is good though, on the surface, it seems to be a much more businesslike way for a highly successful society such as ours to tend to the needs of those of its members who are not sharing in the full measure of that success.

In any event, we now have not only a vast, all-encompassing and largely depersonalized "welfare" structure that we lean on as the source for the more basic needs of our poorer neighbors, but also a federally directed and financed war on poverty that cannot be faulted in its ambition but only, perhaps, in the illusion it fosters that the realities of life can be repealed by federally applied antibiotics, and all made quickly perfect.

By such implied criticism, I do not mean to suggest that some such new attack on the root causes of poverty should not be made—nor that the Federal Government should not furnish the basic direction and the seed money to make that new attack far more meaningful than our sprawling, basic welfare structure—with its caretaking nature—has, or could ever, become. And, in point of fact, the very failure of that welfare mechanism to do anything other than taking care of our poor for us—its failure to motivate or encourage the poor, themselves, to rise above the crippling and self-defeating nature of their environment—was the reason why some new approach to this overall problem had become urgent.

However, Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me from the very beginnings of this new effort that the approach, as drafted for us by the administration's social planners, contained certain clear deficiencies to which prior Congress failed to address themselves in an objective, responsible fashion.

Thus, I had hoped that, this year, things would be different—and I was one of those who, for certainly other than partisan reasons, saw considerable merit in some of the provisions contained in the Republican substitute that such colleagues of mine as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUILL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] had

worked on so hard and so long. There is surely no point in attempting to debate those merits again, now, but I must say it was a discouraging thing for me to see so many of the amendments offered to this bill—when it was here before us in November—by these and others of my colleagues greeted with ridicule and derision from the other side of the aisle, from whence they were shot down by a new sort of "coalition" as steadily and, with but rare exception, with about the same efficiency as would be exhibited by an expert marksman spending a rainy Saturday afternoon in a shooting gallery.

And it was equally discouraging to me to again discover that those in charge of this program downtown, along with its chief advocates here, were displaying the same monolithic attitude toward its form and structure as they had before—an attitude that has marked and marred the legislative process, itself, insofar as it has pertained to this and all other so-called antipoverty bills.

It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that few, if any, of those persons who adopted that monolithic attitude—and who seem to think the antipoverty program, with one exception I will mention in a moment, is perfect as it is, were listening when Daniel P. Moynihan recently warned the Americans for Democratic Action that:

We (liberals) have been too long prisoners of the rhetoric that Republicans don't know anything about the social problems of the nation, or in any event don't really care.

Mr. Speaker, I should think the substantial Republican vote for this bill, as it cleared the House last month, was pretty solid evidence of the fact that Republicans, by and large, do see the need for this kind of an effort, despite their repeated rebuffs at attempting to improve it as they think it should be improved.

We Republicans have supported this program this year—when, perhaps, we had the votes to kill it—because we see promise in it, and because we recognize that, for better or worse, it has been accepted as a sign of hope by the poor, as well as a national pledge of sorts that the opportunities that abound in this blessed land will be made available to all our citizens.

I assume that enough of us will still support this bill—even though to many of our minds it now carries more money than it can efficiently and wisely use, which is, perhaps, something we can hope to correct in the next few days when the supplemental appropriation bill necessary to actually fund it comes before us.

I also assume that enough of us will still support it even though most of us who do so will feel that the Green amendment, so-called, which was adopted here in this body over our objections and has now been retained by the conferees—the only real change made in the program and so made, apparently, to hold together that "coalition" I mentioned earlier—is an unwise amendment and one that may well cripple the vital community-action program which is the only truly innovative feature of the whole antipoverty effort and on



the success of which the success of the whole program hinges.

And I also assume that enough of us will still do so even though, by virtue of the conferees' action, we now have before us not a 1-year but a 2-year authorization which means, of course, that we on our side of the aisle will have no real opportunity to attempt improvements in the program until the 91st Congress.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will do so—just as I shall do—with grave reservations and serious doubts that the antipoverty program, as presently structured and operated, can or will meet the rising tide of expectations of our Nation's poor, a tide that gives every sign of reaching flood proportions next summer, and only because we agree that the promise this program ultimately holds must be encouraged, the hopes the poor have put in it sustained, and the national pledge it represents eventually honored.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the action taken by the conferees in rejecting my amendment which would have prohibited the OEO from funding any work-training programs administered by present or former members of the Communist Party.

The conferees, in eliminating my amendment, say that there is a provision which prohibits employment of Communists. Just placing a ban on Communists only is ridiculous. We certainly do not expect the Director of this program to employ Communists. But it is a sad commentary on the American taxpayers when we ask them to payroll ex-Communists to handle a program dealing with our young people. Everyone knows that Communists are particularly concerned with subverting young people.

To those who argue that an ex-Communist is harmless and might be an asset because he could inform our young people on the evils of communism, I say that argument is pure and simple stupidity.

Why should we gamble on whether or not an ex-Communist has had a change of heart? Why should we take a chance on an admitted Communist more particularly when he is assigned a sensitive position? Are there no other loyal, decent Americans to handle work-training programs which deal with the youth of America?

My amendment was directed specifically against a former Communist, Mr. Robert Schrank, who is now New York City's assistant poverty commissioner in charge of work training programs.

Let me tell you of Mr. Schrank's record. We don't have precise dates on his Communist membership but Mr. Lindsay's press secretary said:

I understand that while Schrank had been a member of the Communist party for 15 years, he gave up his membership prior to his mobilization for Youth appointment three or four years ago.

There is no doubt that Mr. Schrank was connected with a Communist front while American soldiers were ducking bullets in Korea.

From 1952 to 1955, he was a representative of the International Mine, Mill & Smelters Workers Union which was tossed out of the AFL-CIO as a Communist front. Earlier, in 1948, he had

been thrown out of the International Association of Machinists because he was a Communist. And do you know what? He repeatedly denied being a Communist in spite of the charges leveled against him. It was only after my charges that he finally admitted having been a Communist but said he broke off all connections in 1948. Has anyone ever known a Communist to admit membership in the party? What assurances do we have that Mr. Schrank's heart still does not belong to the Communist Party?

Yes, we have seen some Communists repent and realize their mistakes but they have done something overt to prove their disenchantment with the Communist Party. But not Mr. Schrank.

With millions of competent, capable, and loyal Americans who can handle these programs why should we gamble with a man whose loyalty can be still in doubt? Why entrust a sensitive program to a man who is an admitted Communist and who tells us he is now no longer a Communist?

This amendment was an important amendment. It would have stated the position of Congress against the hiring of obvious radicals in the war against poverty. This program is already treading on thin ice and every effort should have been made to remove the slightest scintilla of doubt. I am sorry that the conferees did not insist on retention of this anti-Communist amendment.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to today's explanation of the report of the decision of the House-Senate conferees with mixed feelings.

In 1964, as a member of the 88th Congress, I voted against the birth of this program because I felt there were better and more fundamental ways to do the job of providing opportunity and jobs for the disadvantaged. But my vote was in the minority and the legislation passed.

Now, more than 3 years later, we have appropriated some \$3 billion for the various programs under the so-called war on poverty. With these dollars there have been efforts to learn new programs, to train personnel throughout the United States to administer the programs, to acquire and use capital improvements which are now operative, to zero in on the most effective ways to make the poor more self-reliant and as this spending and this learning has been going on the hard-core problems of the poor have not diminished.

And yet, at extravagant, event profigate expense we have developed tools and we have gained experience. It does not seem to me that, given the problem of poverty in America, and given the investment we have made in lives and treasure, we can turn our backs and walk away because we do not agree with all the mechanics which this final legislative draft contains.

I listened with particular concern to the statement, which to me seemed somewhat subdued, of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] whose long fight over the past 4 years to achieve maximum and meaningful results of this attempt at progress has ended this year in much frustration. I believe it is significant that he voted against the earlier

authorization, and, as a member of the conference committee, declined to sign the conference report. But here today, realizing that we must vote up or down to continue or to kill this program, he has determined that despite the defects of the final bill, he will vote in favor of final passage. This seems to me to be testimony to the effect that while previous appropriations may often have been in vain, yet we cannot turn away from the investment which has been made.

For several months I have studied the operation of these programs in my own district. I have made personal inspection in some cases, and in others I have had objective examination made by a qualified staff member. I have attempted to remain unencumbered by the lobby, however well intentioned, of those employed in the program.

On balance, and in what I consider to be a responsible act, I believe it is proper in representing my district today to cast my vote for the continuance of the program. This is a vote to attack the root causes of poverty. Whether my vote proves to be wise or unwise will be determined by whether those from impoverished homes will be trained properly for tangible jobs, and whether self-reliance rather than dependency will be taught at the community action centers throughout America. I have seen at first hand that through the tools and know-how we have developed there is a potential for constructive gain in this program. The next 2 years will determine whether this potential has been wisely developed.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2388 is a bitter disappointment to those of us who looked to the Senate conferees to strike out the Green amendment which the House wrote into the bill. The Green amendment provides for city hall and county courthouse domination of community action programs and effectively locks the poor out of the decisionmaking process. Despite the assertions on the floor today that there will be participation of the poor, the question is whether there can be meaningful involvement when the community action agency is the state or political subdivision or when two-thirds of the members of the community action board, or the governing board, are public officials and representatives of business, labor, religion, welfare, education, and other groups—appointed we know not how.

I opposed the city hall amendment, more colorfully referred to as the "bosses and boll weevil" amendment, when the antipoverty bill was on the floor last month, and I regret that under the parliamentary situation today there will be no way to vote separately on this issue.

Unfortunately, the conference report retains nearly all of the retrogressive provisions passed by the House in exchange for a minimally adequate authorization, which is still below the administration's request.

The Green amendment destroys the central concept of the poverty program: that programs are to be devised and operated by the poor even if privileged toes are stepped upon in the process. What



was seen by some as a political necessity—lining up southern and big city votes—has been presented as a programmatic virtue—"giving a larger role to responsible elected officials."

This platitude obscures some harsh political realities: the reality that, despite the provision under section 210(a) permitting local governments to designate private nonprofit agencies, few mayors will authorize groups likely to cause the friction which is often a by-product of social change; the reality that antipoverty programs beholden to city hall constitute a reservoir of attractive patronage.

Moreover, whatever independent community action agencies may be permitted to continue will probably be inhibited from operating programs which risk offending the local establishment.

In short, the conference report virtually guarantees that community action programs will revert to the stale social welfare philosophy of routine local government, whose unimaginativeness in dealing with poverty first necessitated a new Federal antipoverty effort.

The conference report retains the rhetoric and form of representation of the poor, but real decisionmaking power reverts to city hall or the county courthouse. Any political subdivision which so chooses may designate itself as sole policymaker, programing agency, and dispenser of funds. Under section 210(e) any political subdivision whose elected officials oppose a community action agency designated under section 210(a) may simply keep it out of the community.

In plain language the bill strips the Federal antipoverty program of the power to counter local complacency. It embodies a concept of States rights and local rights which is contrary to the interests and needs of the poor.

Under the present operation of the program only 41 out of 1,050 community action agencies are political subdivisions. In addition, some 30 agencies have switched from public to private. This hardly demonstrates the desirability of requiring that, upon the will of local government, no autonomous community action agency may continue to function.

As the senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, remarked before the other body last Friday:

You can hardly conceive of public officials who are so broadminded that they would countenance such activities criticizing their own effort as part of the poverty program. You can be sure that any type of work of that type will be suffocated in such a set-up.

This will impair all that was innovative and fresh in the community action program.

Another similarly narrowminded section is the restrictive provision relating to legal services. Section 222(3) provides that funds shall not be used for the defense of a person indicted or informed against for the commission of a crime "except in extraordinary circumstances." This is ludicrous. Poor people hardly need legal services for saving money on their income tax. What is the use of legal services if they are denied when they are needed most?

The new watchword for the antipov-erty program seems to be: do not, under

any circumstances, rock the boat. Community action, except when it generates change; legal services, except when a crime has been committed.

I regret that, in order to continue the antipoverty program at all, there is no alternative but to vote for the conference report which is a set back for the unique concept of self-help and which I fear will turn the antipoverty program into simply another welfare program.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. The bill as it emerged from the conference committee is one which, on balance, will improve and strengthen this Nation's efforts to combat poverty and the human suffering it causes.

The conference report provides an appropriation of nearly \$2 billion for fiscal year 1968 which is an increase of approximately \$200 million over the appropriation for fiscal 1967.

I am gratified that such productive programs as the Job Corps and the special emphasis educational programs have been continued essentially as they were. These programs have repeatedly demonstrated their worth and should be allowed to continue with only minor refinements.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference report. On balance, I feel that its weaknesses are far overshadowed by the good it will achieve.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have worked hard and spent much time, research, and effort in support of OEO-initiated programs since becoming a Member of this body last January. I have consistently held that the Office of Economic Opportunity has, in large measure, done a commendable job, with the tools available, in dealing with the deep-rooted problems confronting the poor of our cities and rural areas. I have urged my colleagues to retain OEO as the agency administering the war on poverty. I am pleased that efforts to obliterate that agency have been defeated. However, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not go on record in strong opposition to many of the amendments now a part of this legislation.

First, the very controversial so-called Green amendment remains almost intact. This one provision alone has done in another way what opponents of OEO were unable to do. It provides that State and local governments may either act as community action agencies themselves or may designate agencies to act for them. In other words, OEO is now placed in the position of administering its programs and dispensing its funds in a similar manner to that of the traditional old-line agencies.

The Green amendment has been attacked as a sellout to city hall—and to the county courthouse in the South. The gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, called it on the floor the "Bosses and Boll Weevil" amendment. Many who have favored the antipoverty program are seriously disturbed.

I count myself in this category, but I confess to being less seriously disturbed, or at least not disturbed enough to vote

against the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

The conferees deferred the effective date of the Green amendment to February 1, 1969, which, I hope, gives us all time to assess its potentials and its pitfalls and to adjust to it, and possibly even change it in the next Congress.

The amendment also gives the Director of OEO the power to bypass the city hall or the county courthouse if they stall or misuse funds or in any way pervert the purposes of the economic opportunity legislation. I feel sure that the Director of OEO will use this power.

Participation of the poor in the poverty program has been the great difference between this agency's policy, with respect to handling the problems of the poor, and that of any other governmental body in the country. I am disappointed that this participation of the poor will be lessened in this year's legislation and hope that continued efforts will be made to reestablish this guiding policy.

It is also my hope that duly elected local officials will become active partners in community action; that they will be concerned and recognize the valuable contributions that can be made by local government in fulfilling the goal of eradicating the poverty in our midst.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the House today considers the conference report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I would like to call attention to a very excellent article on this topic by my good friend and colleague, Congressman WILLIAM D. FORD.

Congressman Ford's article appears in the December edition of the *Michigander*, the monthly publication of the Michigan Jaycees. In it, he points out that few Federal programs have been the subject of more misunderstanding than those in the Economic Opportunity Act.

He goes on to point out that over 6 million Americans have benefitted directly through OEO programs, and that millions more have been directly or indirectly affected by them.

Congressman Ford shows that the concept of private enterprise has been widely accepted as an integral part of OEO planning, and to prove this point quotes Walker L. Cisler, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison Co.

I recommend this excellent analysis of the OEO program to the attention of my colleagues, and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

(By WILLIAM D. FORD, U.S. House of Representatives)

Probably no Federal local programs have been the subject of more misunderstanding than those in the Economic Opportunity Act, with its many and varied projects—Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Community Action, Upward Bound, Legal Service for the Poor, Adult Basic Education, and others.

Although there has been partisan bickering over some of these projects, no one seriously disputes that the overall program has had immeasurable results. More than 6,000,000 Americans have benefitted directly through OEO programs, and millions more have been directly or indirectly affected by them.



For example, it is impossible to calculate the full impact of the Head Start Program. Not only does the child who is enrolled receive a "Head Start" on life, but his parents, brothers and sisters also benefit. This is true because of the Head Start emphasis on proper nutrition, health and dental care, and the importance of education.

The United States Jaycees this year began a program to inform the 6000 Jaycee chapters in the United States about the opportunities for them to participate in OEO programs in their communities. I can think of no more fitting project for Jaycee chapters than to become involved in the aims and objectives of the OEO.

Such an alliance would be a very natural thing for two organizations whose objectives are strikingly similar.

Jaycees have become known as an organization devoted to "Leadership Training through Community Development," and the Office of Economic Opportunity has been given the responsibility of opening avenues of personal development and agencies for community action that will enable those in poverty to pull themselves up to a respectable standard of living.

Like the Jaycees, OEO has recognized that a single agency cannot eliminate all the ignorance, disease, blight, and other handicaps that have condemned nearly thirty million Americans to an existence in poverty. It is because of this realization that the Office of Economic Opportunity tries to enlist the assistance of not only the Jaycees and similar volunteer groups, but also of business, industry, labor, the professions, educational institutions, the church, and every other available resource.

The concept of private enterprise as an integral part of the OEO planning is widely accepted. In a recent letter to me, Walter L. Cisler, Chairman of the Board of Detroit Edison Company, expressed his satisfaction with OEO accomplishments and his faith in its ideals. Mr. Cisler wrote:

"It has been my valued privilege to have served for the past two years as Chairman of the Business Leadership Advisory Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity. This group of key executives of many leading corporations from all segments of the United States consults with and advises the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver, and participates actively in the planning and evaluation of the programs of that office.

"As business and community leaders deeply concerned with the causes and effects of poverty in our society and as citizens who have been privileged to assist those directly responsible for the work of OEO, we know full well of the many problems which must be faced and overcome if meaningful progress is to be made. I and other members of the Council have personally visited and seen firsthand the work of many of the organizations and establishments associated with the endeavors of the Office of Economic Opportunity."

"The recommendations made to the Congress by the Administration redefine and strengthen those areas of the War on Poverty which experience has proven most effective. It merits your full support and I commend it to you most highly."

Howard S. Greenen, Chairman and President of International Telephone and Telegraph, had this to say in 1965 about business involvement in OEO planning:

"Now some of you may wonder why a major, profit-making corporation like IT&T wants to join the War on Poverty. The answer is threefold:

(1) We, in industry, owe it to our society to use our resources to cure a social ill that has been with us too long.

(2) We, in industry, must maintain for ourselves and the Nation, a trained labor force.

(3) We, in industry, have the capital, the manpower, the skills, the technology and the desire to get a job done."

Through direct and indirect contracts, voluntary services of talent and time, and donations of cash and equipment for individual projects, private enterprise has become an important part of the War on Poverty.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been successful in attracting the assistance of private initiative because it has developed programs that are a departure from the accepted systems of welfare in this country. Rather than merely trying to maintain the poor in their impoverished state, OEO is trying to provide the less fortunate with the motivation and the personal resources to pull themselves out of poverty.

Community services by Jaycee and anti-poverty groups has the same objective—to do whatever the local situation demands for civic improvement.

According to the Jaycee Community Development concept, local clubs are encouraged to survey local needs and then to act in those matters that demand attention. OEO Director Sargent Shriver said in a recent press interview about the Community Action aspects of the poverty program:

"We don't try to tell each community what programs they should have. The problems vary from place to place. These are basic issues to be determined at the local level."

It is obvious that a Jaycee-OEO alliance should be an effective one and certainly a productive one for America's poor. In several Southeastern States, local Jaycees are already at work on such vital anti-poverty programs as job placement, slum clearance and housing. I am sure that these "young men of action" find great satisfaction in such meaningful endeavor.

The energy and enthusiasm that the more than 10,000 Michigan Jaycees could bring to anti-poverty programs in this state would be a tremendous boost for those who, because of their surrounding and other handicaps, are not sharing in our nation's prosperity. In addition, involvement in the human development and community action projects of the Office of Economic Opportunity would enable a Jaycee chapter to truly carry out the organization's belief that "Service to Humanity Is the Best Work of Life."

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, although this conference report on the economic opportunity amendments authorization bill measure of 1967 does not contain all that everyone would like, it does represent a responsible conference agreement on most of the basic issues involved and I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly accept it in the particular interest of the underprivileged in this country and the general interest of all the American people.

When we realize that just a few weeks ago there was much serious discussion about the possibility of practically doing away with the Office of Economic Opportunity and distributing its antipoverty functions among several long-established agencies of the executive department then we, I think, can better appreciate the progress of understanding, to benefit the poor, that has been reached by this agreement to continue the Office of Economic Opportunity intact for another 2 years with fiscal authorization not too greatly below the original recommendations of the administration. Of course even these authorizations are less than many of us believe are necessary to do the complete job but they are reasonably acceptable for the continuation of this

truly justifiable war on poverty in this country.

I would express the further hope, today, that when the actual appropriations bill is brought before us that the sentiment of this House will be overwhelmingly registered in support of the full authorized appropriation. Certainly there is no question, from authoritative evidence and testimony that has been given to us throughout this continuing discussion on this measure, that our Nation cannot longer afford the dehumanizing effects of poverty upon our national morale and its tremendous economic drain upon government treasuries at all levels. Let us, therefore, approve this conference report authorization without delay and let us hopefully look forward to approving the full actual authorized appropriation in the near future.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the tales of woe we were hearing in Congress only a few weeks ago, the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 would represent a major victory.

Remarkably, the bill authorizes nearly the amount the administration requested. The money itself, of course, must come from a further bill which will be acted on later this week.

I would strongly urge the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House to support legislation to maintain important antipoverty programs at the level we are about to authorize.

The war on poverty would be strengthened by several provisions in the bill on which we are voting today. It would specifically authorize a day care program for the children of working mothers. It would coordinate all the work and training programs. And it would continue the antipoverty program for 2 years, so that we would not have to go through this ritual next year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 149, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—247

Adair	Battin	Brown, Mich.
Adams	Blester	Burke, Mass.
Addabbo	Bingham	Burton, Calif.
Albert	Blanton	Burton, Utah
Anderson, Ill.	Blatnik	Button
Anderson, Tenn.	Boggs	Byrne, Pa.
Ashley	Boland	Cabell
Aspinall	Brademas	Cahill
Ayres	Brasco	Carey
Baring	Brooks	Casey
Barrett	Brotzman	Celler
	Brown, Calif.	Clark



Cleveland  
Cohelan  
Conable  
Conte  
Conyers  
Corbett  
Corman  
Culver  
Cunningham  
Daddario  
Daniels  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Dent  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Dow  
Dulski  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Ellberg  
Esch  
Evans, Colo.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farbsteln  
Fasell  
Feighan  
Flood  
Foley  
Ford  
Fraser  
Friedel  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Galifianakis  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Glaime  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Gonzalez  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Grover  
Gude  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harvey  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Hicks  
Holifield  
Holland  
Horton  
Howard

Irwin  
Jacobs  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones, Ala.  
Karsten  
Karth  
Keith  
Kelly  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Kupferman  
Kyros  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Lloyd  
Long, Md.  
McCarthy  
McDade  
McDonald, Mich.  
McFall  
Macdonald, Mass.  
MacGregor  
Machen  
Madden  
Mahon  
Matsunaga  
May  
Meeds  
Meskill  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Monagan  
Moore  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris, N. Mex.  
Morse, Mass.  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nix  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
Olsen  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Ottinger  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Philbin  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Pollock

Price, Ill.  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Rallsback  
Rees  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riegle  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roush  
Roybal  
Rumsfeld  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Saylor  
Scheuer  
Schweiker  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Taft  
Tenzer  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tiernan  
Tunney  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waldie  
Walker  
Wampler  
Watts  
Whalen  
White  
Widnall  
Wilson  
Charles H.  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyder  
Wyman  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zwach

## NAYS—149

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Belcher  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blackburn  
Bolton  
Bow  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Fla.  
Burleson  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Clancy

Clausen  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Collier  
Colmer  
Cramer  
Curtis  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
Denney  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dole  
Dowdy  
Downing  
Duncan  
Edwards, Ala.  
Eshleman  
Everett  
Findley  
Fisher  
Flynt  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fuqua  
Gardner  
Gathings  
Gettys  
Goodell  
Goodling  
Gross

Gubser  
Gurney  
Hagan  
Haley  
Hall  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hébert  
Hull  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jarman  
Jonas  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kleppe  
Kyl  
Laird  
Langen  
Latta  
Lennon  
Lipscomb  
Long, La.  
McClory  
McClure  
McCulloch  
McMillan

Mailliard  
Marsh  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mayne  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio  
Minshall  
Mize  
Montgomery  
Myers  
Nelsen  
O'Konski  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Passman  
Pettis  
Poff  
Pool  
Price, Tex.  
Pryor  
Quillen  
Randall

Rarick  
Reid, Ill.  
Reifel  
Reinecke  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rivers  
Rogers, Fla.  
Roudebush  
Satterfield  
Schadeberg  
Schler  
Schneebell  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Okla.  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stuckey

## NOT VOTING—36

Annunzio  
Bates  
Bell  
Bolling  
Broomfield  
Carter  
Cowger  
Dickinson  
Erlenborn  
Fino  
Fountain  
Frelinghuysen

Halleck  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Harsha  
Heckler, Mass.  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Hosmer  
King, N.Y.  
Kornegay  
Kuykendall  
Lukens

McEwen  
Martin  
Mathias, Md.  
Nichols  
Resnick  
St. Onge  
Snyder  
Stratton  
Watson  
Willis  
Wilson, Bob  
Wyatt

So the conference report was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Henderson against.  
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Kornegay against.  
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Fountain against.  
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Nichols against.  
Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Herlong against.  
Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Martin against.  
Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Watson against.  
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Fino against.  
Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.  
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Erlenborn against.  
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Snyder against.  
Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Dickinson against.  
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Halleck against.  
Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Harsha against.  
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 7, 1967.)

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "November 23, 1967," and insert "November 15, 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "December 20, 1967."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 1, line 6, strike out all after "1967" over to, and including line 13 on page 3.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON OF TEXAS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert:

## "TITLE II—REDUCTIONS IN OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

"SEC. 201. In view of developments which constitute a threat to the economy with resulting inflation, the Congress hereby finds and determines that, taking into account action on appropriation bills to date, Federal obligations and expenditures in controllable programs for the fiscal year 1968 should be reduced by no less than \$9 billion and \$4 billion, respectively, below the President's budget requests. The limitations hereafter required are necessary for that purpose.

"SEC. 202. (a) During the fiscal year 1968, no department or agency of the Executive Branch of the Government shall incur obligations in excess of the lesser of—

"(1) the aggregate amount available to each such department or agency as obligatory authority in the fiscal year 1968 through appropriation acts or other laws, or

"(2) an amount determined by reducing the aggregate budget estimate of obligations for such department or agency in the fiscal year 1968 by—

"(i) 2 percent of the amount included in such estimate for personal compensation and benefits, plus

"(ii) 10 percent of the amount included in such estimate for objects other than personal compensation and benefits.

"(b) As used in this section, the terms "obligational authority" and "budget estimate of obligations" include authority derived from, and estimates of reservations to be made and obligations to be incurred pursuant to, appropriations and authority to enter into contracts in advance of appropriations.

"(c) The references in this section to budget estimates of obligations are to such estimates as contained in the Budget Appendix for the fiscal year 1968 (House Document No. 16, 90th Congress, 1st Session), as amended during the first session of the 90th Congress.

"SEC. 203. (a) This title shall not apply to obligations for (1) permanent appropriations, (2) trust funds, (3) items included under the heading "relatively uncontrollable" in the table appearing on page 14 of the Budget for the fiscal year 1968 (House Document No. 15, Part 1, 90th Congress, 1st Session), and other items required by law in the fiscal year 1968, or (4) programs,



monetary pabulum with a minimum of hard facts.

Mr. Speaker, as I have reminded the House many times, the Federal Reserve refuses to release the minutes of the Open Market Committee—probably the most important single instrument of monetary policy. The Banking and Currency Committee has attempted to obtain current minutes for many years and has been consistently refused. The most recent minutes which the members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been able to inspect are for 1960—almost 7 years old.

The press could do great service by insisting that the Federal Reserve System operate in the open, at least to the extent of other agencies of the Federal Government. At a minimum, I would hope that the members of the Washington press corps will insist that the Federal Reserve System—including the famous Open Market Committee—live up to the letter and the intent of the Moss bill—the Freedom of Information Act, which the Congress passed last year.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the New York Times for opening one small window on the inside operations and political maneuverings of William McChesney Martin. But, I hope this is only a beginning.

#### CONFEREES AGREE ON TAX BENEFIT FOR AUTO FIRM

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this body has found our economy so strained by deficits that we can barely afford \$10 million in rent supplements for more adequate housing for those living under desolate conditions, I am sure it will warm your heart, as it warms mine, to find that we are on the verge of passing a \$20 million tax rebate for the American Motors Corp.

Should the other body see fit to provide \$40 million to improve living conditions and provide escape from ghettos through better housing, I hope this body will find itself able to concur.

I am sure Governor Romney would agree that this country has the strength to put at least twice as much money in housing for its poor as it awards American Motors.

I call your attention to the following article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 7, 1967:

#### CONFEREES AGREE ON TAX BENEFIT FOR AUTO FIRM

WASHINGTON, December 7.—Senate-House conferees agreed yesterday on a tax provision that could enable the financially troubled American Motors Corp. to receive a \$20,000,000 tax rebate.

The provision was one of several Senate riders to a minor House tax bill accepted in the conference.

Under the provision, American Motors would be able to carry back net operating losses for five years instead of the three allowed by present law. This would mean it could offset the losses against taxes paid on profits in earlier years and get the substantial rebate.

Also accepted was another Senate provision expected to benefit American Motors.

It would repeal a section of present law that prevents the carry-back to earlier taxable years of an unused investment credit that results from the carry-back of a net operating loss.

Under the investment credit, a company may subtract from its taxes up to 7 per cent of its spending on new plant and equipment. But the credit is valueless unless a company makes a profit on which to pay taxes.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE POVERTY BILL

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the poverty bill in the House and shall vote against the conference report. This should not be construed as an indication of any diminution of my high regard for the respective conferees. From previous statements on the floor, I recognize they are widely held in high esteem throughout this body. However, previous discussions and praise of the fruits of the conference report were such that I fear I must have read the wrong conference report. For this reason, I here state some of the conference report provisions as I understand them:

First. The House poverty bill called for a 1-year extension. The conference report calls for 2 years.

Second. The House bill would have provided \$1,600 million for 1 year and the estimated price of the 2-year conference plan is \$4 billion. Thus, the first year's increase will amount to something like \$400 million or a 25-percent increase in expenditures, with which to ornament a current deficit of approximately \$29 billion.

Third. The House bill called for participation by duly elected public officials in the so-called city hall amendment. The conference report changes the effective date of this amendment from July 1, 1968, to February 1, 1969, and includes a bypass provision that will make it possible for at least 90 percent of the programs to remain unaffected by locally elected officials.

Fourth. The House provision that would require a locality to contribute \$1 in cash, to receive \$9 in Federal funds has been eliminated, retaining the currently permissible in kind—sometimes called the blue sky or hot air—contribution from local sources.

Fifth. The House-voted ban on political activity by poverty workers has been limited in the conference to working hours. An interesting limitation.

Sixth. The House banned the use of \$100-a-day consultants, but the conference report modified that ban to permit the use of consultants provided such use is limited to 100 days per year. On the basis of a 365-day year, with 52 Sundays and, in our 40-hour-week economy, 52 Saturdays, seven legal holidays, 14 days vacation, 7 days sick leave, this totals 132 days which together with 100 days serving as a consultant would leave some of the more astute consultants with 133 days a year to devote to their regular full-time employment.

These are the things I am voting against. I just want to be sure my colleagues know what they are voting for.

#### LETTER TO PRESIDENT PRAISES HIS DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(Mr. POOL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the simple eloquence of an open letter to President Johnson, published in the Brookfield Enterprise, should give renewed strength to our Chief Executive in his determination to preserve South Vietnamese independence.

A young American, Denny Johnson, has told the President that he supports our commitment to Vietnamese freedom because the blessings of peace must be secured for our children—regardless of the cost to us.

This extraordinary man recognizes that freedom around the world is indivisible—its loss in Vietnam is our loss in the United States. He realizes that America cannot remain secure in her prosperity while the hand of oppression lays upon an ally.

The brave people of South Vietnam are threatened with decision by aggression from a ruthless enemy. Our simple but lofty purpose, since the days of President Eisenhower, has been to allow the South Vietnamese to live their lives free of oppression—to secure for them the fruits of liberty.

Denny Johnson has offered his life to preserve the freedom of a distant land—as young Americans before him have valiantly sacrificed theirs. This determination in the face of challenge has made the United States the champion of the free world.

It will help our Nation and our President see through the difficult days ahead.

I include the letter to the President in the RECORD:

#### AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Tonight, as I lay awake in my bed listening to my wife and baby son sleep, I began to think of you.

Yes, as I lay there in my warm bed, many miles away from you, I began to think. I wondered what, just then, you were thinking of. I don't have your job, and sometimes I worry about you, sir, because, you see, I know you're a man just like John Smith, and all those other American people in our wonderful country.

Well, Mr. President, what I really wrote to tell you was this: I don't carry signs, nor do I let my beard grow, nor do I like to pay taxes, but I do love my country, more than anything in the whole world. I never had to go to Viet Nam, or Korea, or Saigon or any of those other far away jungles. But, Mr. President, I will if they call me, not because I want to, but because I think that to preserve a person's freedom is the most wonderful thing in the world.

For all my life I've lived in a country built on ideal, by men better than you and I, and if I can just do one little thing, even give my life, so that my son will enjoy these privileges as I have, I will, and I'll do it with love in my heart.

You and I, Mr. President, as much as I hate to say it, are not important. We will live our lives out and die and be forgotten. The important thing is this: For the world



to exist, and for our grandsons and granddaughters to be able to live peacefully together in a world bound by love. And if we can help, in some little way, this is our purpose and the reason we are here.

I wonder sometimes, if you aren't sitting in your easy chair watching the morning sunrise on a new day and thinking, "Why have I taken upon myself this terrible weight." Yes, Mr. President, the weight of a man's life is a ghastly thing. But I myself would like you to know, deep in my heart, that I think the reason we are fighting more than threefold outweighs the lives we have lost. And I truly believe in my heart, what we are doing must be right.

Through the years men have fought and died for the opportunity to be able to say "this is my country and this is the way I want it." And while sometimes you may feel that maybe these people around you don't want to be free, it's not that way at all, not at all!

You must remember, Mr. President, that these people around us, me included, have known no different. We become used to the good life, and we find it hard to comprehend that people live under oppression.

It's hard to realize that some folks don't have eggs and bacon for breakfast on Sunday, and that they can't take a day off to watch a ball game. We don't know this, and we don't care to know it either.

But I believe that we must wake up now, that we must see that others, too, want to live our way, the American way, and we must help them in any way we can, even if it means sacrificing our own lives in the process.

Before I close, Mr. President, I'd like to mention that all Great Presidents, no, let me say all great men, have had to make decisions that put them alone and under fire, but they have proved to be the wisest in the outcome, otherwise they wouldn't be great men. I want you to know that my little bit of America is willing to help you you share the weight of this conflict in my heart. . . .

DENNY JOHNSON.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. HENRY TANNER, RETIRING DIRECTOR, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to a loyal, dedicated, and excellent public servant, Dr. Henry Tanner, director of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Northampton, Mass., who will retire next Friday after 25 years of service to his country and the Federal Government.

Dr. Tanner assumed the directorship of the hospital in November 1960, when Northampton was in my Second Congressional District. Since that time, many new treatment programs have been initiated and a large number of existing programs refined and expanded.

He provided the leadership and guidance in the development of the psychiatric unit system, establishing an alcoholic rehabilitation program and initiating a treatment plan for patients legally blind or with severe impairment of vision.

Dr. Tanner was instrumental in providing motivation for the patients' rehabilitation employment program, referred to as PREP, through which patients are reimbursed for work assign-

ments in the hospital and given an opportunity to accept gainful employment in the community and return to home and friends.

During the period of his tenure, the hospital facilities in Northampton have been improved, equipment updated, and many new pieces of modern equipment made available to the physicians and paramedical personnel.

The outpatient services have been expanded with ever-increasing numbers of veterans admitted directly for treatment in the general medical and surgical sections of the hospital. A greenhouse for patients was constructed for the patients.

The annual hospital evaluation from the Veterans' Administration regional medical director gave Dr. Tanner's hospital an overall rating of "high satisfactory," and the Northampton hospital received the Veteran Administrator's certificate for achieving an outstanding safety record for 5 consecutive years.

Dr. Tanner was presented with the Presidential citation for the hospital's participation in aiding the handicapped in conjunction with the "Salute to Industry" ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tanner is a fellow of the American Psychiatric Association, and a diplomate, American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology. He is a member of the American Medical Association, American Psychiatric Association, the Suffolk County Psychiatric Association, the Commission on Certification of Mental Hospital Administrators, the Western Massachusetts Psychiatric Society, in which he served as secretary and president, and the Massachusetts Medical Society.

A native of New York City, Dr. Tanner was educated at DeWitt Clinton High School, the City College of New York, and received his medical degree at Tulane University. On completing his internship, he was in private practice.

Dr. Tanner served in the Army Medical Corps during World War II, and later became associated with the Veterans' Administration hospital in Chillicothe, Ohio. He served as chief, acute-intensive treatment services and director of professional services at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Northport, N.Y., before his appointment as director of the hospital in Northampton.

Married to the former Mary Gertrude Churchwell of New York City, Dr. Tanner has one daughter, Mrs. Barbara Paquette of Wilmington, Del., formerly of Northampton, and two grandchildren, William Henry, and Anne Marie.

Mr. Speaker, a farewell reception to honor Dr. Tanner will be held at the hospital in Northampton tomorrow afternoon. I regret that I will not be able to attend, because the House will be taking up important conference reports on legislation this week. I do want to take this moment to extend to Dr. Tanner, and his wife, my very best wishes for the future.

Dr. Tanner has always been very kind and understanding to the veterans and their families in my area. I want to thank him for the courtesies extended to me and my office staff over the years. Dr. Tanner has a right to be justly proud of the hospital he leaves in Northampton,

and of the leadership and guidance he gave to that first-rate institution.

On behalf of my colleagues in the Congress, I want to commend Dr. Tanner for the invaluable contributions he has made to the Veterans' Administration, to the veterans of this Nation, and to his Government over the last quarter century.

#### AM I YOUR ENEMY BECAUSE I TELL YOU THE TRUTH?

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, under the pretext of academic freedom, most Americans assume every avenue of thought is given freedom of expression. But many fail to realize this is incomplete because "academic freedom" only extends to such facts as are preferred by the thinking of the modern libertine intellectuals.

Conversely, the true intellectuals fear telling the American people the truth because the truth is in many instances misinterpreted and can well be attacked and smeared with such hate phrases as racist, neo-Nazi, and white supremacy. Because of such fear from the left spectrum, many true intellectuals who possess the stature and facts to be of invaluable assistance to correct the fathomless depths our society has entered, the public does not hear the wisdom of caution, prudence and temperance—the educational opinion as to how the emotion and licentious release of today will affect the coming generations and those to follow.

One fearless searcher for the truth, able to withstand the pressures of the contemporary modernism is Mr. Carleton Putnam, the fearless author of "Race and Reason."

Mr. Putnam for some 7 years has been calling on our scientific brethren to overlook the passions and politics of popularity in an effort to have them acknowledge the true known facts of race differences.

On November 30 of this year Mr. Putnam addressed himself to Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences. Mr. Putnam's letter to Dr. Seitz is one of the most impressive summations of the situation I have ever had the good fortune to read. It most certainly begs the questions—the answers to which will separate the politician from the statesman.

Because of Mr. Putnam's renowned reputation and deep concern for the races, I commend his letter to the reading of every Member of this House.

There can be no resolution of the problem poignantly posed until the truth is faced and our politically attempted solutions based not on fiction but facts and reason.

The letter follows:

McLEAN, VA.,  
November 30, 1967.

DR. FREDERICK SEITZ,  
President, National Academy of Sciences,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEITZ: You are, I know, familiar with the recent speeches of Dr. William Shockley, both before the National Academy of Sciences and elsewhere, on what he calls the "environment-heredity uncertainty" as



But responsible people in all corners of America already tend to reject Carmichael, and need only Government action against him to confirm their position. But more important than that is the effect this action would have on the whole spectrum of revolutionary and semirevolutionary mentality today.

The rights of free speech and free assembly must be protected. But they must not be abused to the extent of treason. And the executive branch of the Federal Government today has a very real and vital responsibility to draw the distinction.

The reason they have this responsibility is that serious efforts are being made to paint revolution in the colors of free speech and thereby to confuse the people and paralyze the Government.

Revolutionaries thrive on government inaction. The agitators will go just as far as they are permitted to go. They deliberately seek the kind of Government paralysis which today exists.

The movement gathers strength while the high-powered lawyers at the Justice Department debate the meaning of insurrection and the first amendment.

We do need to protect the rights of American citizens under the Constitution. But we badly need executive branch leadership in recognizing major attempts to sweep away our whole system of democratic government which stands to protect those rights.

We badly need leadership in exposing the revolutionaries and their motives to the people through enforcement of the existing laws. And we lack that leadership today.

#### THE LATE DALE BERTHOUX, A VALIANT AMERICAN

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with draft-card burners and draft protesters getting the headlines, you will be comforted. I know, to learn that love of country still exists. This afternoon at 2:30, Sp4c. Dale Berthoux, U.S. Army, one of my constituents, will be buried at Arlington Cemetery.

He is one of the great patriots of the war. At the age of 31, having already served in his country for 2 years on active duty and for 6 years in the Reserves, this young citizen volunteered to his selective service board for service again.

At the time of his enlistment he was an elected commissioner of the city of Jerseyville, Ill., and profitably employed in a sales position. Previous to that he had been on the staff of the Democrat-News in Jerseyville. He was married and had a fine home.

In short, he had a comfortable happy life in Jerseyville and every material reason to let others assume military responsibilities.

Nevertheless, he felt called to serve again. He wanted to serve in the frontlines in Vietnam, and he did. He was involved in the hard fighting on Thanksgiving Day this year when Hill 875 in Vietnam was taken by U.S. forces. On Sunday evening, November 26, near Dakto, he was killed in action. At that

time he was attached to the 173d Airborne Division.

His body was brought to Washington for burial. In the presence of his widow; his mother, Mrs. Paul Berthoux; his brother, Dann; his sister, Mrs. Phil Shelton, and her husband; and his widow's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Johnston, all of Jerseyville; and his brother, Duane, Fairfield, Calif., Private Berthoux joined today the great patriots of many battles and many wars at Arlington Cemetery.

Here is a letter I received a year ago, in behalf of Private Berthoux, which tells eloquently the motivation which led him to Arlington:

NOVEMBER 17, 1966.

Re Pvt. Dale P. Berthoux, US55467165, 4th Plt., Co. "B", 1st Bn. 61st Inf., Fort Carson, Colo.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Congressional Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a former precinct committeeman and Secretary of the Jersey County Republican Central Committee, a former Marine, and as Executive officer of the Jersey Savings and Loan, I am requesting your help through the influence of your high office.

One of my close friends and a native Jersey County, Illinois, now Pvt. Dale P. Berthoux, United States Army, is a very unique person and in a very unusual situation. Pvt. Berthoux is a very rare individual indeed, because in my opinion, he is a true patriot.

Pvt. Berthoux on October 4, 1966, volunteered for service to his country through the local draft board for service in the United States Army. This, as such, may not seem to you to be unusual until the following facts are pointed out:

1. Pvt. Berthoux is 31 years of age.
2. He had already completed his military obligation by serving 2 years of active duty and 6 years in the reserves.
3. He resigned his elected position as one of the four Commissioners of the City of Jerseyville, Illinois.
4. He resigned his position as a salaried representative of one of the larger photographic supply houses in the Midwest.
5. Most important of all, he left behind a wonderful wife and a beautiful home.
6. He suffered from varied and sundry speculations concerning his action.

Knowing Pvt. Berthoux as I do and from my intimate conversations with him, his sole purpose and his aim in volunteering his services is to set an example for the young people of this community, this State, and this Nation. He is (as many people are) concerned about some of our young men who:

1. Publicly burn their draft cards.
2. Get married for the sole purpose of avoiding service to their country.
3. Purposely get into trouble, again for the sole purpose of avoiding the draft.

He is also very concerned, as many of us are, about the growing attitude that patriotism is passe and to be ridiculed.

I, therefore am requesting, because of his actions and the motives behind them, your help in obtaining a waiver for him as to his age to enable him to attend Army Flight Officers' Training. This young man, I believe, should even deserve direct commissioning because of the fine and brave action he has taken. I also believe that his action should be made known to the people of this Nation.

Yours very truly,

JOHN G. ZIMMERMAN.

#### DECISION IN UNITED STATES AGAINST ROBEL A TRAGEDY

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an important decision today handed down by the Supreme Court—United States against Robel. I was dismayed to hear that the Court has declared an important section of the Subversive Activities Control Act unconstitutional. The Court now tells us that we cannot make it unlawful for any member of a Communist organization to engage in any employment in any defense facility. The Court feels that we have violated freedom of association by so trying to curb sabotage and spying in our defense facilities.

The people of this country have been patient with the Court in the past, although they have had good reason to question its decisions which appear to them to go easy on criminals and Communists, but I doubt that this decision will be met with the same patience.

To quote one part of this decision, written by Chief Justice Warren, the Court says:

It is made irrelevant to the statute's operation that an individual may be a passive or inactive member of a designated organization, that he may be unaware of the organization's unlawful aims, or that he may disagree with those unlawful aims.

Communists know what the aims of their organization are, and their membership is surely an affirmation of consent as well as a method of support for those goals. They surely are not unaware that the aims of the Communist Party are unlawful and dangerous to the security of our country. The Court admits the objectives of the Communists are unlawful, but it declares that just because one belongs to an organization which conspires against the Government of the United States does not mean that he agrees with its unlawful aims. This is what the Court says is guilt by association. I disagree.

I have today been in contact with the Department of Defense about what needs to be done to provide adequate protection for our defense establishments in view of this decision. I hope my colleagues will join me in drafting and passing legislation by the early part of next year to fill the vacuum left by this decision. I will shortly have a bill in this area in which I would welcome cosponsors in the House.

#### IMPACT OF COPPER IMPORTS

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, an interpretation of the latest data from BDSA—Department of Commerce, on the import of copper raw material—ore concentrated material, blister, and refined copper—indicates the following: Whereas the first quarter report of 1966 importation of copper was 120,000 short tons, the figure increased to 175,000 short tons in December of 1966. This shows an accumulation of inventory by both domestic producer and consumer industries as a precaution against a possible strike and/or possible price increases.



The average import of copper raw material in 1966 was approximately 140,000 short tons per quarter. Beginning in the first quarter of 1967, imports held at the 140,000 short-ton level. However, in the second quarter of 1967 this figure increased to 154,500 short tons. The startling fact, however, is that during October of 1967 the import of raw copper increased to 60,892 short tons and, when projected on this basis for the fourth quarter of 1967, it will be 180,000 short tons, the largest figure for these imports in the last 2 years. This bears out charges made by the mayor and city council of Butte, Mont., and the unions that the importation of copper raw materials has increased sharply in recent months.

I would like to point out to my colleagues the grave impact that these imports are having not just on the State of Montana and the other copper-producing States, but on our Nation and its economy as well. We have discussed in this body the dangers of inflation, and I have discussed my concern for the employees who have been on strike against the copper companies since July 15, a total of 149 days on this December 11.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee and its distinguished chairman, WILBUR MILLS, who has given careful attention to the subject of inflation and the drain of our gold reserves from the impact of these imports. The cost of these imports has been averaging between 60-65 cents per pound, while the domestic price is 38 cents per pound. This situation has created a drain on the dollar. It is inflationary, damaging to our national economy, and particularly damaging to the striking workers and to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, my concern for the strikers and the fact that negotiations have not been carried on has prompted me to write to the President, urging him to appoint a special board of inquiry to look into the copper strike.

I insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Robert Walker in the New York Times. This fine article points out an additional aspect of this situation: That buyers are substituting other metals, when possible, because of the shortage of copper. This, too, will surely be harmful to copper companies and workers as well.

#### SUBSTITUTES FOR COPPER GAIN GROUND

(By Robert Walker)

"Maybe you'd better forget about copper and ship us aluminum instead."

Reactions like this are increasingly evident among buyers of wire, cable and other products in which copper and aluminum compete for the market, industry sources observed in recent weeks.

The growing tendency to find substitutes for copper is only one of several symptoms of a strike in domestic copper mines, smelters and refineries that began July 15, closing about 90 per cent of American capacity.

In addition, prices for foreign copper have risen, driving the prices of brass-mill products higher. Many copper-and-brass fabricating operations—not themselves struck—have nevertheless been forced to shut down for lack of raw materials.

#### NO SETTLEMENT SEEN

A settlement of the 19-week strike was nowhere in sight last week. The United Steelworkers—bargaining for its own members and those of several other unions in

the copper industry—and the major copper producers were reported to be far apart on two basic issues.

One was wages, and the other—probably destined to be more troublesome—was a union demand for company-wide bargaining with each of the producers. Traditionally, copper settlements have been reached mine by mine and smelter by smelter.

Company spokesmen charged that the eventual aim of the Steelworkers was to achieve simultaneous contract expiration dates at all the facilities of each company, enabling the union finally to bargain for one contract with the whole industry under the threat of a blanket, national strike.

Spokesmen for the copper producers last week discounted reports from Washington that the Administration would move for an injunction to halt the strike under the Taft-Hartley Act.

#### PRICE INCREASES

"Let's face it," one copper executive observed, "the strike is not yet a political problem. Most of the general public doesn't even know it's on."

The copper producers were painfully aware it was on. They estimated last week that the loss in production so far had been 600,000 tons.

Production in October was a trickle of 1,868 tons from United States mines, while 39,490 tons were refined and about 75,000 tons were shipped.

The difference between mine output and consumption has been made up partly by mill and consumer inventories—*evidently much larger at the beginning of the strike than almost anyone had imagined*—and partly by scrap supplies and foreign sources.

The American producer price—the lowest in the world at 38 cents a pound—was something of a joke. This is the price at which United States copper companies sell domestically mined metal to favored customers.

However, there was practically no mined metal. As a result brass mills had imposed a series of price increases that brought the level for copper content in such products as plumbing fixtures to about 50 cents a pound.

In a series of moves last week, Canadian copper producers raised their prices from 47½ cents a pound to 51 cents a pound in Canadian funds.

The price on the London Metal Exchange—the so-called world price—was distorted by the devaluation of the pound. It was hovering around 61 cents a pound, down from 62 cents before the pound was cut from \$2.80 in United States funds to \$2.40.

And even if the strike ended tomorrow—which it won't—producers and consumers would be in trouble. The Barth Smelting Corporation, a Newark processor, commented in a market letter last week:

"Considerable problems will arise when United States producers' copper does again become available. There will be such a huge backlog of defense-rated orders laying claim to it that civilian consumers would not get copper for a long time, unless present regulations were changed.

"Defense set-asides [the proportion that producers must hold for defense orders] are still at 26 per cent.

"The Government may find it necessary to increase this percentage or stretch out the period for replacement of copper used from their inventories by defense contractors, to insure a flow of copper for defense and civilian producers alike.

"Without such change, non-defense consumers would be forced into the open market to secure their copper, which would push these outside prices even higher."

#### MONTANANS AND JOB CORPS SHARE THANKSGIVING

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, In his Thanksgiving proclamation, the Governor of the State of Montana, the Honorable Tim Babcock, asked his fellow Montanans as they celebrate a holiday from work and enjoy a bounteous meal, to open their hearts to their less fortunate neighbors. I am proud to note that among those "less fortunate neighbors, who never have known Thanksgiving in a home and who would count as one of the most cherished experiences of their lives, the opportunity to share in the joys of a Montana family Thanksgiving gathering," were the enrollees of the Federal Job Corps centers. It gives me great pleasure to know that these youngsters, who have been forgotten for so long, are being forgotten no more. I include Governor Babcock's proclamation at this point in the RECORD:

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas, it has been traditional, since Thanksgiving was celebrated in Plymouth Colony in 1621, for Americans to set aside one special day each year to give thanks for the blessings afforded them by an Almighty Being; and

Whereas, the major religious faiths join together at Thanksgiving in a united appeal for aid to the unfortunate, asking all Americans to share in accordance with their ability; and

Whereas, Thanksgiving is a warm and happy occasion, a time when all of us as individuals and families can demonstrate to our own inner satisfaction that we are indeed good neighbors, concerned with the welfare of our fellow men and truly desirous of helping those who are less fortunate than we; and

Whereas, there are those among us—in our state rehabilitation centers, in the Job Corps camps, in orphanages and other institutions—who never have known Thanksgiving in a home and who would count as one of the most cherished experiences of their lives the opportunity to share in the joys of a Montana family Thanksgiving gathering; and

Whereas, this traditional American holiday is a time for prayer for our men in Vietnam and our service personnel in many other parts of the globe; a time for earnest reflection on the basic principles which have made America the greatest nation ever to exist in the history of the world; and a time for giving thanks for national loyalty, patriotism and belief in the ideals of freedom; and

Whereas, in praying for peace, it would be appropriate to display and honor our country's flag on the occasion of Thanksgiving;

Now therefore, By the power vested in me, as Governor of the State of Montana, I, Tim Babcock, proclaim: Thursday, the 23rd day of November, 1967, as Thanksgiving Day in Montana, and ask Montanans, as they celebrate a holiday from work and enjoy a bounteous meal, to implore the Almighty for the safety and strength of our fighting men, to open their hearts to their less fortunate neighbors to reflect seriously on the meaning of Thanksgiving, and to give prayerful thanks for the many wonderful blessings which are theirs.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Montana to be affixed. Done at the City of Helena, the Capital, this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

JIM BABCOCK,  
Governor of Montana.

Attest:

FRANK MURRAY,  
Secretary of State.



A telephone call between Marcello and Giancana straightened out the episode, which was dismissed as a misunderstanding between Mafia families.

DiPiazza was returned to his New Orleans home via the same route, by the same escorts.

DiPiazza, despite an arrest record stretching back to 1946, had no convictions until his federal trial last September in Cincinnati.

In 1960, he was one of a dozen defendants in the New Orleans "free load" gambling case, but later was excused from the trial because of a weak heart. DiPiazza made the same excuse to get out of the Cincinnati trial, but a judge ordered him to trial with a federal physician standing by. (The free load case involved a federal charge that bookies were using long-distance phone lines without charge.)

Other defendants in the New Orleans case included Benny "Big Porky" Lasoff; his brother, Robert "Little Porky" Lasoff; Myron Deckelbaum, and Gilbert Lee Beckley, then all of Newport. All the defendants were acquitted.

DiPiazza, who continued his bookie business until his arrest by FBI agents in New Orleans on Nov. 25, may have learned some of his tricks from Gil Beckley.

Beckley, according to Internal Revenue agents, operated his gambling enterprises out of the Fontainebleau Hotel in New Orleans during the 1962 trial. Federal agents say Deming, Roger Egan and Roger Seith, all from northern Kentucky, received their gambling schooling from Beckley.

Beckley, known as "The Brain," of the nation's layoff gambling network, was the author of the "Cincinnati Line." He also was creator of the Beckley-Soble combine out of Montreal, the largest bookmaking operation in Canada.

Beckley, who paid tribute to the Vito Genovese family of New York through Mafia lieutenants "Fat Tony" Salerno and "Trigger Mike" Coppola, was convicted last March of violating the federal interstate transportation in aid of racketeering statute.

Federal agents say that the mob probably had selected Deming to be their layoff gambling man in Cincinnati, rather than Deming applying to them for his franchise.

Deming, because of his schooling with Beckley, is known to be an experienced gambler who ran a successful business. The mob would not try to control directly a nickel-dime handbook operator.

Deming also was known to be careful, had a relatively light arrest record, and would not be careless in allowing evidence to get into the hands of federal agents. He also was considered honest and would give an accurate accounting of his layoff business.

Agents were unable to uncover how Deming passed his money along the layoff betting routes. Other gamblers, they say, find no difficulty in passing money by couriers, Western Union, or through the mails.

The Mafia's "commission," which settles geographical and jurisdictional disputes, says a Justice Department official, knows exactly what is going in the Greater Cincinnati area.

"When you convict Gil Beckleys, Sam DiPiazas and Clyde Demings, it hurts them," he says. "But they will be back."

"They have the time and the patience, and an unlimited supply of money."

What led to the conviction of Deming and DiPiazza last September was, literally, one of the biggest men in Hamilton County—Emil "Jelly" Wehby who weighs well over 250 pounds.

Jelly is one of the many small-time figures who hung around Newport in its heyday until George Ratterman was elected sheriff of Campbell County.

On Jan. 13, 1966, Jelly Wehby was in Las Vegas. He began making numerous phone calls from a pay phone. The calls were so numerous that special agents of the Internal Revenue Service took notice.

It was those phone calls which ultimately led to the arrest and conviction of Deming and DiPiazza.

Both were convicted in U.S. District Court on Sept. 26 on seven counts of interstate transportation in aid of racketeering and one count of conspiracy.

In January 1966 Wehby was using a public pay phone at the hotel. IRS agents got the long distance toll records for that phone.

The toll records showed that numerous calls were being made to a certain number in Cincinnati. The IRS office in Las Vegas asked the Cincinnati IRS office to check.

Cincinnati did. It found that the number was for Harry Acker at 3808 Woodford road, Silverton. The name Harry Acker meant nothing to the special agents in Cincinnati.

The wagering squad of the IRS office was out of town (the Cincinnati IRS office covers the southern half of Ohio including Columbus). But by June 11 the wagering squad turned its attention to Harry Acker by placing the Woodford road address under surveillance.

The surveillance was maintained from 11:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., normal bookmaking hours. Interest picked up when one of the IRS agents got a good look at Harry Acker. The agent informed his colleagues that Acker really was William Clyde Deming, a bookmaker. From 1954 to 1962, he had held a federal gambling stamp.

IRS went to the Cincinnati phone company and got toll records for the number and also for Deming's home in Ft. Thomas, showing calls to bookmakers in other cities. An IRS agent placed several bets with persons who were dealing with Deming.

The evidence was sufficient for agent Guy Wetherell to list the facts in an affidavit for a search warrant for the basement apartment at 3808 Woodford road. U.S. Commissioner Henry E. Sheldon II signed the warrant and on July 22, 1966, the agents raided the apartment.

Simultaneously, raids were conducted in Akron, Dayton, O., Cynthiana, and Lexington.

What they found in Silverton turned out to be a bonanza for enforcement agents. Deming was caught with weeks of betting slips and balance sheets, showing who he was dealing with, when, and how much money was involved.

The betting slips were torn into small pieces of paper and were accumulating in a shopping bag. Another shopping bag with more betting slips was found in Deming's home.

Agents believe Deming was afraid to put the slips in the garbage because other bookmakers have been convicted by evidence found in their garbage.

It took the IRS months to piece together the tiny pieces of paper into legible betting slips.

Also found in the basement apartment were a tape recorder with race results on the tape and a short-wave radio. Deming had \$7500 on his person. The agents found a bank entry slip with the number of a safe deposit box.

The agents got another search warrant five days later to enter this box—listed as being rented by Carl Donaldson at the Norwood branch of the First National Bank of Cincinnati. There, the agents found \$45,000 in cash. The money was seized and is being held as part of the evidence against Deming. Nobody ever has found Donaldson.

From the betting slips and balance sheets, the agents determined that from June 18 to July 21, 1966, Deming carried on a \$400,000 a month bookmaking business.

The records show that both Deming and DiPiazza were laying off bets with each other. Bookmakers lay off bets when one of them has heavy betting on a particular race. To ease the hazard of a big pay-off on one race, a bookmaker bets part of it with another bookmaker.

Deming's records showed that while his knowledge of racing was excellent he never-

theless bet on short odds sure things. For instance, on June 30 he bet \$15,000 and got back \$17,000. On July 19 he bet \$16,800 and got back \$18,730.

Phillip Michael, federal prosecutor, asked Deming during a trial recess how he would pick the up-coming famous Woodward race at Aqueduct. Deming not only picked Damascus to win, Buckpasser to come in second, and Dr. Fager to place third, but also gave a 10-minute explanation for his choices. The race on Sept. 30 came out as Deming picked it.

The balance sheets found in the shopping bags contained phone numbers of DiPiazza's apartment home in New Orleans, the two New York hotels where he stayed along with their room numbers, and the New Orleans Athletic Club which DiPiazza frequented.

All this indicated Deming was making numerous bets with DiPiazza. The evidence to prove that DiPiazza was betting with Deming came from another raid.

This was made on Jan. 8, 1966, when the federal government conducted raids in Miami, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Conyers, Ga.; Columbia, S.C.; Clarksdale, Miss.; New Orleans and Baton Rouge.

These raids stemmed out of the use of the "blue box," a generator which produced a sound identical to a telephone dial tone. With this tone, long-distance calls can be made without toll records being made. The raids also stemmed from the use of telephone credit cards in with bogus names.

One of the men to be served with search warrants that day was Samuel S. DiPiazza. And on his person DiPiazza was carrying balance sheets.

At the trial the balance sheets of Deming and DiPiazza complemented each other. The verdict was guilty as charged. The sentences were 10 years in federal prison for both of them.

Deming's days in Federal Court in Cincinnati have just begun. He goes on trial again today on another charge of interstate transportation (making long distance phone calls) in aid of racketeering. With Deming as another defendant is Otto Kuhn of Lexington, who, the government charges, was dealing with Deming in horse bets.

Deming also faces trials in Cincinnati with Hershel "Huck" Turner, 47, of Cynthiana, and Joseph Polli of Louisville.

(Mr. WYDLER (at the request of Mr. WATKINS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WYDLER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## RURAL POVERTY

(Mr. SCHERLE (at the request of Mr. WATKINS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, during the debate in this House on the amendments to the administration's antipoverty program, I offered an amendment which would earmark antipoverty expenditures on urban and rural poor, in accordance with the respective incidents of rural and urban poverty.

As was the fate of most amendments to that particular bill, this proposal was voted down.

We knew at that time that, while nearly half of this Nation's poor live in rural areas, the Office of Economic Op-



portunity was proposing to allocate about 36 percent of fiscal 1968 expenditures to the fight against rural poverty. We knew at that time that 26.9 percent of rural Americans are poor as compared with 14.4 percent of our city dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, what we did not know was that at the very time we were rejecting a move to guarantee the rural poor their fair share of the antipoverty effort, the President of the United States was holding the lid on a report which calls the situation of 14 million rural poor "a national disgrace."

This report has been in the President's hands since September, nearly 4 months. There was plenty of time for an evaluation of its contents by the Education and Labor Committee during its consideration of the whole antipoverty effort.

Today, I ask "Where were you, Mr. President?" I suspect many millions of poor people in rural America are asking the same question.

I include the following article from the Washington Post:

#### RURAL POVERTY

The President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty has made findings and recommendations so sweeping and comprehensive and exhaustive in character that its report is bound to figure in the formation of national policy for a generation.

Its disclosures on the nature of rural poverty will not surprise or amaze those who have heard the reports of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and others. The poverty of 14 million rural Americans is, as the Commission says, "a national disgrace." It is not the first to say that the urban riots of 1967 "had their roots in considerable part in rural poverty." The Commission rightly makes the point that "the more vocal and better organized urban poor gain most of the benefits of current anti-poverty programs."

The disparities between urban and rural life have become a matter of common knowledge: one in every eight urban persons is poor, one of every 15 suburban, one of every four rural persons. Thirty per cent of the people live in rural America, but 40 per cent of the poor. Three out of five rural white people are poor. There are three million illiterate rural adults. One out of 13 houses are unfit. The melancholy indices of rural calamity can be continued ad infinitum.

The Commission, in spite of its gloomy findings of fact is hopeful that something can be done and it wishes the country to adopt and put into effect a policy that would give to residents of rural America equal opportunity with those of other citizens. It has a program for providing full employment, adequate shelter, rural education, medical care, family planning, rural housing, better rural government and other answers to rural inadequacies.

In total, its recommendations would involve Federal commitment to rural change on a scale unprecedented as to both expenditure and intervention in local and state affairs. Some of its proposals tend toward complicating governmental arrangements that elsewhere it finds already too involved.

The Commission's appraisal of the Federal acreage crop adjustment programs acknowledge that they are not specifically "poverty" programs, but faults them for not having more effect on the poor. The crop adjustment programs have effects that permeate the life of many parts of rural America, maintaining commodity price levels that otherwise would descend to disaster levels, distributing direct benefits and sustaining the prosperity of the vast rural business of supplying and marketing farm commodities. These commodity programs may not

deal with the rural poor—but they deal with a lot of people who would be poor without them and their significance and importance in relations to rural life should not be minimized.

To close the poverty gap by cash subsidies to the poor, the Commission estimates, would cost \$12.5 billion—\$5 billion for rural poor alone. It is an alternative the utter simplicity of which, in the form of income subsidies of one kind or another in the end may strongly recommend itself as an alternative to the more involved social, economic and cultural programs the Commission proposes.

#### REA TELEPHONE LOAN POLICY

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. WATKINS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve as the administrator of the Rural Electrification program under President Eisenhower for 3 years, 1953–56. This program has to a degree had its controversial moments, but by and large all admit that its contributions to the well-being of rural America have been outstanding, if not amazing.

During the years that I served, it was my purpose to administer the act in keeping with the intent of the law and in a manner that would bring maximum benefits to rural America with a minimum of burden to the treasury of the United States.

Today, the rural electric cooperatives have proceeded with a record most outstanding in near total rural service, and loan repayments are beyond the fondest forecasts of REA proponents. Rural telephone service in 1953 had not progressed to a satisfactory degree, and independent telephone companies had not been given the encouragement to expand services in rural areas. We adopted a policy of stimulating expansion by extending loans to those companies for that purpose. Major emphasis was placed on the small, independent companies which found other financing almost unobtainable. This was done because any system to be successful needs a central exchange, and hopefully rural areas would receive service with the stimulus of Federal low-interest loans. The plan worked and the independents met the challenge. A great expansion of rural telephone service resulted.

It was never the intention of the REA act to make telephone loans to companies well able to finance their own operation. However, it seems that this policy has been departed from and large companies now seem to have latched on to below-cost interest rates to expand not just rural telephone service but total overall systems operation.

I submit for the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal which is an example of the point I make:

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE IS EXPECTING INCREASE IN EARNINGS FOR YEAR—EXECUTIVE SAYS ADVANCE IS SEEN DESPITE PER-SHARE DILUTION OF ACQUISITIONS AND OTHER FACTORS

NEW YORK.—Earnings of Continental Telephone Corp., St. Louis, are expected to rise to about \$1.15 a share in 1967, from \$15,129,598, or \$1.07 a share, in 1966, Phillip J. Lucier, president, said after a meeting of the New York Society of Security Analysts.

Mr. Lucier said earnings gains are being achieved despite dilutionary earnings effects of prompt consolidation of 71 acquisitions made this year, with others pending, higher depreciation charges, and a general trend this year of lower earnings by the independent telephone industry.

Just one of the acquisitions, Trans-Continental Telephone & Electronics Inc., cost nine-month earnings five cents a share by being included just three days after merger into Continental. Sharply increased depreciation charges cost another seven cents a share, and will have a further adverse effect in the fourth quarter, Mr. Lucier noted. Earnings for the nine months were \$14,828,746, or 79 cents a share, up from \$12,322,846, or 71 cents a share, a year earlier. Revenue rose to \$128,291,538 from \$106,140,010.

Continental has made an agreement in principle with the government of Trinidad-Tobago to acquire a 50% interest in the government-owned telephone system serving those two Caribbean islands, Mr. Lucier disclosed. The agreement is subject to approval by the cabinet of Trinidad-Tobago and by Continental directors. If satisfactorily concluded, Continental would take over management of the system next spring, he said. The system serves 45,000 telephones and has a long waiting list of applicants for phone service, he added.

#### ENTERED AREA IN JANUARY

This would be Continental's fourth acquisition in the Caribbean area. It entered the area for the first time in January with acquisition of a 51% interest in the system serving Grand Bahama Island. It purchased a 51% interest in the Barbados system in February and a 50% interest in the Jamaica system at mid-year. These three systems now serve about 79,500 telephones. Continental is interested in making further acquisitions of telephone systems in the Caribbean, Mr. Lucier said.

Continental expects to be serving almost 1,200,000 telephones by year-end, almost double the 660,000 a year earlier, Charles Wohlstetter, chairman, told the analysts. The company expects to acquire additional independent systems next year with a total of about 100,000 telephones, and to continue making annual acquisition at about that rate for the next few years, he said. Company officials estimated that about 1,700 small nonaffiliated systems with about 2,000,000 telephones are candidates for acquisition by larger systems.

Even without further major acquisitions, Continental expects to be serving about 2,000,000 telephones by early 1971, Mr. Lucier predicted. He forecast telephone revenue of \$300,000,000 and manufacturing sales of \$75,000,000 by early 1971, and said the company expects to double per-share earnings by the end of 1972.

Capital outlays by Continental this year and next will total about \$100,000,000, up from about \$70,000,000 in 1966, he said. But outlays per-telephone are diminishing because 75% of the company's equipment is less than five years old, he said. Depreciation will provide about one-third of next year's construction budget, up from 22% last year, he said.

A bank line of credit will carry Continental's outside financing needs through May 1969, although the company may enter the money market next year, he said. Continental companies hold \$132,000,000 of loans, averaging 30 years, from the Government's Rural Electrification Administration at 2% interest, he reported. The company may reconsider its current policy of reluctance to seek new REA loans in view of interest rates up about 7% in commercial markets, he added.

Net income from Continental's manufacturing operation rose 18% in the first nine months, Mr. Lucier reported. "But the third quarter was very soft, reflecting the cutback in capital expenditures in the inde-













Public Law 90-222  
90th Congress, S. 2388  
December 23, 1967

## An Act

61 STAT. 672

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967".

Economic Oppor-  
tunity Amend-  
ments of 1967.

### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$1,980,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, \$476,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, \$60,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part D of title I, \$950,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, \$27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out section 406 of title IV, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title V, \$25,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title V, \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

78 Stat. 508.  
42 USC 2701  
note.

79 Stat. 978.  
42 USC 2966.

Post, p.711.

80 Stat. 1472.  
42 USC 2991 et  
seq.

## TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

### JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

78 Stat. 508.  
42 USC 2711-  
2722.

#### "PART A—JOB CORPS

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.



"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

"INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

"(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age fourteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

"(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular school-work, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs, or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

"(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;

"(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves; and

"(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe (including special standards for the enrollment on a residential basis of 14 and 15 year olds) and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

"SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including court, probation, parole, law enforcement, education, welfare, and medical authorities and advisers. They shall also provide for—

"(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the purpose of—

"(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

"(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and



"(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

"(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

"(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion.

#### "SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows such potential enrollee's individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that his conduct will not be inimical to the goals and success of the Job Corps and that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.

"(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.

#### "ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

"(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

65 Stat. 75.  
Ante, p. 100.



Loyalty oath.  
Post, p. 716.

62 Stat. 749.

“(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act or a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.’ The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

“(d) After the Director has determined whether an enrollee is to be assigned to a men’s training center, a conservation center, or a women’s training center, the center to which he shall be assigned shall be that center of the appropriate type in which a vacancy exists which is closest to the enrollee’s home, except that the Director, on an individual basis, may waive this requirement when overriding considerations justify such action. Assignments to centers in areas more remote from the enrollee’s home shall be carefully limited to situations in which such action is necessary in order to insure an equitable opportunity for disadvantaged youth from various sections of the country to participate in the program, to prevent undue delays in the assignment of individual enrollees, to provide an assignment which adequately meets the educational or other needs of the enrollee or is necessary for efficiency and economy in the operation of the program.

“(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions.

#### “JOB CORPS CENTERS

“SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers may be residential and/or nonresidential in character and shall be designed and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling, and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers, to be known as Civilian Conservation Centers, to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men’s and women’s training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment.

“(b) To the extent feasible, men’s and women’s training centers shall offer education and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresidential basis to participants in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

Civilian Conservation Centers.

Post, p. 683.



## "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

"(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

Enrollee education and vocational training.

"(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

High school equivalency certificates.

"(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

## "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

"SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees with such personal, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the program and not to exceed \$50 per month thereafter, except that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not exceeding \$50 per month, may be provided from the beginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be of less than six months' duration, and the Director is authorized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates specified herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him. Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage continued participation in the program, achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their personal allowances.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.



Termination of  
enrollment.  
Readjustment  
allowance.

"(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

80 Stat. 495.

"(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

#### "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

"SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

#### "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Community ad-  
visory councils.

"SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Whenever possible, such advisory councils shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action agency. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it,



including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and cooperative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

#### "COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

"SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

"(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.

"(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity. Records.

"(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 637(b) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of this Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. Post, p. 720.

The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to— Records.

"(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;

"(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;

"(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and

"(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.



If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.

"EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

"SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, institutions of higher education, boards of education, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

"(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime sponsors, as described in part B of this title, in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, in-

78 Stat. 532.

42 USC 2948.

Research project grants.

Post, p. 683.



cluding programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

Report to Congress.

78 Stat. 532.

42 USC 2948.

“(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of existing educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

“(1) a job survey be made of the area;

“(2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;

“(3) an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

“(4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and

“(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

#### “ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

“SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

80 Stat. 1469.

42 USC 2945.

#### “PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

“SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of mean-



ingful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

"(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

Veto power of Governor.

"(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

#### "APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

Federal employ-  
ment laws, non-  
applicability.

"SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

68A Stat. 3.  
53 Stat. 1362.

"(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

Compensation for  
work injuries.  
5 USC 8101 et  
seq.  
80 Stat. 532.

"(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

"Performance of  
duty."

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

80 Stat. 540.

"(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

"(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

Tort claims.  
62 Stat. 982.  
28 USC 2671 -  
2680.

"(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

62 Stat. 983;  
80 Stat. 306.

"(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.

"(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.



---

"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

---

"SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase the residential capacity of Job Corps centers above forty-five thousand enrollees.

"(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio of 50 per centum women enrollees in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socioeconomic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

"(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$6,900 per enrollee. Operating costs, limitation.

"(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States. Studies. Property of the United States.

---

"POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

---

"SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps shall be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

"(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions." 43 Stat. 1070.  
2 USC 256.  
Corrective actions.

---

WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

---

SEC. 102. Part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: 78 Stat. 512.  
42 USC 2731 et  
seq.



"PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

"COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

"(b) For the purpose of this part, a community may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to community action, manpower services, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and comprehensive work and training programs assisted under this part.

"(c) A comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant component programs authorized by this Act with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs and activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

"PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123(c)). This agency must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"(b) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

"(c) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make use of public and private organizations as delegate agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work and training program, including without



limitation agencies governed with the participation of the poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational institutions, the public employment service, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training institutions, and other capable public and private organizations.

"(d) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement.

"(e) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

#### "ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following: Work and training programs.

"(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school;

"(2) programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over) with useful work and training (which must include sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training) designed to assist those persons to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment;

"(3) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

"(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

"(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or Concentrated employment program.



proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

“(6) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

“(7) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

“(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: *Provided*, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

“(9) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

“(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

“(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this part. In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts.

Minimum wages.

52 Stat. 1062; 80

Stat. 838-841.

29 USC 206.

75 Stat. 71.

29 USC 213.

80 Stat. 1466.

42 USC 2922.

80 Stat. 1475.

42 USC 2610c.



## "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant; and

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) The Director shall terminate financial assistance for any program under this part in any case in which he determines that any person charged, in whole or part, with the responsibility for the administration of the program is a member of the Communist Party.

"(c) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(d) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(e) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

## "PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

Low income.  
Criteria.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

Federal employ-  
ment laws, non-  
applicability.

## "ELDERLY

"SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.



"PILOT PROJECTS

"SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

"(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

"(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part and part D of this title. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

Post. p.688.

"ROLE OF THE STATES

"SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

"(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

"(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

"(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

"(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

Post. p.703.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a) (5); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

"LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations



establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this part exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 225(c). Post, p. 702.

#### "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

"(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

76 Stat. 23.

42 USC 2571

note.

78 Stat. 532.

42 USC 2948.

"(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this part. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129."

#### SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

SEC. 103. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

80 Stat. 1455.

42 USC 2761-

2762.

#### "PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 150. The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to eligible urban areas, and (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

##### "ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies or private organizations for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part. Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact on the area served. Such programs may include—



80 Stat. 1465;  
Post, p.  
 42 USC 2901 et  
seq.

Ante, p. 683.

"(1) economic and business development programs, including programs which provide financial and other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas served so as to provide employment opportunities for residents of those areas, and programs such as those described in title IV of this Act for small businesses in or owned by residents of such areas;

"(2) community development activities which create new training and employment opportunities and which contribute to an improved living environment; and

"(3) manpower training programs for unemployed or low-income persons which support and complement economic, business, and community development programs, including without limitation activities such as those described in part B of this title.

#### "REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 152 (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program or component project under this part unless he determines that—

"(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

"(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the development of entrepreneurial and management skills and the ownership or participation in ownership of assisted businesses by residents of the area served;

"(3) projects will be planned and carried out with the maximum participation of local businessmen by their inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory councils, or through other appropriate means;

"(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and with other relevant plans for physical and human resources of the areas served;

"(5) the requirements of subsections 122(e) and 124(a) of this Act have been met;

"(6) preference will be given to the residents of the areas served in filling jobs and training opportunities; and

"(7) training programs financed under this part shall be designed wherever feasible to provide those persons who successfully complete such training with skills which are also in demand in communities or neighborhoods other than those for which programs are established under this part.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from one location to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

"(c) The level of financial assistance for related purposes under this Act to the area served by a special impact program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this part.

"(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not less than 7 per centum for the purpose of carrying out this part.

#### "APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

"SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for business location and expansion purposes is

80 Stat. 1255.  
 42 USC 3301  
 note.

Ante, p. 684,  
 686.

Limitation.

63 Stat. 414.  
 42 USC 1451 et  
seq.



made available as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

“(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall be deemed ‘redevelopment areas’ within the meaning of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the provisions of title II of that Act.

“Redevelopment areas.”

79 Stat. 560;  
80 Stat. 1477.  
42 USC 3161.

“(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this part.

#### “EVALUATION

“SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Director may designate, and up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the Director's findings and recommendations concerning the program, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

78 Stat. 532.  
42 USC 2948.

#### “FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

“SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.”

#### COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

SEC. 104. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

78 Stat. 516.  
42 USC 2781 et  
seq.

### “TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

#### “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

“SEC. 201. (a) This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—



"(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be made more responsive to local needs and conditions;

"(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

"(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

"(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

Office of Economic Opportunity, statement of policy.

"(b) It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

#### "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

##### "DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 210. (a) A community action agency shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—

"(1) has the power and authority and will perform the functions set forth in section 212, including the power to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

"(2) is determined to be capable of planning, conducting, administering and evaluating a community action program and is currently designated as a community action agency by the Director.



A community action program is a community based and operated program—

Community action program.

“(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

“(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

“(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the purposes and provisions of this title.

“(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

“(c) For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a community action program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to work and training programs, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and community action programs assisted under this title.

“(d) The Director may designate and provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency in lieu of a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines (1) that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or to carry out such plan in a satisfactory manner, or (2) that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

“(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a community action agency designated under section 210(a) if the elected or duly appointed governing officials of such political subdivision do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

“(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.



"COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

"SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(d), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

Board member-  
ship.

"(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available or willing to serve is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.

"(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to the character, funding, extent, and administration of and budgeting for programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, such board, council, or agency shall be broadly representative of such area, subject to regulations of the director which assure adequate opportunity for membership of elected public officials on such board, council, or agency. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to make use of neighborhood-based organizations composed of residents of the area or members of the groups served to assist such agency in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of components of the community action program.

Board stand-  
ards.

"(d) (1) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total membership), procedures establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group, which shall not be less than 50 percent of the membership, shall be established by the board.



"(2) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the community action board or governing board may petition for adequate representation.

"(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title. Board powers.

"(f) Each community action board referred to in the first sentence of subsection (a) shall—

"(1) have a full opportunity to participate in the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries;

"(2) have at least one-third of its members chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served;

"(3) be so established and organized that the poor and residents of the area concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests and regularly participate in the planning and implementation of those programs; and

"(4) be a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad community involvement in the programs assisted under this title.

#### "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives. Use of funds.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions: Community action agency, functions.

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems



and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency



shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

Rules and regulations.

“(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan or nonpartisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

#### “HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

“SEC. 214. Each community action agency shall encourage the establishment of housing development and services organizations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is required to help low-income families and individuals more effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs. Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit housing development corporations. Such corporations may themselves become sponsors of housing under existing programs of specialized housing agencies, but under no circumstances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs now administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing development and service organizations shall coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts so that any programs undertaken under authority of this section shall be closely related to other community action programs.

#### “PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

##### “GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 221. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies for the planning, conduct, administration and evaluation of community action programs and components. Those components may involve, without limitation, other activities and sup-



porting facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly poor—

- “(1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;
- “(2) to attain an adequate education;
- “(3) to make better use of available income;
- “(4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and a suitable living environment;
- “(5) to undertake family planning, consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions;
- “(6) to obtain services for the prevention of narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics;
- “(7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, including the need for health services, nutritious food, housing, and employment-related assistance;
- “(8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and family problems which block the achievement of self-sufficiency;
- “(9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs of the community; and
- “(10) to make more frequent and effective use of other programs related to the purposes of this title.

He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency.

“(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

“(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

“(d) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as a condition of assistance, that each community action agency has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds provided under this part. Such systematic approach shall encompass a planning and implementation process which seeks to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the community, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and private resources, establishes program priorities, links program components with one another and with other relevant programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may, however, extend the time for such requirement to take into account the length of time a program has been in operation. He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation of other Federal agencies in support of the development and implementation of plans under this subsection.

“(e) In order to promote local responsibility and initiative, the Director shall not establish binding national priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall review each application for

Ante, p. 691.

Financial  
assistance.  
Condition.



financial assistance on its merits. Before extending financial assistance to a new community action agency under this section, and in determining the amount of and conditions on which such assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the extent and nature of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance to a previously existing community action agency, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such agency.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under section 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (A) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (B) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, or (C) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private non-profit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as 'Project Headstart' focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level. "Project Headstart."

"(2) A program to be known as 'Follow Through' focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential. Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements. "Follow Through."

"(3) A 'Legal Services' program to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate serv- "Legal Services."



ices. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall make arrangements under which the State bar association and the principal local bar associations in the community to be served by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the proposed project before such project is approved or funded, and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the operations of such project, if approved and funded. No funds or personnel made available for such program (whether conducted pursuant to this section or any other section in this part) shall be utilized for the defense of any person indicted (or proceeded against by information) for the commission of a crime, except in extraordinary circumstances where, after consultation with the court having jurisdiction, the Director has determined that adequate legal assistance will not be available for an indigent defendant unless such services are made available.

"Comprehensive  
Health Services."

"(4) A 'Comprehensive Health Services' program which shall include—

"(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of poverty and marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, such as preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and followup services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and

"(ii) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to low-income residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served: *Provided, however,* That such services may be made available on an emergency basis or pending a determination of eligibility to all residents of such areas.

Funds, allotment.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit and consider the comments and recommendations of the local medical associations in the area and shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services; and



"(B) Programs to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both prospective and practicing health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or arrange for training and study in the field of health services for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, the Director may arrange for the payment of stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for persons undergoing such training and study and for their dependents. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall achieve effective coordination of programs and projects authorized under this section with other related activities.

"(5) A program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary educational success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assistance for such projects may be provided directly to institutions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely coordinated with activities of community action agencies and activities carried on under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

"Upward Bound."

"(6) A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services' designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange to carry out his functions through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a manner that will insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or other agencies or organizations if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects, such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, which will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve and make available not less than \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not less than \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out this paragraph.

79 Stat. 1219.  
20 USC 1001  
note.

"Emergency Food  
and Medical  
Services."

Funds.

"(7) A 'Family Planning' program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maxi-

"Family Plan-  
ning."



"Senior Opportunities and Services."

imum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

"(8) A program to be known as 'Senior Opportunities and Services' designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Consistent with, and subject to, the provisions of sections 230 and 232 (a), (b), and (c), programs under this section may include related training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

#### "RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 223. In the conduct of all component programs under this part, residents of the area and members of the groups served shall be provided maximum employment opportunity, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement. The Director shall encourage the employment of persons fifty-five years and older as regular, part-time and short-term staff in component programs.

#### "NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

"SEC. 224. The Director shall encourage the development of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in such fields as health, education, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services, and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate framework) as to promote maximum participation of neighborhood residents in center planning, policymaking, administration, and operation. In addition to providing such services as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available, such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs, such as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community development activities, as may be necessary or appropriate to best assure a system under which existing programs are extended to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are responsive and relevant to the range of community, family, and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighborhood needs and conditions.



---

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

---

"SEC. 225. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to section 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

Reallotment.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

Special programs, allotment.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 221 and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title, Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 131.

Non-Federal contribution.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 221 and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c). The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

Ante, p. 687.  
Restriction.



## "PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

## "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

## "STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

## "RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to



be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

78 Stat. 532.  
42 USC 2948.

“(c) Not more than 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of this section. One-third of the sums so appropriated or allocated shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (f) of this section.

“(d) No pilot or demonstration project under this section shall be commenced in any city, county, or other major political subdivision, unless a plan setting forth such proposed pilot or demonstration project has been submitted to the appropriate community action agency, or, if there is no such agency, to the local governing officials of the political subdivision, and such plan has not been disapproved by the community action agency or governing body, as the case may be, within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

“(e) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot projects which (1) aid elderly persons to achieve greater self-sufficiency, (2) focus upon the problems of rural poverty, (3) are designed to develop new techniques and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, or (4) are designed to encourage the participation of private organizations, other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this title.

“(f) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

79 Stat. 552.  
42 USC 3121  
note.

“EVALUATION

“SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this title, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services and including, where appropriate, comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of those programs or individual projects. He may require community action agencies to provide for independent evaluations, and where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis. He shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. He shall also arrange for obtain-



78 Stat. 532.  
42 USC 2948.

ing the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. The reports of studies undertaken under this section, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, shall be public records, and the results shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

“(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplemental financial assistance provided by sections 221, 222, 230, and 231.

“(c) The Director shall provide by contract for the conduct of an independent study and evaluation of the action taken under sections 210 and 211 of this Act and the effects thereof, with particular reference to (1) the exercise of their authorities under the provisions of title II of this Act by States and political subdivisions, (2) the participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, public officials and others and (3) the administrative and program advantages and disadvantages, if any, encountered or foreseen in implementing such sections. He shall transmit such study and evaluation to the Congress before April 1, 1969.

#### “PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

##### “ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

Assistant Directors, appointment.

“SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

##### “RURAL AREAS

“SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232, of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

“(b) The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall



consider the relative number in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school drop-outs; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service; and (7) poor persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places as determined by the latest reports of the Bureau of the Census.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

#### "SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 242. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

#### "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 243. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review



and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in subsection (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

**Annual audits.**

“(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

“(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

**“SPECIAL LIMITATIONS**

“SEC. 244. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

“(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

**Compensation,  
limitation.**

“(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 225 (c) have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering



cases (particular in large metropolitan areas) where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local salary levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

“(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

“(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

Family planning services.

“(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates are inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

“(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

“(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

“(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

“(7) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all of the programs assisted under this title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency exceed 15 per centum of the total costs, including non-Federal contributions to such costs, of such programs. The Director, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation, criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs of such programs. In any case in which the Director determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 per centum of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the

Financial assistance, limitation.

Waiver.



limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 245. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

78 Stat. 524.  
42 USC 2841-  
2881.

SEC. 105. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read "PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM", and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read "LOANS TO FAMILIES".

42 USC 2841.

(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards."

78 Stat. 524;  
80 Stat. 1464.  
42 USC 2851.

(c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting the word "principal" after the word "aggregate", and (2) by inserting after "families" the following: ", and, in the case of the elderly, will contribute to the improvement of their living or housing conditions".

42 USC 2946.

(d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking out "titles III of this Act" in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

(e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows:

#### "PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

#### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.

#### "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

"(b) Programs assisted under this part may include projects or activities—

"(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation (including the provision and maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling;



“(2) to promote increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families; and

“(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farmworkers and members of their families as appropriate through education and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment brought about by technological advancement and to take advantage of opportunities available to improve their well-being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent employment or by participating in available Government training programs.

#### “LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under this part unless the Director determines that the applicant will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

“(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures or requirements to assure that programs under this part are carried on in coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

#### “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

“SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such technical assistance or training of personnel as may be required to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

“(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evaluation of projects under this title and may, through grants or contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.”

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

SEC. 106. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “enterprises;” and inserting in lieu thereof “enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals, or (2) owned by low-income individuals;”.

78 Stat. 526.  
42 USC 2901.

(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended by—

80 Stat. 1465.  
42 USC 2902.

(1) striking out “employment of the long-term unemployed” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban or rural areas with high proportions of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals”;

(2) striking out the period at the end of the next to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon; and

(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sentence, “*Provided, however,* That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency.”

(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: “, and shall seek to stimulate new private lending activities to such concerns through the use of the loan guaranties, participations in loans, and pooling arrangements authorized by this section”;

(2) by striking out the first subsection (b);



(3) by adding at the end of the second subsection (b) the following: "To insure an equitable distribution between urban and rural areas for loans between \$3,500 and \$25,000 made under this title, the Administrator is authorized to use the agencies and agreements and delegations developed under title III of the Act as he shall determine necessary."; and

(4) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection  
 "(c) The Administrator shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section, including full information on the location, income characteristics, and types of businesses and individuals assisted, and on new private lending activity stimulated, and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

78 Stat. 532.

42 USC 2948.

42 USC 2907.

(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

(1) renumbering section 405 to read "408" and inserting in such section "and the Secretary of Commerce" immediately following the word "Administration";

42 USC 2906.

(2) striking out section 404; and

(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, 406, and 407 to read as follows:

#### "DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director, after consideration of any recommendations of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consideration of any recommendations of the Director, shall define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

#### "LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

#### "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

"SEC. 406. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

Ante, p. 710.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

"(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;



"(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities;

"(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

Ante, p. 710.

"(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

"(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

"(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

"(c) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

"(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

"(e) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall, in carrying out programs under this section, consult with and take into consideration the views of the Secretary of Commerce, with a view to coordinating activities and avoiding duplication of effort.

"(f) The President may, if he determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, transfer any of the functions under this section to the Secretary of Commerce.

"(g) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide for an independent and continuing evaluation of programs under this section, including full information on and analysis of the character and impact of managerial assistance provided, the location, income characteristics and types of businesses and individuals assisted, and the extent to which private resources and skills have been involved in these programs. Such evaluation together with any recommendations as he deems advisable shall be included in the report required by section 608.

78 Stat. 532.  
42 USC 2948.

#### "GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 407. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this



section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608."

#### DAY CARE PROJECTS

80 Stat. 1466.  
42 USC 2921-  
2925.

SEC. 107. (a) Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part at the end thereof:

#### "PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day care for children from families which need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise to obtain objectives related to the purposes of this Act, with particular emphasis upon enabling the parents or relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to continue basic education, vocational training, or gainful employment.

##### "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to appropriate public agencies and private organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons may receive day care. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment and services. Such day care projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Financial assistance under this section may be provided to employers, labor unions, or to joint employer-union organizations, for day care projects established at or in association with a place of employment or training where such projects are financed in major part through private funds. Project costs payable under this part may include costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.

49 Stat. 620.  
42 USC 1305.

"(b) The Director may require a family which is not a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in part, for the day care services provided under this program where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

"(c) The Director may provide, directly or through contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance and training necessary for the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part.

"(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. In approving applications for assistance under this part, the Director shall take into consideration (1) the extent to which applicants show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas which they will serve, and (2) the extent to which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed, including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.



"(e) Each project to which payments are made hereunder shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evaluation shall be conducted by such agency or independent public or private organization as the Director shall designate, with a view to determining, among other things, the extent to which the day care provided may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, the extent to which such day care may have reduced the costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities in the area served. Up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this part, except that where such evaluation is carried on by the assisted agency itself, he may pay only 90 per centum of such costs. Such evaluations, together with a report on the program described in this part, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

78 Stat. 532.  
42 USC 2948.

#### "DURATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 523. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years."

(b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

80 Stat. 1466.

#### "TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND DAY CARE PROGRAMS"

(c) Title V of such Act is further amended by inserting after the heading thereof the following:

#### "PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS"

(d) Sections 501, 502, 503, 504, and 505 of such Act are amended by striking out "this title" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

42 USC 2921-  
2925.

#### AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

SEC. 108. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "four" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

80 Stat. 1468.  
42 USC 2941.

(b) Section 602(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; by inserting before "compensate" the following: "except that no individual may be employed under the authority of this subsection for more than 100 days in any fiscal year: (2)"; and by striking out ", and" after "travel time" and inserting in lieu thereof "; and (3)".

78 Stat. 528.  
42 USC 2942.

(c) Section 603(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

80 Stat. 1469.

"(b) Programs assisted under this Act shall not be carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with (1) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office, (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or (3) any voter registration activity. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue rules and regulations to provide for the enforcement of this section, which shall include provisions for summary sus-

42 USC 2943.



pension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis."

(d) Section 604 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

"SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to assure that—

"(1) special notice of and an opportunity for a timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided for an agency or organization which would like to serve as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose application to the prime sponsor or community action agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed reasonable by the Director;

"(2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency situations, nor shall an application for refunding under sections 123, 221, 222, or 312 be denied, unless the recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and opportunity to show cause why such action should not be taken; and

"(3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient agency has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing."

(e) Part A of title VI of such Act is amended by inserting, after section 605, the following new section:

"ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESEARCH OR DEMONSTRATION CONTRACTS

"SEC. 606. (a) The Director or the head of any other Federal agency administering a program under this Act shall make a public announcement concerning:

"(1) The title, purpose, intended completion date, identity of the contractor, and proposed cost of any contract with a private or non-Federal public agency or organization for any demonstration or research project; and

"(2) The results, findings, data, or recommendations made or reported as a result of such activities.

"(b) The public announcements required by subsection (a) shall be made within thirty days of entering into such contracts and thereafter within thirty days of the receipt of such results.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General to assure that the requirements of this section are met, and he shall at once report to the Congress concerning any failure to comply with these requirements."

(f) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and title II the meaning of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 225 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes

78 Stat. 531.  
42 USC 2944.

42 USC 2941.

42 USC 2949.



all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in titles I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services;

"(3) the term 'permanent resident of the United States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a non-immigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

"(4) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity."

(g) Section 610 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

"SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, education and other services and activities which assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) maintain a constant review of all programs under this Act to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration; (3) initiate and maintain inter-agency liaison with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority. In exercising his responsibilities under this section, the Director shall cooperate with the Commissioner on Aging. The Director shall describe the ways in which this section has been implemented in the annual report required by section 608."

(h) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "part A of title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II", and (2) by inserting the words "a substantial number of the" immediately before the word "persons" the second and third time that word appears.

(i) Section 611 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR THOSE VOLUNTARILY POOR

"SEC. 611. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that, in determining a person's eligibility for benefits under this Act on account of his poverty, such person will not be deemed to meet the poverty criteria if his lack of income results from his refusal, without good cause, to seek or accept employment commensurate with his health, age, education, and ability."

(j) Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

66 Stat. 189;

79 Stat. 911.

8 USC 1184,

1152.

8 USC 1153.

79 Stat. 978;

80 Stat. 1468.

42 USC 2950.

Duties of  
Director.

78 Stat. 532.

42 USC 2948.

80 Stat. 1470.

42 USC 2951.

78 Stat. 532;

80 Stat. 1470.

42 USC 2961.

42 USC 2962.



## "JOINT FUNDING

"SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose."

78 Stat. 533.

(k) Section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

## "LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 613. No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act shall, pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted under this Act by such community action agency or such other agency, plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance."

79 Stat. 978;  
80 Stat. 1471.  
42 USC 2966.

(l) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

## "TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations for any program or activity under this Act or any Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity, not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out any such program or activity under the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 per centum."

(m) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

80 Stat. 1472.  
42 USC 2970.

(1) adding the following new section after section 620:

## "RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

78 Stat. 528;  
80 Stat. 1468.  
42 USC 2942.  
Ante, p. 698.

"SEC. 621. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 222(a) (2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(2) striking out the heading "PART B—COORDINATION OF ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS" and

(3) inserting at the end of such title a new part B to read as follows:

## "PART B—COORDINATION

## "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, provides for an information center, and prescribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to promote better coordination among all programs related to this Act, with a view to making those programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State



and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal resources in the solution of specific problems, and generally improving cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of this Act.

"ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 631. (a) There is established, in the Executive Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council'), which shall be composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and such other officials of the Federal Government as the President may from time to time designate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council to serve as chairman. Each member shall designate an alternate to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to assist the President in— Duties.

"(1) providing for the coordination of Federal programs and activities related to this Act;

"(2) developing basic policies and setting priorities with respect to such programs and activities;

"(3) resolving differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities; and

"(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of this Act.

"(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties. Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide temporary assistance. Executive Secretary.

"(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a separate report to the Congress. Report to Congress.

"(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall reserve such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

"SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

"(1) undertake special studies of specific coordination problems at the request of the President or the Council, or on his own initiative;

"(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities under this Act, and consult with interested agencies and groups, including State agencies described in section 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council, with a view to identifying coordination problems that may warrant consideration by the Council or the President and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action for overcoming those problems, either through the Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other Federal, State, or local agencies; and Ante, p. 703.

"(3) prepare a five-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of Federal and other governmental expenditures, and,



where feasible, the contributions of the private sector, needed to eliminate poverty in this country within alternative periods of time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized by this and other Acts, and any new programs which may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country, and it shall include recommendations for such new programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress and updated on an annual basis.

#### "COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering programs related to this Act shall—

"(1) cooperate with the Director and with the Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities; and

"(2) carry out their programs and exercise their functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted by other applicable law.

"(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their responsibilities under this Act.

"(c) The President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

#### "COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effective administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where appropriate other related programs or projects, and be included within or otherwise carried on in combination with community action programs. In the case of other programs related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies responsible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in a manner which encourages combinations with other related projects and activities where appropriate, and with community action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make a continuing review of the operation of this section with a view to (1) determining particular groups of programs which, because of the objectives, or similarities in target groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and making recommendations accordingly to the President or appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or recommending additional or common procedures, as appropriate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent, consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and making recommendations respecting such consolidations to the Director and the President.

#### "INFORMATION CENTER

"SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and operate an information center for the purpose of insuring that maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this Act and that information concerning those programs and other relevant information is readily available to



public officials and other interested persons. The Director shall collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute information as described above, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In connection with operation of the center, the Director may carry on research or studies concerning the improvement of information systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal information systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials or used to further coordination objectives.

"(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. He may also make grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

"(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to State and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required by those agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.

#### "PROHIBITION

"SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

#### "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through such procedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement) shall—

"(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (a); and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.



## "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 638. As used in this part, 'programs related to this Act' and 'coordination' shall include the programs and actions described in this section:

"(1) 'Programs related to this Act' include programs under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted programs which have objectives which are, in whole or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of this Act, or which provide resources which may be used in combination with resources under this Act to assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

"(2) 'Coordination' includes, but is not limited to—

"(A) actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor, such as actions: to extend services to new areas, provide them in a common place, or structure them so that they are more readily accepted or widely utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited education or other special handicaps; to establish common eligibility standards among programs serving substantially similar groups or operating in the same areas; or to develop methods of operation or administration that will provide new employment incentives or opportunities for the poor;

"(B) actions to promote better use at the State or local level of Federal assistance available under diverse programs, such as actions to establish procedures for cooperation among State or local agencies seeking assistance from different Federal sources with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication and service gaps and promoting common or complementary priorities; or to modify or improve technical or administrative requirements imposed by different Federal agencies that may operate to increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imaginative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their cooperation with one another;

"(C) actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources, such as actions to develop new methods of processing requests for assistance or granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies more generally to use resources jointly in support of common objectives; to establish common priorities for purposes of program planning, research and demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

"(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legis-



lation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively."

#### AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 109. Section 701(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out "July 1, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1968", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "With respect to any period after June 30, 1969, subsection (a) shall not apply."

Public assist-  
ance.  
78 Stat. 534.  
42 USC 2981.

#### VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

80 Stat. 1472.  
42 USC 2991 et  
seq.

### "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

#### "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

##### "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

#### "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

##### "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

"(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities; and

"(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities



that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor. The assignment of such a volunteer in any State shall be terminated by the Director when so requested by the Governor of such State not later than thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Governor and Director after such request has been made by the Governor to the Director.

#### "TERMS OF SERVICE

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

"(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

Ante, p. 674.  
62 Stat. 749.

#### "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

80 Stat. 495.



"PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than are required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

"(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

"(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

"SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

"SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for the conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and in not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, under which—



Ante, p. 672.

"(1) volunteers under part A, and members of the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section, provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-five with intensive education, training, and counseling for at least a six-month period prior to their release from confinement and for at least a six-month period thereafter;

"(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hundred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

"(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section, members of the Teacher Corps who have been recruited and trained by one or more institutions of higher education; and

"(4) not more than forty such members are furnished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such members are so furnished during each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for purposes of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per week for each dependent. Such members who are experienced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without regard to the provisions of section 513(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

79 Stat. 1256.  
20 USC 1103.

#### "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B, and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

##### "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

"SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons and older persons membership groups as volunteers and participant agencies in the various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.



## "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

"SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

Federal employ-  
ment laws, non-  
applicability.

"(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a) (2) (B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

80 Stat. 525.  
5 USC 7321-  
7327.

## "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

"(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

"(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be directly or indirectly utilized to finance labor or anti-labor organization or related activity.

"(e) Persons serving as volunteers under this title shall provide such information concerning their qualifications, including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to such procedures, for selection and approval as the Director may require. The Director may fix such special procedures for the selection and approval of low-income residents of the area to be served by a program who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title.

## "DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

## TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 111. (a) Sections 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (and all references to such sections) are redesignated as 141, 142, 143, 144, and 145, respectively.

Ante, pp. 683-  
686.

(b) Section 141 of such Act (and all references to such section) is redesignated as 161.

(c) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council," the following: "of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council,".

78 Stat. 422.  
3 USC 105.



## TITLE II—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

### INVESTIGATION

SEC. 201. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is authorized and directed to make an investigation in sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, in order to determine—

(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

78 Stat. 508.

42 USC 2701 note.

### REPORTS

SEC. 202. The Comptroller General shall make such interim report as he deems advisable and shall transmit his final report to the Congress not later than December 1, 1968. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation as he deems advisable.

### POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 203. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated officer.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

5 USC 5101-  
5115, 5331-  
5338.

80 Stat. 416.

5 USC 3109.



## AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

## TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 embezzles, willfully misapplies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds, assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or contract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Penalties.

78 Stat. 508.

42 USC 2701  
note.

(b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal to renew a contract of employment in connection with a grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 induces any person to give up any money or thing of any value to any person (including such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

## TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 401. The amendments made by this Act shall be in effect immediately upon its enactment, except as provided in this section. Until June 30, 1968, the provisions of section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act shall apply to community action agencies in existence and funded prior to the enactment of this Act, except that in any grant or funding agreement made with such an agency prior to June 30, 1968, adequate provision shall be made for transfer of functions, obligations, records, authority, and funds to any community action agency designated pursuant to sections 210 or 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended by this Act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall require the termination before February 1, 1969 of an existing community action agency or any program assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 prior to the designation of, and provision of financial assistance to, a community action agency or other agency established under sections 210 and 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended by this Act.

78 Stat. 516;

80 Stat. 1456.

42 USC 2782.

*Ante*, pp. 691,  
692.

Approved December 23, 1967, 10:25 a.m., Cam  
Ranh Bay, So. Viet Nam.

## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 866 (Comm. on Education and Labor) and  
No. 1012 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 563 (Comm. on Labor and Public Welfare).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 113 (1967):

Sept. 22, 25-29, Oct. 3-5, Dec. 8: Considered and passed Senate.

Nov. 3, 7, 8, 13-15, Dec. 11: Considered and passed House.



3540 E